FHI 059, Version 12	1	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0399			Date of visit: 03/12/2019			
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Ir	nspector:			
Site No: FS0860 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Shapinsay Scottish Sea Farms Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLA	4 VMD 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 8.9	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA O-2			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Stock on site was split down to Puldrite in August 2019 @500-600g. No problems reported on site at time of inspection, fish showed very good feed response. Visibility was poor at time of inspection due to adverse weather conditions which were deteriorating during the inspection, however, no dead observed. One moribund observed in centre of cage 8, unable to catch as too close to the centre. All fish sampled for VMD appeared in very good condition with very few caligus observed. Lep numbers have been extremely low, one adult female counted in summer, otherwise no adult female leps reported. Site conducted a hydrogen peroxide treatment for AGD in September 2019, numbers had began to increase. Numbers have remained low and not reported to be causing any issues.

Only sea lice treatment conducted this cycle has been one SLICE treatment to reduce the levels of caligus. Mortalities are incinerated at central point for all SSF sites in Orkney, with the incinerator situated at Twatt.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0399	019-0399 Site No: FS0860						
Date of Visit:		03/12/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL							
Age group	19 S1							
No Fish	313,154							
Mean Fish Wt	1.9 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Jan 2021		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	2021 S1		
Recent (last 4 wks) (disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inspection?						V
2. Date of last inspe		i irispection:					18/08/2017	'
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	,				10/00/2017	Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				Ÿ
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried out	t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	isiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed of	f?			Other (detail))		
If other detail:	Incinerated a	at central loca	tion at Twatt.		<u> </u>			
3. Mortality records								Y
			wk 48 - 225	for site, wk 47	- 147 for site,	wk 46 - 200	for site, wk 4	5 - 165 for
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): site								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.							

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y				
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y				
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S.					
If other, detail:					
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y				
Biosecurity Records					
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y				
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any					
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y				
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y				
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?					
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher					
health status, certification if required)?					
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y				
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	V				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y				
aquaculture animals held on site?					
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	1				
II IIO, detail.					
Results of Surveillance					
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y				
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y				
3. Any significant results?	N				
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).					
Records checked between: August 2017 to Dec 2019					

г	HI 059, Version 12							ISS	uea by: F	HI			
	Case no:	2019-03	399	Site No:	:	FS0860			Date of v		03/1	12/2019	03/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	y. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		00:00	1	Inspector	r:			VMD No). [39
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG	\ 	VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
۰													
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Г	Pool/Fish No												
Г	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6						
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL						
	Average weight	2kg	2kg	2kg	2kg	2kg	2kg						
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW						
						_							
o ic													
Jetails									- 1				
			0						- 1				
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	1	_	5	7	0	10		_				
Ċ,	Facility NO	1	3	5	7	9	10						

12/2019 Additional Sample Information:													
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0399		Site No:	FS0860		Insp:	
Date of Visit	03/12/2019		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		novements on from equivalent zone or					
species		cluding third country	0		18	26	0
	Number of sup	oliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
	Number of desi		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Ir :	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
	•	or in a coastal zone with category V					H
	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				0
	-	from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0	Ī			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2	1			0
					Total		21
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0399	;	Site No:	FS0860	
Sea Lice Inspection (4 0			
•	nced sea lice problems in the previous	•	o oingle w	aar alaaa baaia?	
	lanagement Area (or equivalent) fa access to a range of licenced in-fee				
azamethiphos and ema	amectin benzoate) as well as acce in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agree	ss to suitable biological a	nd/or mech	hanical control measur	res, and
Management Area (or		illent of statement releva	int to the si	ite and Coop i anni	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection? (Le	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard spe	ecified 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 sugg (CoGP Annex 6)	ested criteria for treatme	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	that
_	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numb 0/6/19) during the period that recor	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6	6/19) or
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Health Inspec	ctorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considere	d to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
	reatments been administered or othereatment 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	a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in coope	eration between participat	ting farms?	•	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where fewer				
	ific written lice management proced scalation of a sea lice infestation?	dure with waypoints desc	ribing set a	ctions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea I	ice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment damage due to pre	edators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
	ce to mitigate against the predation		etail below)	Υ
	d nets, tensioned nets, top nets,	M.M.L.			
If other, detail below:					
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been experienced on	or in the vicinity of the si	te since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question	10			
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (whe	re they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisher	ies trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If ye	s give detail			
9. If gill note were death	oved was this action agreed with la	cal wild fich interests and	Wac norm	ission given by Seettis	h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed with lo P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	cai wiiu iisti iiiterests and	was perm	ission given by Scottis	"
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the risk	of further escapes? (No	t covered in	n code but could	
be considered under	r satisfactory measures of the A	ct)			
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with regards to co	ntainment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No: 2019-0399 Site No: FS0860 Date of Visit: 03/12/2019 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 date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 8. 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 exceination 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 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?	FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	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 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 maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual 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 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 vacination in the sea 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?	Case No: 2019-0399	Site No: FS0860	
1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area? If N, no further questions require completion. Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify 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?	Date of Visit: 03/12/2	019 Inspector:	
If N, no further questions require completion. Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared? 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection? 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area? 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies? 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement? 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review? Arrangements for Fish Health Management 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm? 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm? 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm? Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments? 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?	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 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 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?	1. Is the farm under inspection locat	ted within a farm management area?	Y
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 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 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?	If N, no further questions require co	mpletion.	
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 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 the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?	Points of Compliance for Both Fa	rm Management Agreements and Statement	s
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?	3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the release.5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish6. Does the FMAg/S identify the data	or inspection? evant farm management area? n farm site(s) to which it applies? te of commencement of the agreement or staten	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?	Arrangements for Fish Health Ma	nagement	
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?	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?	10. Does the FMAg/S identify the sp11. Does the FMAg/S identify the m	pecies of fish which may be stocked into the are	a or farm?
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?	12. Does the FMAg/S identify the ar		dead fish from any
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?	Arrangements for The Manageme	ent 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?	13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrang	gements for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
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?		ailability and the use of medicines on farms cov	
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?		•	e treatments for sea
47. Done the FMA v/C identify the amount of a symplectic traction at a few as within the area?	16. Does the FMAg/S identify the cir	rcumstances under which biological controls and	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?	17. Does the FMAg/S identify the ar	rangements for synchronous treatments on farm	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements	Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?	area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the ar	·	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	le harvest practices on farms in the area or individu	ual 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 fallow a	and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto site	es covered by the
-	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ot?	on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become,	, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	l operated in accordance with the agreement or sta	atement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 25/01/2019	

Site No: FS0860

Case No: 2019-0399

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No: 2019-0399 Site No: FS0860

Date of visit: 03/12/2019 Inspector(s): PMM

Point for consideration Risk level Satisfactory? Requirement Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records				
1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2,	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in	Low & Medium	Υ	Annex 6	
the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ?			SSI 1,2,	
(Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date				
of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility				
number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed				
and correct stages recorded ⁴				
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not	Low	N/A	SSI 1,2(g)	No lice counts missed
conducting the count stated?				
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give	Low	N/A		No sea lice counts missed, if not conducted this would be recorded in
detail.				site diary.
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4		N	Detail if necessary:	
years?				
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea li	ce			
2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:				
a) L. salmonis record levels have been above the suggested criteria	High	N/A	CoGP Annex 6	Never above CoGP suggested criteria
for treatment?				
b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	Never at level to cause welfare problem
welfare problems		V	0.00404005004	01105 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	Medium	Υ		SLICE administered to reduce caligus levels.
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of :			VMD ¹² 19	
	Litaria	V	SSI 1,3	
the name / identity of the product	High	Y		
the date of administration	High	Y		
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered	High	Y		
the method of administration of the product	High	Y		
the identification of the fish / facilities treated	High	Y		
name of the person administering the treatment	Low	Y		
the withdrawal period	Medium	Υ		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:			VMD 18	
the name of the veterinary surgeon	High	N/A		
name of the product	High	N/A		
batch number	High	N/A		

1111 033, VEISIOII 12		issued by	,. 1 1 11	Bate of 100ac: 00/10/2010
Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
the date of administration	High	N/A		
amount administered	High	N/A		
identification of fish treated	High	N/A		
withdrawal period	Medium	N/A		
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant	High	N/A		One SLICE for caligus, Lep levels have been extremely low.
impact upon the lice levels recorded?				
Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site				
average <i>L.salmonis</i> numbers (all stages)		N. / /	001.4.4	
2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their	Low	N/A	SSI, 1,4	
impact is there a record of:				
the nature and date of the method employed; the identification				
number of all facilities subjected to the method; the name of the				
person employing the method				
2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:			VMD 19	
proof of purchase of the medicine concerned	Medium	Υ	VMD 17	
name of the product	High	Υ	1	
batch number	High	Υ	1	
the date of purchase	Medium	Υ		
the quantity purchased	High	Υ		
the name and address of the supplier	Medium	Υ	1	
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19	
the date of disposal	Medium	N/A		
the quantity of product involved	Medium	N/A		
how and where it was disposed of	Medium	N/A		
2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83	
protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea				
lice?				
Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments				
conducted on site	N.A. altaura	V	0-05404045000	01.105 to restore cellings
2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	SLICE to reduce caligus
2.11 If not in there a recorded accountable reason for not assured in a	Medium	N/A	CoCD 4 3 125 5 2 00	
2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?	wedium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
circumstances?	Wediaili	14//	4.0.100, 0.0.09	
2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use,	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	Provided by company vet.
available to those responsible for treatment administration?			10.700, 0.0.07	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea		Υ	Detail if necessary:	
lice?			,	
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and	farm managen	nent agreements		
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of	Low	Υ	SSI 1,5,b	
contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?			CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
provisions of the NTS ⁶ ?				
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	Between SSF and CAS.
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
involvement? Consider:			SSI 1,5, c	
-agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -coordinated monitoring and treatment				
-co-operation between participating farms				
This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to			4	
determine				
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in	Low	N/A	SSI 1, 5, c	At present sea lice levels are extremely low.
relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?				,
3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in	Medium	N/A	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of				
treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the				
maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy?				
For example, the principles of ISLM include:				
Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event				
(SADE) to the VMD.				
The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a				
suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking				
veterinary advice)				
Appropriate discharge consent in place				
Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as				
necessary				
Monitoring lice numbers Using an array of treatments where possible				
Treating all stocks on site at the same time				
Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients				
Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and				
certainly not on the same cohort of lice				
Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities.				
0.7.4	I II I-	V	0-0040705047	
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	
within the defined area?				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?				
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?		Y	AFSA ¹³ 4A Detail if necessary:	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	FMAg in place between SSF and CAS
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	FMAg in place between SSF and CAS
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	FMAg in place between SSF and CAS
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium	N/A	AFSA 4B	FMAg in place between SSF and CAS
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined, is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?	High ¹⁰	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High	N	CoGP 4.3.100	multi year class area
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.101	
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures		_		
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site?	High	Υ	CoGP 7.1.8	
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1	
parasite identification	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High	Υ	5.3.53-55	
recording counts	High	Υ		
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Υ		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Υ		
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	Y	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	

	B'-1-11	10-11-10		
Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this				
Where records exist regarding SOPs and site procedures these				
should be inspected to confirm suitability				
e. Inspection of site and site stock				
5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?	Medium	Υ	VMD schedule 5	
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count	High	Υ		
data?				
Refer to section e) of guidance notes				
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating	High	Υ		
to sea lice infestation?				
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Υ	CoGP Annex 6,	10 fish from all pens sampled for sea lice and gill scores, weekly
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in	High	Y	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
lice recognition and recording?	· ···g··	T.	1.0.0 1 00, 0.0.00 00	
(Cross reference to training records – Section d)			1	
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54	Due to adverse weather conditions, full sea lice count, following 10 fish
6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP	Medium	Υ	Annex 6	nor cade weekly protocol - not observed - However competence was
suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)?				
N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the				
control and reduction of sea lice			_	
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information	High	Υ	Annex 6	
including species and stages observed to be correct?			_	
Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are:				
for Caligus elongatus all identifiable stages and for Lepeophtheirus				
salmonis chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg				
strings) ¹¹				
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be	Medium	Y	1	
satisfactory?				
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate	High	N/A		Administration of treatments not observed, only sea lice treatment
competent manner?				condcuted this cycle has been a SLICE treatment to reduce caligus
				levels on site.
Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per				
prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations,				
appropriate product used				
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	
surgeon for dosage calculation?				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?		Υ		Withdrawal for TMS, company vet has access to fish talk.
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
h. FHI sea lice counts If necessary conduct a sea lice count in accordance with the protocol of the CoGP. Indicate where this procedure has been done and make a record of results within the comments box	Power granted under the Act — section 3 (2) (a)	
Collection of samples If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection	Power granted under the Act — section 3 (3) (a)	
j. Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)	

- [1] Scottish Statutory Instrument The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008
- [2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture
- [3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be s
- [4] Recording requirements:- for C. elongatus all identifiable stages and for L. salmonis mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)
- [5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately
- [6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS
- [7] FMA = Farm Management Area
- [8] FMS = Farm Management Statement
- [9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement
- [10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18
- [11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate for Caligus elongatus: mobiles; and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis: non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.
- [12] VMD The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)

Point for consideration Risk level Satisfactory? Requirement Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary

[13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)

Case No:	2019-0399	Date of visit: 03/12/2019						
Site No:	FS0860	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD SLA	06/12/2019							
SLA	12/12/2019							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 03/12/2019

 Site No
 FS0860
 Site Name
 Shapinsay

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190399

An enhanced sea lice inspection to ascertain the levels of sea lice and for assessing the measures in place for the prevention, control and reduction of sea lice was conducted in accordance with the Aguaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of records with regards to sea lice, site procedures with regards to sea lice and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of sea lice records

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

b) Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

c) Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and area management agreements.

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

d) Inspection of records relating to training and procedures

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

e) Inspection of site and site stock

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

f) Inspection of farm count procedures

An inspection of site staff conducting and recording a sea lice count was carried out. This met the requirements of The Fish Farming Business (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 and CoGP. No further recommendations or further action required.

g) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

Procedures were not inspected as a treatment was not taking place at the time of inspection. However, discussions on procedures with the site manager would suggest that the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 12/12/19





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 FS0860 INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 03/12/2019
SITE NAME Shapinsay
CASE NO 20190399

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.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

 Site numbers of the source site or destination site for movements on and off site were not being recorded in the movement records book. Discussed with site manager at time of inspection and these are to be recorded for future movements.

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 fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

An enhanced sea lice inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

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



Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 06/12/19

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018						
Case No: 2019-0715			Date of visit: 02/12/2019						
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspecto	r:						
Site No: FS1076 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Setterness North (Bomlo) Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8.9	Thermometer No:	T274	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-4						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Additional Case Information:

On inspection of the site, moribund/ lethargic fish were noted and removed for further examination. No external signs of disease were noticed with gills looking in good condition. Main external signs that were noticed was physical damage as a result of the physical treatment (Optilicer) that had recently been on site (wk 44, 28/10/2019) when mortality levels jumped from 4,235 (0.57%) the previous week to 8,733 (1.18%). Gill health had been noted on site prior to this but mortality levels had remained low. After the increase in mortality levels post treatment, they quickly fell back to what they had been prior to this event. Pen 3 which had slightly higher weekly mortality levels than other pens underwent a freshwater treatment instead and did not see such an increase in mortalities post treatment. Fish taken for VMD sampling were examined and appeared in good condition with no signs of disease both externally and internally.

Inspection of sites records carried out on 02/12/2019 while inspection of stock on site carried out on 03/12/2019.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2019-0715		Site No:	FS1076					
Date of Visit:		02/12/2019			Inspector(s):]	
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		te representa	itive?			Y Y	}	
Site Details									
Total No facilities Species	SAL	12	Facilities sto	cked	11	No facilitie	s inspected	12	
Age group No Fish	2019 S1 706,000								
Mean Fish Wt	2.7 kg								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	March 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site) -	Jan. 2021			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N	
Movement Records 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspe 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a system Mortality Records	s available for ction: plete and corre cords available plete and corre ates for introd ints carried out tem in place for	ectly entered? e for dead fislectly entered? luctions (outwood) t by (or on belor maintenance	h and waste? ith GB) availa nalf) of the bu	uble? siness (not usi	_		15/10/2018	Y Y Y Y N/A	
1. Mortality records		•			\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	TIM/NAA /Ch-	. 41 =1\	Y	
2. How are mortalities If other detail:	es aisposea o	Γ?			Whole fish -	I WIMA (She	etiand)		
Mortality records (Recent mortality (·	correctly ente		818, 1.48%), 4	6 (8,588, 1.19	%), 47 (3,10	03, 0.44%), 4	8 (2,746,	
5. Evidence of recer		• •						N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:					
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N	
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action:	unexplained) r	mortalities bee	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A	
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.									

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
4. Do continue describe (local 4 colon)2		V
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		ĭ
If yes, detail: T.M.S	ა.	
If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for insper	ction?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly e	ntered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspersion.	ection?	Y
•	ortality removal, recording and safe disposal bee	n considered?
	the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinal	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	•	y professional of any
moreaged (arresplanted) mortality at the	Site been indicated:	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the	e event that the presence or suspicion of the pre	esence of a listed disease
	when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	

15/10/2018 - 02/12/2019

5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher

6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

Records checked between:

health status, certification if required)?

aquaculture animals held on site?

If no, detail:

ni 059, version 12							153	ueu by.				
Case no:	2019-07	715	Site No:		FS1076					02/	12/2019	03/
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG					
Time sampling starts/ends:	14:4	5:00	15:1	5:00	l	Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. 	12
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
dd Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1	2										
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL										
Average weight	2.7000	2.7000										
Sex	N/A	N/A										
Water Type	SW	SW										
	ت Girlsta	Railsborough (Kames)										
	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 2.7000 Sex N/A Water Type SW	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 2 Pool Group Species SAL SAL Average weight 2.7000 2.7000 Sex N/A N/A Water Type SW SW	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 14:45:00 15:1 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No BA Fish nos 1 2 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 2.7000 2.7000 Sex N/A N/A Water Type SW SW	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 14:45:00 15:15:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No BA Pool Group Species SAL SAL Average weight 2.7000 2.7000 Sex N/A N/A Water Type SW SW	Case no: 2019-0715 Site No: FS1076 Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling starts/ends: 14:45:00 15:15:00 15:15:00 Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG Add Fish/Pools - click MG MG Pool/Fish No 1 2 Description Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 2.7000 2.7000 Sex N/A N/A N/A Water Type SW SW	Case no: 2019-0715 Site No: FS1076 Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling starts/ends: 14:45:00 15:15:00 Inspectors Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Image: Pool Group species SAL SAL Species SAL SAL Average weight 2.7000 2.7000 Sex N/A N/A Water Type SW SW	Case no: 2019-0715 Site No: FS1076 Priority samples: VI BA PA MG Time sampling starts/ends: 14:45:00 15:15:00 Inspector: Inspector: Inspector: Inspector: Starts/ends: A MG VI VI VI VI VI A VI VI	Case no: 2019-0715 Site No: FS1076 Date of Samplin Priority samples: VI BA PA MG Time sampling starts/ends: 14:45:00 15:15:00 Inspector: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Inspector: Inspector: Pool/Fish No Inspector: Inspector: Inspector: BA MG VI Inspector:	Date of visit/ Sampling: VI	Case no: 2019-0715 Site No: FS1076 Date of visit/ 02/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2019-0715 Site No: FS1076 Date of visit 02/12/2019

12/2019	2/2019 Additional Sample Information:												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018	
Case Number:	2019-0715		Site No:	FS1076		Insp:		
Date of Visit	02/12/2019		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		_	40	- 00		
species	compartment in Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	0	
Movements off	Frequency of n		0			10	10	
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 l		0					
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I		_				
diseases)		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		4	
		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			
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters			Chiocodic			
processors	,, p	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0	1	2		0	
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0	1				
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	-			\vdash	
		n from MS of equivalent status	1				-	
		n from zone or compartment of					-	
	equivalent status							
	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	1				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3	
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ī			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5					
Biosecurity	•	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				\vdash	
CoGP/Regulator				J				
Practices in accordance	Yes		<u> </u>	1			0	
with regulator or industry	No			-			\vdash	
code of practice			3	J				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0	
	No		2				\vdash	
					Total		23	
					Rank		MEDIUM	

Case No:	2019-0715	Site No: FS1076								
Sea Lice Inspection (S	••									
 Has the site experient 	iced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N							
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	anagement Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Y							
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	mectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period		nd							
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		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 adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)										
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	N							
_	•	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) od that records are inspected?	or Y							
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Υ							
9. Is <i>C. elongatu</i> s infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N							
•		istered 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 actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	N/A							
•	•	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Y							
		I 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 recognise infestation?	ed Y							
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Y							
Containment Inspecti	on									
 Has the site experier 	iced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N							
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ							
Top Nets, Tensioned	Nets, M.M.L									
If other, detail below:										
 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 skij	p 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	capees? If yes give detail								
8 If all nots were deplo	wed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish								
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)									
		imise 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

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0715	Site No: FS1076	
Date of Visit: 02/12/2019	9 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 Is the current FMAg/S available for it Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fance Does the FMAg/S identify the date on Does the FMAg/S identify the date on 	int farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statement of review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Managements	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or Y
 Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin Does the FMAg/S identify the special 	nation requirements for stocks held in the area of ies of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available to arms?	reatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and c farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable h	narvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	which the area or individual farm will be fallo	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	or more year classes may be stocked onto s	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brockovered by the agreement or statement?	odstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	ot on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Managem	ent Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreemen parties to the agreement?	nt include arrangements for persons to becor	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and ope	erated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	the FMAg/S? 1.5 - Aug. 2018	

Site No: FS1076

Case No: 2019-0715

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

Case No:	2019-0715	Date of visit: 02/12/2019							
Site No:	FS1076	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	1								
	 								
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI/ CNI/ SLI/ VMD	13/12/2019								
	1								





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0440 **DATE OF VISIT** 03/12/2019 SITE NO FS1076 SITE NAME Setterness North (Bomlo)

CASE NO INSPECTOR 20190715

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 13/12/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0716			Date of visit: 02/12/2019				
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Ins	pector:				
Site No: FS1027 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Linga (Setterness) Grieg Seafood Shetland L	_td				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 8.9	Thermometer No:	T274	FHI 045 completed N/A				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-4				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		Y 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. N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

On inspection of site the occasional moribund fish was spotted (less than 1 per pen). No clinical signs of disease were noticed so no diagnostic samples were taken. Lice levels have been above reporting threshold and physical (Optilicer) and bath treatments have been carried out which reduced levels below the reporting threshold as well as the CoGP suggested criteria for treatment.

Week 47 (w/b 18/11/2019) increased mortality down to tarpaulin treatment on pen 9. High level toxicity with salmosan. Volume of water within tarp lower than expected when standard dose of salmosan added. Treatment aborted after an hour when it was spotted that a few fish were starting to go over. Pen 9 had 7066 (14.26%) morts. Mortality rate immediately dropped back to 68 fish for that pen the following week. Issue was raised with site manager at time of inspection and resolved.

Inspection of records carried out on 02/12/2019 while inspection of stock on site carried out on 03/12/2019.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0716		Site No:	FS1027				
Date of Visit:		02/12/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	itive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details			_			_		
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL							
Age group	2019 S1							
No Fish	464,000							
Mean Fish Wt	2.5 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Aug. 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	March 202	1	
D				N	1,	/-: l4	·:-:4\0	N
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		IN	Any escapes	(since last	VISIT)?	N
•								
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
Date of last inspe							12/09/2018	
Are records comp		•						Y
Are movement re	cords availab	le for dead fis	h and waste?					Y
Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	siness (not us	ing a STB)?			N/A
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	tation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for ii	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail: 3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•			0.04%), wk 46	(283, 0.06%),	wk 47 (10,2	243, 2.15%),	wk 48 (941,
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal	lities?					Y
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
Week 47 Pen 9. Inc	rease in mort	alities (7066,	14.26%) due	to error in cond	centration of ba	ath treatme	nt. See additi	onal info
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (inexplained) i	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:		Event report	ed to compan	y vet.				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N

If yes, detail:	H2O2, T.M.S., Salmosan	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records compl	lete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdr	awal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)? H2O2, T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Record	9	
•	s available for inspection?	Y
•	nd frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
	nd period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ned) mortality at the site been included?	Y
` '		
4. Has the action tha	t will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
	uded and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health sta	tus of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	ation if required)?	
	lry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disea	ase been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals		
_	ity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveilla	nce	
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
•	available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant res	ults?	N
	etailed under recent disease problems).	

12/09/2018 - 02/12/2019 Records checked between:

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:						: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0716		Site No	FS1027		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/12/2019		No of n	novements/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	(5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone o		9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers		0 5		14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n			0 3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des			0 3		10	3
Exposure via water	<u> </u>	Site contac	ts	0 1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	(o			
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion		1 2	4		4
	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 wate		0 1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		(
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)			1			1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status			2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status			4			
	Processing fish from Category III farm			В			
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10	0			\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	(D			
products	Common processes 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
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5			-
Biosecurity		Number of site	es	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
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			- 1			ш
CoGP/Regulator			_	_			
Practices in accordance	Yes						0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		;	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes						0
	No			2			Ш
					Total Rank		25 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0716	Site No: FS1027	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)		
 Has the site experient 	nced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ
	mectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and of time?	Y
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		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	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?	•	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	N
_	•	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o od that records are inspected?	rY
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Υ
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)	Y
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	N/A
•	•	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Y
		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 recognise infestation?	d Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspecti	on		
 Has the site experier 	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ
Top Nets, Tensioned	Nets, M.M.L		
If other, detail below:			
 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	estions 4 – 9. If No skij	p 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	
8 If all note were deple	wed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
	•	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under	•	·	
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ

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: 2019-0716	Site No: FS1027	
Date of Visit: 02/12/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	etion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 Is the current FMAg/S available for in Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fait Does the FMAg/S identify the date of Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or stateme f review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimularm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introd	uced to the area or
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	ation requirements for stocks held in the area of ies of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm i	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	gements for the storage and disposal of any dearm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cover	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requilice on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available tarms?	treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circuiused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and of farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or ingements for the movement of live fish on and o	

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 indi	vidual 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 fallocked?	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep?	pt 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 becor	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 1.5 - Aug. 2018	

Site No: FS1027

Case No: 2019-0716

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

Case No:	2019-0716			Date of visit:	02/12/2019			
Cusc No.	2010-0110			Date of visit.	02/12/2010	ı		
Site No:	FS1027			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
						-		
Report Summary	_			1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/ CNI/ SLI	23/12/2019		Z IIISP					
2011 01111 021	20/12/2010							
	†							





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440 SITE NO FS1027 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 03/12/2019
SITE NAME Linga (Setterness)
CASE NO 20190716

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 not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

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

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: 23/12/2019
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: 2019-0717			Date of visit: 03/12/2019
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0408 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Poseidon Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9	Thermometer No:	T274	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-4
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•		mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site inspected and fish appeared to be in good health with no lethargic/moribund fish seen. Mortality levels have not been above reporting level all through current production cycle. Sea lice levels have been above reporting threshold and physical (Optilicer) and bath (freshwater) treatments have been carried out which has reduced numbers below reporting levels. Lice numbers currently above CoGP suggested criteria for treatment. Further physical and bath treatments scheduled to begin towards the end of week 49.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0717		Site No:	FS0408]			
Date of Visit:		03/12/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL							
Age group	2019 S1							
No Fish	565,948							
Mean Fish Wt	2.07 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Aug. 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Jan. 2021		
Recent (last 4 wks) (disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspec 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records comp 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certificators	s available for ction: lete and corre cords available lete and corre ates for introd	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered?	h and waste?				29/08/2018	Y Y Y N/A
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a systematical syste	nts carried out			•	_			N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a		•						Y
How are mortalitiesIf other detail:	es disposed of	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (·	·		0.04%), wk 46	(474, 0.08%),	wk 47 (557	, 0.10%), wk	48 (297,
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action:	ınexplained) ı	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	d by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last				Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S			
If other, detail:				
2. Medicines records avai	•			Y
3. Are records complete a				Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal	·			Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S		
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stored a	ppropriately?			Y
Biosecurity Records				
1. Biosecurity records ava	ilable for inspection?			Y
2. Has the manner and fre	equency of mortality removal, record	ing and safe disposal b	peen considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and pe	eriod in which the APB will notify Sco	ttish Ministers or veter	inary professional of any	
increased (unexplained)	mortality at the site been included?			Y
	be taken in the event that the preser	•	•	Y
	and how and when that will be notif			
	f aquaculture animals being stocked	on the farm site been	covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification	if required)?			
6. Have the husbandry an	d hiosecurity measures implemente	d hetween each enider	miological unit to minimise	Y

If no, detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

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

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

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

Records checked between:

29/08/2018 - 03/12/2019

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:						: 08/10/2018	
Case Number:	2019-0717			Site No:	FS0408		lnsp:	
Date of Visit	03/12/2019				ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements				0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of mov	vements on from equi	valent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		vements on from equi	valent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of supplie	uding third country ers		0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of mov			0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of destin			0		6	10	3
Exposure via water			Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or bo	,		0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream o	in a coastal zone wit r within 1 tidal excurs	ion	1	2	4		4
	farms upstream o	in a coastal zone wit r within 1 tidal excurs	ion	1	3	6		Ш
		in a coastal zone wit r within 1 tidal excurs		1	4	8		
Management practices				None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing p	lant discharging into a	adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm proce			0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)			1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status		status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status			4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm			8				\Box
	Processing fish fr	om Category ∀ farm		10				ldot
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own waste	only processed.		0				$\overline{}$
products	Common processes with other farms			3	1			3
	Collection point for	or waste from other fa	rms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unp	asteurised feed		0	l			0
	Feeding unpasted	urised feed		5				-
Biosecurity		N	umber of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from	om single shorebase		0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staf	f and equipment		0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1				\vdash
CoGP/Regulator					1			
Practices in accordance	Yes			n]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			0				0
	No			2				
						Total Rank		23 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0717		S	ite No:	FS0408		
Sea Lice Inspection (• •	s in the previous 4 years	s?				N
	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single y	ear class basis?		Υ
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of lica	cenced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medica	ations (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	ures, and	Υ
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or		gement agreement or sta	atement relevan	nt to the si	ite and CoGP Farm		Y
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, Co	oGP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the C	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	•	elow the suggested criter	ria for treatment	t in the Co	oGP during the period	d that	N
_	•	<i>lmonis</i>) numbers per fisl od that records are insp		el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or	Y
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If r	no, FHI see com	nment.			Υ
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welf	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, §	5.3.50)	N
		istered or other actions elongatus is considered					Υ
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where	applicable)?					Υ
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon t	the lice le	vels recorded?		Υ
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	d out in cooperation bety	veen participatir	ng farms?	•		Υ
		where fewer population		_		nt for	Υ
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with winfestation?	aypoints descril	bing set a	actions to deal with re-	cognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	se detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	ion						
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment dama	ige due to predators in t	he current or pr	evious pro	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (De	tail below)		Υ
Top Nets, Tensioned	l Nets, M.M.L						
If other, detail below:							
2. Have seems incide	unta au avenuta haan av	maniamanal am an in tha vi	inimity of the site	ainaa Ala	- last Elli inspection?		N
•		perienced on or in the vi	icinity of the site	e since the	e last FHI inspection?		•
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep		•					
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB f	orthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP - 4	.4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO ar	nd local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover es	capees? If yes give deta	il				
8. If all nets were deal	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and	was nerm	ission given by Scotti	ish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		g. Journal Total Wild Hal	cicoto ana \	uo penin			
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could		
be considered unde	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with i	regards to containment?	If no, please de	etail reaso	on(s)		Υ

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: 2019-0717	Site No: FS0408	
Date of Visit: 03/12/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for it 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fat 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date o 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date o 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statemer f review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	iced to the area or Y
 Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin Does the FMAg/S identify the species 	nation requirements for stocks held in the area o ies of fish which may be stocked into the area o mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	r farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ad fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available tr arms?	reatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and cl farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify accepta	able harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the date date when a farm or area may be rest	es by which the area or individual farm will be fallow tocked?	v and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether agreement or statement?	r one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	tes covered by the Y
_	r broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ont?	on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Mana	agement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agree parties to the agreement?	ement include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed an	nd operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issu	ue of the FMAg/S? 1.5 - Aug. 2018	

Site No: FS0408

Case No: 2019-0717

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

Case No:	2019-0717	Date of visit: 03/12/2019								
Site No:	FS0408]		Inspector	WJM]				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
					.			.		
					<u> </u>					
			-							
	+			+	 	-		+		
	_	-		<u> </u>	 			+		
					 			 		
			-		 					
					 					
				1	t	1		t		
					 			1		
	•	•			•	•				
Report Summary Case Type				1						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI/ CNI/ SLI	23/12/2019			1						
				1						





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0440
 Date of Visit
 03/12/2019

 Site No
 FS0408
 Site Name
 Poseidon

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190717

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.

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.

Date: 23/12/2019

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0718			Date of visit: 04/12/2019				
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspe	ector:				
Site No: FS0946 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	North Voe Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd	3				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 9.16	Thermometer No:	T274	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-5				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

All mortalities for current production cycle put down to poor performers and physical damage. Numbers have increased slightly from end of October but never been above reporting threshold. Week 45 (28/10/19), was when mortalities started to increase. A storm had blown in so tougher conditions for the poor performers to cope with is thought to be the main reason. No lethargic or moribund fish spotted while carrying out inspection of all stocked pens. Fish were coming up for food and appeared in good condition. A total of 4 fish were removed for VMD sampling. External and internal examination showed no signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0718		Site No:	FS0946				
Date of Visit:		04/12/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilities	s inspected	8
Species	SAL							
Age group	2019 S0							
No Fish	357,898							
Mean Fish Wt	0.553 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Jan./ Feb 20	21	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	March/ Apı	ril 2021	
D	dia a a a a a a a a la la			N	1,	/-: l4·	-:-:t\0	N
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		IN	Any escapes	(since last \	VISIT)?	N
•								
Movement Record	_							
1. Movement records available for inspection?								
2. Date of last inspection: 30/08/2017								
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?								
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?								
5. Are records comp		•		-61-0				Y
6. Are health certific		iuctions (outw	vitn GB) avalia	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen				•	_			N
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for ii	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente		0, 1.44%), 46 (2 496 0 050/	17 /2 107	0.60/.) 49./2	Y 224 0 620/\
4. Recent mortality ((last 4 wks):		VVK 45 (5,50	0, 1.44 /0), 40 ((3,400, 0.9370)	, 47 (2, 107,	0.070), 40 (2	.,234, 0.0270)
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no		••		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								N
If yes, detail: 7 Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities he	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? N/A If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								N/A

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
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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of 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?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 30/08/2017 - 04/12/2019	

	Summary samples	HIST		ВА	MG	VI	PA	Total Sa	mples
	ld Fish/Pools - click								
	Pool/Fish No								
	Fish nos	1-2	3-4						
	Pool Group								
	Species	SAL	SAL						
	Average weight	0.5530	0.5530						
	Sex	N/A	N/A						
	Water Type	SW	SW						
	Stock Origin Facility No	Girlsta	Girlsta						
S	racility NO	4	7						

	Additional Sample Information:											
0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of Issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0718		Site No:	FS0946		lnsp:	
Date of Visit	04/12/2019		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	0
Name and a set		•					10
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10 10	10
Exposure via water	Iraniber of des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I 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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	laillis upstream	IT OF WILLIIIT T LIGHT EXCUISION	<u>'</u>	4	٥		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		О
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0	1			
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	4	-			
		n from MS of equivalent status	1				1
		n from zone or compartment of					
	equivalent stat		4				
	Processing fish	n 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	Ī			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	-			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No fooding of a	unpasteurised feed		ן 1			
Ose of unpasteurised feeds	Feeding unpas	•	5				-
Biosecurity	r ccarrig arripas	Number of sites		J	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0		2		0
		taff and equipment	0		2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	-			
CoGP/Regulator	<u> </u>		<u>'</u>				
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	1			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		15
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0718	Site No: FS0946	3					
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)							
1. Has the site experien	ced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?	N					
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class	basis?					
	mectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including de well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical co of time?						
 Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e 		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and Co	OGP Farm Y					
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ					
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. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)								
_	•	nonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (pried that records are inspected?	or to w/b 10/6/19) or N					
	•	ealth 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? (Co	GP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N					
•		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> had longatus is considered to have welfare implications? (Co						
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	pplicable)?	N/A					
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recor	rded? N/A					
•		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Y					
		where fewer populations or part populations are held with						
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ment procedure with waypoints describing set actions to festation?	deal with recognised Y					
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Y					
Containment Inspection								
		ge due to predators in the current or previous production	cycles?					
2. Are measures in plac	e to mitigate against t	he predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ					
Tensioned Nets, Top	Nets, A.D.D., M.M.I							
If other, detail below:								
			N					
•		erienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI	I inspection?					
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	·	•						
5. Have these been rep	orted to local DSFB fo	rthwith (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)? (CoGF	9 – 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	reed with local wild fish interests and was permission giv	ren hy Scottish					
Ministers? (Legal, CoGI	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)							
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code bu	it could					
be considered under	•	·						
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ					

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: 2019-0718	Site No: FS0946	
Date of Visit: 04/12/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 Is the current FMAg/S available for it Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fance Does the FMAg/S identify the date on Does the FMAg/S identify the date on 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statemer f review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	iced to the area or Y
 Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin Does the FMAg/S identify the special 	nation requirements for stocks held in the area o ies of fish which may be stocked into the area o mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	r farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ad fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	ed by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available tr arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and cl farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	le harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	ividual 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 fallocked?	ow and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep?	pt 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	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 1.5 [ext] - 15/05/2019	9

Site No: FS0946
Case No: 2019-0718
Nature of non-compliance:

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

Case No:	2019-0718	Date of visit: 04/12/2019						
Site No:	FS0946	l		Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	+							
	+		 					
	+							
	+							
	1							
	.							
	_							
	+							
Report Summary	T	I		1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/ CNI/ SLI/ VMD	13/12/2019		2 11130					
	1							
			<u> </u>					





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0440
 Date of Visit
 04/12/2019

 Site No
 FS0946
 Site Name
 North Voe

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190718

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.

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 13/12/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0719			Date of visit: 05/12/2019				
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspe	ctor:				
Site No: FS0088 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Cloudin Cooke Aquaculture Scotland	d Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 9.03	Thermometer No:	T274	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-10				
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 N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

All records available and correctly maintained. No lethargic or moribund fish spotted while carrying out inspection of all stocked pens. Fish were coming up for food and appeared in good condition. A total of 25 fish were removed for VMD sampling. External and internal examination showed no signs of disease.

No mort count for wk. 48 as all staff and workboats assisting carrying out a freshwater treatment at another site so prevented mort's being lifted. Mortality records for the start of week 49 showed no increase from previous weeks.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0719]	Site No:	FS0088				
Date of Visit:		05/12/2019			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL							
Age group	2019 S0							
No Fish	712,334							
Mean Fish Wt	0.413 kg	1 1 0001		N (1 (5	. /8':	0 /0 /	0004	
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	July 2021		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Sep./ Oct.	2021	
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(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 If yes, is there a systematical	nts carried ou	• •	•	•	_			N
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a How are mortalitie If other detail:	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	Y
If other detail: 3. Mortality records of		on site incin						Y
4. Recent mortality (•	correctly ent		014%), 46 (59	96. 0.08%). 47	(940, 0.13%	6)	
5. Evidence of recen	•	typical morta			, 0.00 /// 1.	(0.10, 0.110)	<u> </u>	N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
C. Americathan maales in			l d O					■ NI
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	mortality du	ring period cr	iecked?					N
•	7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?							
f yes, detail action:								
Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								

2. Medicines records available for inspection?	_							
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								
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y							
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							
moreusea (arresplantea) mortanis at the site been menausa.								
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease								
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?								
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y							
health status, certification if required)?								
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y							
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?								
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y							
aquaculture animals held on site?								
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y							
If no, detail:								
Results of Surveillance								
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	V							
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Ÿ							
3. Any significant results?	N							
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	IN							
ii yes, detaii (ii not detailed dildei recent disease problems).								
Records checked between: 04/10/2017 - 05/12/2019								

н	Priority samples:	VI		BA		PA		MG	Н			
	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		0:00 Indoors		0:00	3	Inspecto	or: 4	5	VMD No	o.	34
ı	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	PA		Total Sa	amples
Å	Add Fish/Pools - click											
Г	Pool/Fish No											
	Fish nos	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25						
	Pool Group											
П	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL						
н	Average weight	0.4130		0.4130								
н	Sex	N/A		N/A		N/A						
н	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW						
	Stock Origin	Fumace	Fumace	Furnace	Furnace	Fumace						
Ö	Facility No	1	2	6	1	11						

	Additional Sample Information:											
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0							

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FH	II			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0719			Site No:	FS0088		Insp:	
Date of Visit	05/12/2019			No of me	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 M	S	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zo	ne or	0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country		0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n			0	3	6	10	10
IVIOVEITIETIUS OII	Number of des			0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site co	ntacts	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 catego n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with catego n or within 1 tidal excursion	•	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with catego n or within 1 tidal excursion	ry V	1	4	8		ш
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			0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)		1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status		2				
	Processing fish equivalent state		4					
	_	from Category III farm		8				
	Processing fish	from Category ∀ farm		10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms		3	1			3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed		0	l			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5				ш
Biosecurity		Number o	f 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]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			0	1			0
	No			2				
						Total Rank		23 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0719		Si	ite No:	FS0088		
Sea Lice Inspection (• •	s in the previous 4 years	s?				N
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single ye	ear class basis?		Υ
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of lic amectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medica	ations (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	ıres, and	Υ
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or	_	ement agreement or sta	atement relevan	t to the si	te and CoGP Farm		Y
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the C	CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ria for treatment	in the Co	oGP during the period	I that	Υ
_	•	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fisl od that records are insp		l of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or	N
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	no, FHI see com	ment.			N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfa	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)	N
		istered or other actions is elongatus is considered					Υ
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where	applicable)?					N/A
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon tl	he lice le	vels recorded?		Υ
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	d out in cooperation betw	veen participatin	ng farms?	•		Υ
		where fewer population		_		nt for	Υ
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with wiinfestation?	aypoints describ	oing set a	ctions to deal with red	cognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	e detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	ion						
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the	he current or pre	evious pro	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (Det	ail below)		Υ
Top Nets, Tensioned	Nets, A.D.D., M.M.	L., Lice Skirts					
If other, detail below:							
3 Have escape incide	ints or events been ev	perienced on or in the vi	icinity of the site	since the	e last FHI inspection?		N
If Yes proceed with que			on the one	onioo uii	o laot i i i iliopoolioii.		
4. Have these been rep		•					
		orthwith (where they exis					
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il				
8. If gill nets were depl	oyed was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and v	vas permi	ission given by Scotti	sh	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG				1			
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not o	covered in	n code but could		
be considered under	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with r	regards to containment?	If no, please de	etail reaso	on(s)		Υ

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: 2019-0719	Site No: FS0088	
Date of Visit: 05/12/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
 Is the current FMAg/S available for it Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fat Does the FMAg/S identify the date of Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or stateme f review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimifarm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introd	luced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	ation requirements for stocks held in the area of ies of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm i	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any dearm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cover	red by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available tarms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and of farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or a	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indivi	idual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	y which the area or individual farm will be fallowed?	w and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto si	ites covered by the
-	podstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	t on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager	ment Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ent include arrangements for persons to becom	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and op	perated in accordance with the agreement or s	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue o	of the FMAg/S? 04/10/2019	

Case No:	2019-0719			Date of visit:	05/12/2019			
Site No:	FS0088	l		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notifica	tion		
Í	i i	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
					-			
D 10								
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/ CNI/ SLI/ VMD	13/12/2019							
	+							
	+							
	+							





Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd Crowness Road Hatston Kirkwall, Orkney KW15 1RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0095
 Date of Visit
 05/12/2019

 Site No
 FS0088
 Site Name
 Cloudin

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190719

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.

R25

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 13/12/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0724			Date of visit: 03/12/2019				
Time spent on site: 5	hours	Main	Inspector:				
Site No: FS0242 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Odhairn (Gravir) The Scottish Salmon C	Company				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 10.8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA W-4				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

Lumpfish stocked march this year. All of have died due to bacterial infection. Initial input of 10,000 @30g across all cages.

Biologist report on lumpfish mortality in July 2019 - no significant pathology observed and no discernible reason for die off.

Risk category increased from LOW to MEDIUM - Site will now be inspected every two years.

slightly increased mortality had been recorded in pen 5. Upon inspection two dead fish were observed floating in the middle of the pen. No moribund or lethargic fish were observed.

Hydrolysing at beginning of november showed good clearance.

Sea lice had jumped above 2 adult females per fish in week 48. Breach will be reported by company biologists.

One mortality event in 2017 (week 37) had not been reported to the FHI - 6729 fish 2.24%.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy, showing no signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0724		Site No:	FS0242				
Date of Visit:		03/12/2019			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author 1. Business/site detai 2. Changes made to	ls summary		ite representa	itive?			Y Y]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL							
Age group	2018 S0's							
No Fish	516,978							
Mean Fish Wt	3184							
Next Fallow Date (Site	e)	March 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	October 20	020	
Recent (last 4 wks) di	isease proble	ems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
·			ober - in routi	ne sampling 3		(0.1100 1001	vieny.	
Movement Records								
1. Movement records	available for	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspect							16/08/2017	
3. Are records comple		ectly entered?						N
4. Are movement reco		•						Y
5. Are records comple	ete and corre	ectly entered?						Y
6. Are health certificate	tes for introd	uctions (outw	ith GB) availa	ıble?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement	s carried out	by (or on bel	nalf) of the bu	siness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syste			•	•	_			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	vailable for ir	spection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)		
		vhite shore co	ockles		(3.2.3.1.1.	,		
3. Mortality records co								Y
Recent mortality (la	et 4 wke):		•	sh-0.16%) wk4	•	.46%) wk46	(1220 fish-	
* `	•	6 missl masses		(2467 fish-0.39	970)			V
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
Pen 5 grumbling CMS		racility/no sto	ck per racility	reason.				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								
If yes, detail: Towards end of 2017 cycle large mortalities occurred across site attributed to AGD and CMS								
7. Have increased (ur					acioss sile al	inbuteu to A	OD and Civic	Y
If yes, detail action:		Reported to	•					
joo, actan action.			uilu i i ii					

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 inspect 3. Are records complete and correctly en 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
 Biosecurity records available for inspect. Has the manner and frequency of more 	tality removal, recording and safe disposal be ne APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterin	
	event that the presence or suspicion of the p when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture a health status, certification if required)?	nimals being stocked on the farm site been c	overed (equal or higher Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity m	neasures implemented between each epidem	iological unit to minimise

If no, detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

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

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

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

CMS - detected in routine sampling end of october 2019

Records checked between:

18/08/2017 - 03/12/2019

Г	HI 059, Version 12							ISS	sued by:	FHI			
	Case no:	2019-07	724	Site No:		FS0242			Date of Samplin		03/	12/2019	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	11:0	0:00	11:3	0:00	l	Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	12
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
ı	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Δ	add Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2										
	Pool Group												
П	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	3.1000	4.1000										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	Mixed from mingary and clachan (FS0398)	Mingarry (FS0145)										
O.	T actility 140	4	5										

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0724		Site No:	FS0242		Insp:	
Date of Visit	03/12/2019		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
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Mayamanta off							10
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	10
Exposure via water	rtaniber of des	Site contacts		_			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				igwdow
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I 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		igwdow
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	namio apolican	TOT WILLIAM T LIGHT CACCATOLOGY	<u> </u>				
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	1			
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī			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	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	·	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		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				•			
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		16
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0724		S	Site No:	FS0242		
Sea Lice Inspection (••	s in the previous 4 years	s?				N
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single y	ear class basis?		Υ
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	access to a range of lic amectin benzoate) as in a reasonable perio	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab d of time?	sea lice medic ble biological ar	ations (inc nd/or mecl	cluding deltamethrin, hanical control measu	ıres, and	Υ
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or	_	ement agreement or sta	atement relevar	nt to the si	ite and CoGP Farm		Y
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)							
_	•	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish od that records are insp		el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or	Y
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	no, FHI see con	nment.			Υ
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welf	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)	N
		istered or other actions is elongatus is considered					Υ
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where	applicable)?					Υ
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?		Υ
•		out in cooperation betw					Υ
		where fewer population		_		nt for	Y
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with wiinfestation?	aypoints descri	ibing set a	ections to deal with red	cognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	se detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	on						
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in ti	he current or pr	revious pr	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (De	tail below)		Υ
ADD, tensioned nets	, top nets, MML						
If other, detail below:							
2. Hayo oscano incido	nto ar avento been av	perienced on or in the vi	icinity of the city	o oingo the	a last EUI inspection?		N
•			cirilly of the site	e since un	e last FHI IIIspection?		
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep		•				I	
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4	1.4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il				
8. If aill nets were depl	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and	was perm	ission given by Scotti	sh	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		g. 222 mar recal mile flor		Lo Polill	and the state of t		
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could		
be considered under	r satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	regards to containment?	If no, please d	letail reaso	on(s)		Υ

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: 2019-0724	Site No: FS0242	
Date of Visit: 03/12/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fair	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or stateme f review?	Y Y Y
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimifarm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introduction requirements for stocks held in the area	
	ies of fish which may be stocked into the area mum stocking density of any pen on any farm	
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	gements for the storage and disposal of any d arm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availage of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cover	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requilice on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or gements for the movement of live fish on and	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	ole harvest practices on farms in the area or individu	ual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be resto	s by which the area or individual farm will be fallow a ocked?	and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto site	es covered by the
	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept or t?	n any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreer parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become,	, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	d operated in accordance with the agreement or sta	tement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 03.07.18	

Site No: FS0242

Case No: 2019-0724

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

Case No: 2019-0724 Site No: FS0242 Date of visit: 03/12/2019

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
11/09/17	17/11/2019	≥750g	2.1kg	SAL	2016	Weekly	2.24	Explained	AGD, Complex gill issues
					1		+		

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	6729	Harvesting had commenced to reduce biomass	FHI visited 16/8/17 during start of mortality event. Diagnostics taken. Historic data collected during inspection (2019-0742) no further action required.

Case No:	2019-0724			Date of visit:	03/12/2019					
	2010 0124			Date of Visit.	30/12/2010					
Site No:	FS0242			Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
Report Summary				1						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI SLI CNI VMD	11/12/2019									
		•								





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0169
SITE NO FS0242
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 03/12/2019 **SITE NAME** Loch Odhairn (Gravir)

Case No 20190724

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 found to be inadequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

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

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

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

The FS number was not always recorded in the source/destination section of the movement book. It was agreed with the site manager during the inspection that this would be recorded moving forwards

This must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met.

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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.



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: 11/12/2019

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2019-0726			Date of visit: 04/12/2019					
Time spent on site:	0 hours	Main Ins	pector:					
Site No: FS0927 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Kyles of Vuia The Scottish Salmon Con	npany					
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 9.6	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA W-2					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

~Lumpfish input in November 2019- No significant mortality observed.

Mortality

week 38 2017- 29165 - 6.93%

week 7 2019 - 1895 - 1.35% - post input mortality - Fish less than 750g

1.13 % - 6037 - week 13 - Post input period - Fish less than 750g

During the inspection a seal was observed in one of the pens via the feeding cameras. The seal left the pen via the hold that that it entered. Divers were brought onto site within 1 hour of discovery of the hole. Divers inspected the whole net and repaired a hole in the base of the net. A initial notification was submitted to FHI the following day. A few dead salmon from seal predation were observed in the pen where the seal had gained access.

All fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0726		Site No:	FS0927				
Date of Visit:		04/12/2019	1		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? 2. Changes made to details?								
Site Details								
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	cked	14	No facilitie	s inspected	14
Species	SAL	Lumpfish						
Age group	19 S1's	2019						
No Fish	398,643	39,568						
Mean Fish Wt	2490g	30g						
Next Fallow Date (Si	te)	June 2020		Next Input Dat	te (Site)	December	2020	
(,				ı ()			
Recent (last 4 wks) o	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	Υ
	Hole discovered on day of inspection.							
Movement Records								
Movement records available for inspection? Y 2. Data of local inspections.								
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								
Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? N If you is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?								
If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records available for inspection?								
2. How are mortalities disposed of? Other (detail)								
If other detail: whole fish to white shore cockles.								
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? 4. Record mortality (last 4 w/s): 1. Record mortality (last 4 w/s):								
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): wk48(1,37%-5556)wk47(2040-0.5%)wk46(2736-0.67%) wk45(1668-0.41%)								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? If you facility nec/ne mortality per facility/ne stock per facility/reason:								
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: Seal and grilses after grade								
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								
If yes, detail: Post input mortality - see additional info								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								
If yes, detail action: Vets contacted, reported to FHI								
8 Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet								

If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? SLICE and TMS	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	V
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	V
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	У
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	У
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	У
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	У
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	У
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	У
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
,	

27/06/2017-04/12/2019 Records checked between:

Case no: 2019-0726 Site No: FS0927 Date of visit/ Sampling:	8
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 16:30:00 17:30:00 Inspector: VMD No. starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5	
starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5	
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samp	
	oles
Add Fish/Pools - click	
Pool/Fish No	
Fish nos 1 2	
Pool Group	
Species SAL SAL	
Average weight 2490g 2490g	
Sex N/A N/A	
Water Type SW SW	
Stock Origin Russell burn (FS0500) (FS0500) Russell burn (FS0500) 8	
ಸ್ರ Facility No 4 8	

12/2019 Additional Sample Information:	12/2019 Additional Sample Information:										
0 Total Tests assigned 0											
	_										
 											

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:								
Case Number:	2019-0726			Site No:	FS0927		Insp:		
Date of Visit	04/12/2019			No of mo	ovements/s		Score		
Live fish movements				0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equiv	alent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equiv	alent zone or	0	9	18	26	0	
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country		0		10	14	0	
Movements off	Frequency of n			0	3	6	10	10	
Wovernerits on	Number of des			0		6	10	3	
Exposure via water			Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,		0					
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with or within 1 tidal excursion	n	1	2	4		2	
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with n or within 1 tidal excursion	n	1	3	6		ш	
		or in a coastal zone with or within 1 tidal excursion		1	4	8		ш	
Management practices				None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into ac	ljacent waters	0	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro			0				0	
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)		1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent st	atus	2					
	equivalent stat		4						
		from Category III farm		8					
	Processing fish	from Category V 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 farr	ns	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed		0	l			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5				-	
Biosecurity		Nu	mber of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shore base		0	1	2		1	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment		0	1	2		1	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			0	1			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1				\vdash	
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					
						Total Rank		20 MEDIUM	

Case No:	2019-0726	Site No: FS0927								
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)									
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N							
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ							
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 doo Management Area (or e		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	У							
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	У							
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	У							
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	N							
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?										
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Υ							
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)										
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)										
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ							
•	· ·	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ							
			Υ							
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?										
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?										
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ							
Containment Inspecti	on									
 Has the site experier 	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	Υ							
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ							
Otak ADD, Tensione	d nets, MML, top ne	ts, seal blinds								
If other, detail below:										
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	Υ							
If Yes proceed with que		•								
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	sters?	Υ							
•		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	Υ							
6. Have these been rep	oorted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	Y							
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	N							
8 If all note were deale	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish								
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		N/A							
		imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could								
be considered under	•									
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	N							
A seal had gained entry	y to one of the pens du	uring the inspection.								

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: 2019-0726	Site No: FS0927	
Date of Visit: 04/12/20	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection locate	ed within a farm management area?	Y
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? e of commencement of the agreement or statemen	у у у
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 y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	cination requirements for stocks held in the area or ecies of fish which may be stocked into the area or aximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	r farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arr fish farm in the area or the individual	rangements for the storage and disposal of any de al farm?	ad 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	
	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available tr	reatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circused on farms in the area or individu	cumstances under which biological controls and clual farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arr	rangements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arr	cumstances when live fish may be introduced or re	
or individual farms?		

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	ole harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be resto	s by which the area or individual farm will be fallow ocked?	v and the earliest y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	tes covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether covered by the agreement or statemen	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept nt?	on any site y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agree parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	d operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 27.12.18	

Site No: FS0927

Case No: 2019-0726

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

Case No:	2019-0726			Date of visit:	04/12/2019			
Site No:	FS0927	ı		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D 10								
Report Summary Case Type								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI CNI SLI VMD	16/12/2019							





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 Visit04/12/2019Site NoFS0927Site NameKyles of VuiaInspectorCase No20190726

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 found to be inadequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had 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

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

The FS number was not always recorded in the source/destination section of the movement book. It was amended at the time of inspection and agreed with the site manager that this would be recorded in the future.

This must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met.

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.

In regards to containment and escapes, some issues were identified during the inspection.

The site has been recommended for an enhanced containment inspection and this will be conducted in due course.

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:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/12/2019

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2019-0727			Date of visit: 09/12/2019					
Time spent on site:	5 hours	Main Inspect	or:					
Site No: FS0907 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch na Thull Loch Duart Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 5.5	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

Fish moved on site from Duartmore. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/201			
Case No:	2019-0727]	Site No:	FS0907					
Date of Visit:		09/12/2019			Inspector(s):			1	
Registration/Authoral Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ils summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y		
Site Details									
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	6	
Species	SAL								
Age group	Parr								
No Fish	175,326								
Mean Fish Wt	91g								
Next Fallow Date (Si	te)	April 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	November	2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N	
Movement Records									
		v inanastian?						V	
 Movement records Date of last inspect 		r inspection?					26/10/2015	'	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	,				20/10/2013	Y	
4. Are movement red		•						Y	
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered?	•					Y	
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	ductions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A	
Transport Records									
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y	
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			Y	
Mortality Records									
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y	
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)				
If other detail:	Whole fish to	aken to Badca	all shorebase,	for collection f	or disposal.				
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente						Y	
4. Recent mortality (I	last 4 wks):		189 across s	site, 151 attribu	ted to predato	r damage (cormorants)		
5. Evidence of recen								N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:					
6 Any other peaks in	a mortality du	ring pariod ob	ookod2					N	
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	Tilloriality du	ning penou ch	ieckeu!					IN	
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A	
If yes, detail action:	,,								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.									

5111.050 V · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		D + 1: 00/40/0040
FHI 059, Version 12 Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail:		N
If other, detail:		V
Medicines records available for inspection? Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y
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		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recor	- ·	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Sc	• •	al of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presense detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no	•	sted disease Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocke health status, certification if required)?	d on the farm site been covered (equal o	or higher Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implement transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, vi	•	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place aquaculture animals held on site?	ce to maintain the physical containment of	of Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement of no, detail:	ented on site?	Y
Results of Surveillance		

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

26/10/2015 - 09/12/2019

	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA	=	MG	Н		1	
	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		00:00 Indoors	16:3 2	0:00	3	Inspecto	r: 4] 5	VMD N	o.	2
	Summary samples	HIST		ва	N	ИG		√I	PA		Total Sa	amples
	Add Fish/Pools - click											
	Pool/Fish No											
	Fish nos	1-6	7-12									
I	Pool Group											
	Species	SAL	SAL									
-1	Average weight		0.0800									
-1	Sex	N/A	N/A									
-	Water Type	FW	FW									
	Stock Origin	Duartmore	Duartmore									
Ċ	ਲ੍ਹੋ Facility No	1	2									

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

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:					: 08/10/2018	
Case Number:	2019-0727		Site No:	FS0907		Insp:	
Date of Visit	09/12/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			c	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	C	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country		9	18	26	
	Number of sup	·			10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	1 0	3	6	10	3
	Number of des		C		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contact	ts (1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or	,	c)			
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	rs (1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	C				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2	!			
	Processing fish equivalent stat	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8	3			
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	C				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	<u>-</u>			3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of ι	unpasteurised feed		- 			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	5			ш
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	C	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes						0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			Н
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		С				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes]			0
	No		2				Ш
					Total Rank		14 LOW

Case No:	2019-0727		Site No:	FS0907					
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)								
	• •	in the previous 4 years?	•						
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	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?									
• •	cumented farm manage	ement agreement or state	ement relevant to the si	ite and CoGP Farm					
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. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)									
		<i>nonis</i>) numbers per fish l od that records are inspec		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	or				
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 si	ignificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)					
				levels have exceeded the ions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)					
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where a	pplicable)?							
•	•	s taken had a significant	impact upon the lice le	vels recorded?					
•		out in cooperation betwe							
		·		e held without treatment for					
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es			points describing set a	actions to deal with recognise	ed				
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count dat	ta? If no please detail re	easons.					
Containment Inspecti	on								
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment damag	ge due to predators in the	e current or previous pre	oduction cycles?	N				
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	he predation experienced	d on site? (Detail below	')	Y				
Top nets, tensioned i	nets, bird scarers (kit	es)							
If other, detail below:									
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been exp	erienced on or in the vici	nity 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	oorted to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist))? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)					
6. Have these been rep	oorted to the SSPO and	l local fisheries trusts for	thwith (where they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail							
0. If will water	aved wee this	wa a al with tarante with the	ntavada d	dealer short by October					
If gill nets were deploy Ministers? (Legal, CoG		reed with local wild fish i	nterests and was perm	lission given by Scottish					
, -		mise the risk of further es	scapes? (Not covered in	n code but could					
be considered under	-	_							
	•	egards to containment? If	f no, please detail reas	on(s)	Υ				

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0907

Case No: 2019-0727

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

Case No:	2019-0727			Date of visit:	09/12/2019					
Site No:	FS0907	l		Inspector:		l				
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
			<u> </u>							
	_									
	+									
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI,CNI,VMD	12/12/2019									
	-									





Loch Duart Ltd Badcall Salmon House Scourie, Lairg Sutherland IV27 4TH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0398
SITE NO FS0907
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 09/12/2019
SITE NAME Loch na Thull
CASE NO 20190727

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 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 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 gueries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 12/12/2019

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0728			Date of visit: 10/12/2019				
Time spent on site:	.5 hours	Main Inspecto	r:				
Site No: FS1333 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross Hatchery The Scottish Salmon Company	/				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 7.9	Thermometer No:	T147	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 carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:					

Additional Case Information:

First batch of ova brought on site 20/11/2019.

No dead waste removal since input. In future all dead waste to be transported to Dundas Chemicals.

Eggs hatched w/b 02/12/19.

Inspection of site separation and biosecurity measures of additional sites under development carried out.

FHI 059, Version 12	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date	of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0728	Site No:	FS1333		
Date of Visit:	10/12/2019	Inspe	ctor(s):	
Registration/Authorisation De 1. Business/site details summar 2. Changes made to details?		ative?	Y	
Site Details Total No facilities Species Age group No Fish Mean Fish Wt SAL Alevins 1,700,000	1 Facilities sto	cked 1	No facilities insp	pected 1
Next Fallow Date (Site)	February 2020	Next Input Date (Sit	e) July 2020	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease prol If yes, detail:	blems?	N Any e	escapes (since last visit)?	N
Movement Records 1. Movement records available f 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and cord. Are movement records availa 5. Are records complete and cord. Are health certificates for introduced in the cord.	rrectly entered? ble for dead fish and waste? rrectly entered?		First	inspection Y N/A N/A Y
Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried of the second of the sec			STB)?	N
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records available for 2. How are mortalities disposed If other detail:	•	Whol	e fish - Dundas Chemica	Y Is
Mortality records complete an Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	~ 500 -1000	dead eggs removed	per day since input on av	
Evidence of recent increased, If yes, facility nos/no mortality per	• •	/reason:		N
6. Any other peaks in mortality of If yes, detail:	luring period checked?			N
7. Have increased (unexplained If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality events' been r			n mortality events sheet.	N/A

transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?

Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no. detail:

Results of Surveillance

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

3. Any significant results?

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

Records checked between:

First inspection

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0728		Site No:	FS1333		Insp:	
Date of Visit	10/12/2019		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	10
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		_	40		
species		ncluding third country	0			26 14	10
	Number of sup		0				10
Movements off	Frequency of n		0			10	3
	Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water	Irannia muataat	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or	ed (secure water supply through borehole)	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		
					<u> </u>		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion			4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters			- CHISCOURC		
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 fish (re-cycling risk)						
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status						
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of						
	equivalent status						
	Processing fish from Category III farm						
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ī			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		n]			0
with regulator or industry	No		3	-			╟──┤
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2				
					Tatel		-
					Total Rank		HIGH
					Naill		HIGH

Case No:	2019-0728	Site No: FS1333							
•	(Seawater Sites Only)								
1. Has the site exper	ienced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?							
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?							
azamethiphos and e can these be deployed	mamectin benzoate) as ed in a reasonable period documented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and d of time? ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm							
	. 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 (L. sa records are inspecte		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that							
		<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?							
If yes, have these be	en reported to the Fish F	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.							
9. Is <i>C. elongatu</i> s in	festation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)							
•		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)							
11. Has any other ac	tion been taken (where a	applicable)?							
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the action	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?							
13. Are treatments, v	where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating farms?							
sea lice?		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for							
	ecific written lice manage escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised infestation?							
16. Do the sea lice le	evels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.							
Containment Inspe	ction								
1. Has the site exper	ienced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N						
2. Are measures in p	lace to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y						
Site indoors									
If other, detail belo	w:								
2	d-u44- b		N						
		perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?							
•	questions 4 – 9. If No skip reported to Scottish Minis	•							
5. Have these been	reported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)							
6. Have these been	reported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)							
7. Were methods (if	any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail							
8 If all nots were do	ployed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish							
	oGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	green married and married and mad permission given by deciden							
		imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could							
	der satisfactory measu								
	•	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ						

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS1333

Case No: 2019-0728

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

o 11	0040 0700			.	40/40/0040			
Case No:	2019-0728	J		Date of visit:	: 10/12/2019			
Site No:	FS1333	1		Inspector:	:	1		
Results Summary	Freq.	Detahasa	Unan		te of Notifica		II	and .
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
-	+			<u> </u>	<u> </u>			-
	+	-						
	+	-						
	+							
	+							
	1	Ì		Ì	Ì			Ì
	+	<u> </u>						<u> </u>
	+							
	+	-	-					
	+							
	+				†			1
	+							
	_							_
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI,CNI	12/12/2019							
	+		-					
	+		 					
	+		-					





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169
Site No FS1333
Inspector

DATE OF VISIT 10/12/2019
SITE NAME Applecross Hatchery
CASE NO 20190728

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the site was registered.

R04

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

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:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 12/12/2019

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