FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of iss	sue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0073			Date of visit: 21	1/02/2019
Time spent on site:	hours	Mai	n Inspector:	
Site No: FS0742 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Glenfinnan Mowi Scotland Ltd		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 6.3	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 complete	ed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	F CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addit	tional information/clinical scor tional information/clinical scor tional information/clinical scor	e sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0073		Site No:	FS0742				
Date of Visit:		21/02/2019	1		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author 1. Business/site detai 2. Changes made to 0	ls summary		ite representa	tive?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		32	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	32
	sal							
J J ,	2019 Q2's 945,025							
_	74.72g							
Next Fallow Date (Site		20th of April		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Jun-19		
		•		V	1,	<i>'</i> : 1 (: :::0	
Recent (last 4 wks) di If yes, detail:	isease probl HSS	ems?		Ť	Any escapes	(since last	VISIT)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records	available for	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspect		i inopodion.					20/08/2018	
3. Are records comple		ectly entered?						Y
4. Are movement reco	ords availabl	e for dead fis	h and waste?					Y
Are records comple		•						Y
6. Are health certificate	tes for introd	luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	ıble?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement	ts carried out	t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	siness (not usi	ng a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syste	em in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	tation records?	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	vailable for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	s disposed of	f?			Ensiled - on:	site		
If other detail:	Ferguson tar	nkers remove	d ensiled was	te from site.				
3. Mortality records co	•	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (la	ast 4 wks):		461/site					
Evidence of recent								N
If yes, facility nos/no r	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:				
C. A			10					I N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	mortality du	ring period ch	ескеа?					N
7. Have increased (ur	nexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,							
8. Have 'mortality eve	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A

If yes, detail:	pyceze	formalin	TMS	
If other, detail:				
2. Medicines records available	•			Y
3. Are records complete and	•	d?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal per	iod?			Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?			Formalin TMS	
If other, detail:	- maria-ta-la-O			V
6. Are medicines stored appre	opriately?			'
Biosecurity Records				
1. Biosecurity records availab	•			Y
			ording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
•		•	Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mor	tality at the site	been included	a <i>?</i>	1
1 Has the action that will be t	aken in the eve	nt that the nre	esence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and		•	·	
			ked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if re			(- ,	
			nted between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
			visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
		neasures in p	lace to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on			manufad an aita?	
8. Have the biosecurity proce If no, detail:	dures been ade	quately imple	mented on site ?	<u> </u>
ii iio, detaii.				
Results of Surveillance				
1. Has any animal health surv	eillance been c	arried out by,	or on behalf of, the business?	Υ
2. If yes, are results available		•	,	Y
3. Any significant results?				Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed ur	ider recent dise	ase problems	s). See additional comments	

Records checked between: 20/8/19 - 21/2/19

Additional Case Information:

Site Manager not present for inspection. Assistant site manager facilitated the inspection.

Some records not entered onto carbon copy. Photocopy of missed records taken and included with carbon copy sheets.

Only one set of steel cages currently stocked with fish. The set of cages at the east end of the loch formally known as Salmon bay have no fish stocked currently.

In Health Surveillance carried out on the 5th of February the company vet reported the morts as being low however during necropsy of 12 fish 8/12 showed clinical signs of HSS (petechiae in visceral fat in muscle). Routine surveillance was continued and it was recommended to continue with HSS signs surveillance.

Paperwork, Sampling and inspection completed by supervised by

Г	HI 059, Version 12							ISS	suea by: F	HI			
	Case no:	2019-00	073	Site No:		FS0742			Date of v		21/0	02/2019	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		y. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:0	0:00	14:0	0:00	1	Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	21
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
ı	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
,	Add Fish/Pools - click												
L	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-21	22-46	47-66	67-86								
	Pool Group												
Г	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
п	Average weight	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750								
п	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
п	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW								
		Natchery	Lochailort Recirculation Hatchery	လ Lochailort Recirculation Hatchery	Lochailort Recirculation Hatchery								
O	JI domey 140	20	20	20	20								

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0073		Site No:	FS0742		Insp:	
Date of Visit	21/02/2019		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	
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				igwdot
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					\vdash
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		igsquare
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iaims apstream	TOT WILLIEF T HAZI EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	<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				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				0
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			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		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	ĺ			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	-			\vdash
Jan S. P. Wolloo							
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2]			
					Total		17
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0073		Site No:	FS0742	
Sea Lice Inspection (• •				
•	nced sea lice problems in	•		vaar alaaa baais0	
		ralent) fallowed synchronously o			
azamethiphos and ema	amectin benzoate) as well in a reasonable period of	ed in-feed and bath sea lice med as access to suitable biological time? ent agreement or statement relev	and/or mec	hanical control measu	res, and
Management Area (or	equivalent)?				
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspec	tion? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6))		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required star	ndard specified in the SSI and the	e CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	the suggested criteria for treatme	ent in the Co	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	· ·	is) numbers per fish been at a le	evel of 3 or a	above during the perio	d that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Heal	th Inspectorate? If no, FHI see co	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is o	onsidered to cause significant we	elfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
		ed or other actions taken when <i>L</i> gatus is considered to have welfa			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where appl	icable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions ta	ken had a significant impact upo	n the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out	in cooperation between participa	ating farms?	?	
14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	g strategy for the site, who	ere fewer populations or part pop	ulations are	e held without treatmen	t for
	ific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infes	nt procedure with waypoints desc station?	cribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks ref	ect sea lice count data? If no ple	ase detail r	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment damage o	lue to predators in the current or	previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the p	oredation experienced on site? (I	Detail below	')	Υ
Tops nets	Electric bird nets				
If other, detail below:					
Rentokil for vermin con					N
•	•	enced on or in the vicinity of the s	site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Ministers				
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forth	vith (where they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and lo	cal fisheries trusts forthwith (whe	re they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escape	es? If yes give detail			
9. If all note were dead.	aved was this action a res	d with local wild fish interests an	d was name	piecion givon by Co-#i-	.h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		d with local wild fish interests an	u was perm	iission given by Scottis	
, -		e the risk of further escapes? (No	ot covered i	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures				
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with rega	rds to containment? If no, please	detail reas	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

Site No: FS0742

Case No: 2019-0073

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

Case No:	2019-0073			Date of visit:	21/02/2019			
Site No:	FS0742	l		Inspector:		l		
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	27/02/2019							
ECI CNI	27/02/2019							
VMD	27/02/2019							
		_						
	1							
	Ī							
	1		1					





Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0119 DATE OF VISIT 21/02/2019
SITE NO FS0742 SITE NAME Glenfinnan
INSPECTOR CASE NO 20190073

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.

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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 queries regarding this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 27/02/2019

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 o	f issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0074			Date of visit:	20/02/2019
Time spent on site:	hrs	Ma	in Inspector:	
Site No: FS0800 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Leinish Grieg Seafood Shet	land Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 comp	leted
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	S CoGP MA	M-25
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed?	•	N/A If yes, see addi	itional information/clinical s itional information/clinical s itional information/clinical s	core sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry				
	Could not get out to s	ite due to bad weather/bro	ken boats	

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0074		Site No:	FS0800				
Date of Visit:		20/02/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornamental 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	0
Species	sal							
Age group	17 S0's							
No Fish	289,116 4 kilos							
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	may 19		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	sep/oct 19		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		Υ	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	Υ
If yes, detail:	AGD.			•	,	`	,	
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							29/05/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	•					Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	•					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	uctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		by (or on be	half) of the bu	siness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_			
Mortality Records	·		·					
Mortality records	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)		
	Whole fish, k		oup		,			
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly enter	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		wk4-0.33%w	/k5-0.13% wk6	i-0.23% wk7 -	0.52%		
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					Y
If yes, detail:	see additiona							
7. Have increased (ınexplained) ı	nortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RI case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	heet.	N

	available for inspection? ete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdr	•		Y
5. If yes, what treatme	•	T.M.S., Salmosan	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stor	ed appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records	s		
1. Biosecurity records	s available for inspection?		Y
		rding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
	•	cottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplain	ed) mortality at the site been included?	?	Y
1 Has the action that	t will be taken in the event that the pres	sence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
	uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no	·	
5. Has the health stat	tus of aquaculture animals being stocke	ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certifica	ation if required)?		
	· ·	ted between each epidemiological unit to minimise visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	'
		nce to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals I		iso to maintain the physical containment of	
8. Have the biosecuri	ity procedures been adequately implem	nented on site?	
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	nce		
1. Has any animal he	alth surveillance been carried out by, o	or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results a	available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant resu	ults?		Y
•	tailed under recent disease problems).		
Complex gill disease,	, some sea lice damage, Chronic AGD.		
В	acordo abackad batwaca:	20/05/49 20/2/40	

29/05/18-20/2/19

Additional Case Information:

Due to the extremely poor weather on the day of inspection and consequently the day after, the inspection of cages was not carried out.

Monday the 18th Feb count - total avg females for site 3.19 - not reported yet.

Site manager told us about a previous escape where a pipe on the well boat had burst during fish movements spilling fish out into the sea. This had be reported to the FHI and steps had been taken to prevent this happening in the future. The site made efforts to recapture the fish in collaboration with the local DSFB, using gill nets around the cages and near river mouths.

week 45- 3.06% 11828 -

week 46 - 1.01 % 3782 -

Spike in mortalities was recorded during week 45 and week 46 in 2018. These spikes were not reported to the FHI. After speaking to the production manager he reported that the mortality was attributed to two treatments in two pens. The optilicer was being trialled in pen 1 and a salmosan treatment took place in pen 3. Both of these treatments resulted in an increase in mortality.

Paper work completed by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0074		Site No:	FS0800		Insp:	
Date of Visit	20/02/2019		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	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	-
Movements off			0			10	10
Movements on	Frequency of m		0			10	3
Exposure via water	rtuniber er des	Site contacts		_			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				oxdot
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					\vdash
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		oxdot
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8		
	iaims upstream	TOT WILLIAM T HOUSE EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	٥		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	rfrom Category ∀ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			$\overline{}$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			$\overline{}$
	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				ш
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		2				┝─┤
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		19
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0074		Site No:	FS0800	
Sea Lice Inspection (9	• •	s in the previous 4 years	?		Y
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		year class basis?	Y
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of lic	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medications (in	ncluding deltamethrin,	res, and
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or		ement agreement or sta	tement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm	Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Anne	(6) Y
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ia for treatment in the 0	CoGP during the period	that N
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	•	monis) numbers per fish	n been at a level of 3 or	above during the period	d that Y
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comment.		Y
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	.3.50) N
		istered or other actions telongatus is considered			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where	applicable)?			Υ
•	•	ns taken had a significan	t impact upon the lice l	evels recorded?	Y
•		d out in cooperation betw			Y
		where fewer population			t for Y
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with wa infestation?	aypoints describing set	actions to deal with rec	ognised Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no please detail	reasons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
•		ge due to predators in th	ne current or previous p	production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (Detail belo	w)	
ADD	Top nets	Seal Screen	MML	•	
If other, detail below:					
ii otiler, detail below.					
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been ex	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site since t	he last FHI inspection?	Υ
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No ski	p to question 10		·	
4. Have these been rep		•			Υ
		orthwith (where they exis			Υ
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they exi	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17) Y
·	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	l		Υ
Gill nets			!		
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish	·		n Y
	•	imise the risk of further			
be considered under	•	,		l boat to prevent fish eso	cape in case of
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	egards to containment?	If no, please detail rea	son(s)	

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: 2019-0074	Site No: FS0800	
Date of Visit: 20/02/2019	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	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for it4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? If commencement of the agreement or statement If review?	Y Y Y
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxi individual farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu- 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 ngements for the storage and disposal of any de	or farm? or farm? n the area or the
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	rs and treatments?
of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cover	
lice on farms in the area or individual fa	arms? mstances under which biological controls and c	cleaner fish are to be
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 rangements for the movement of live fish on and c	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or inc	dividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates I date when a farm or area may be restoc	by which the area or individual farm will be fal	llow and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement?	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kee?	ept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement o	or statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 1.5 30th of April 201	19

Case No: 2019-0074 Site No: FS0800 Date of visit: 20/02/2019

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):
05/11/18	11/11/2018	≥750g	3.1	SAL	17 S0's	Weekly	3.06	Explained	Treatment
12/11/18	18/11/2018	≥750g	3.1	SAL	17 S0's	Weekly	1.01	Explained	Treatment

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):
	11828	Post treatment morts from optilicer trial and salmosan treatments (pen 1 &3)	mortality fell below threshold on week 47, no further action required
	3782	Post treatment morts from optilicer trial and salmosan treatments (pen 1 &3)	mortality fell below threshold on week 47, no further action required

Case No:	2019-0074	Date of visit: 20/02/2019						
Site No:	FS0800	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Papart Summan				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	la a a	and .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Reg	04/03/2019							





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
 20/02/2019

 Site No
 Site Name
 Leinish

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190074

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

On this occasion, the site inspection could not be conducted as adverse weather conditions prevented access to the pens.

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 2013

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

On this occasion the site was not accessible due to adverse weather conditions so the measures in place for the control of parasites and containment of stock could not be assessed.

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: 05/03/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2019-0075			Date of visit: 20/02/2019		
Time spent on site:	6 hours	Main Inspec	etor:		
Site No: FS1175 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Gob na Hoe Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd			
Case Types: 1 REG	23	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-25		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
Diagnostic samples taken?					
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit deta	ail reason below:			
L	Inable to carry out site in	nspection due to poor weather cond	itions		

FHI 059, Version 12		Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No: 20	019-0075	Site No:	FS1175				
Date of Visit:	20/02/2019	1		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authoris 1. Business/site details 2. Changes made to details	summary checked by si	ite representa	tive?			Y N	
Site Details							
Total No facilities	7	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilities	s inspected	0
Species sa							
9 - 9	7 S0's 33,986						
4	7kilo						
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site)			Next Input Da	to (Sito)	cont 2010		
ivext Fallow Date (Site)	Apr-19		Next Input Da	ie (Sile)	sept 2019		
Recent (last 4 wks) dise	ease problems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last v	/isit)?	N
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	GD			, ,		,	
Movement Records							
	vailable for inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspection	· ·					16/05/2017	
3. Are records complete	e and correctly entered?	•					Y
4. Are movement recor	ds available for dead fis	h and waste?					Y
· ·	e and correctly entered?						Y
6. Are health certificate	s for introductions (outw	ith GB) availa	ble?				N/A
Transport Records							
1. Are any movements	carried out by (or on bel	half) of the bu	siness (not usi	ng a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a system	n in place for maintenand	ce of transpor	tation records?	•			
Mortality Records							
1. Mortality records ava	ailable for inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities of	disposed of?			Other (detail)			
If other detail:	Vhole fish - Biogas bin gı	roup					
•	nplete and correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): wk4-0.60% wk5-0.19% wk6-0.36% wk7 -0.25%							
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?							
If yes, facility nos/no mo	ortality per facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:				
C. Amy other meets in w		a also dO					NI NI
If yes, detail:	nortality during period ch	ecked?					N
• •						N/A	
If yes, detail action:							
						N/A	

2. Medicines records available for inspection?			Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?			Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	Salmosan	TMS	
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, rec	ording and safe	disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify \$		rs or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included	1?		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the pre	sence or suspic	cion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and how and when that will be r	•	•	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stock	ked on the farm	site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?		, , ,	
Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implement	nted hetween ea	ach enidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff,			
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in pl		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		and priyondar dornamment or	
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implei	mented on site?		
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?			Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Chronic AGD and PGD	
Combined with lice burden - freshwater treatment advised	costia infection	present.	
Records checked between:	16/05/2017 -	20/02/19	

Additional Case Information:

There have been issues with AGD on the site, but the site manager indicated that this was pen specific, and seemed to be localised to pen 4. The health surveillance carried out by vets corroborated this information.

The fish have also been treated with salmosan to help with ongoing lice issues. Despite ongoing health issues morts have been quite low.

There were a gap in the lice count data for week 7 in 2019, the reason being that poor weather conditions prevented the lice counts from taking place that week. The counts for week 8 had not been entered into fish talk at the time of inspection.

Due to adverse weather conditions the cages could not be inspected at the time of visit. Another visit has been arranged for the following month.

Paperwork completed by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0075		Site No:	FS1175		Insp:	
Date of Visit	20/02/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	П
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	-
Movements off	Frequency of n	•	1 0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
		n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1			3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	unpasteurised feed	0	i i			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				ш
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 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		Το	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				\vdash
CoGP/Regulator				ı			
Practices in accordance	Yes		1 0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				ш
					Total Rank		20 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0075		Site No:	FS1175			
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •	s in the previous 4 years	2		V		
•	•			par alaca basis?	т У		
			chronously on a single ye		Y		
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, zamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and an these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?						
4. Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e		ement agreement or sta	tement relevant to the si	te 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	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the	e SSI and the CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6) Y		
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	a for treatment in the Co	GP during the period t	that N		
B. Have average adult for records are inspected?	*	monis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or a	bove during the period	d that		
f yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comment.		Υ		
9. Is <i>C. elongatu</i> s infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50) N		
•			aken when <i>L. salmonis l</i> to have welfare implicati				
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?			N/A		
12. Have therapeutic tre	eatments or the action	s taken had a significan	t impact upon the lice lev	vels recorded?	Υ		
13. Are treatments, whe	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation betw	een participating farms?	,	Y		
		•	s or part populations are				
15. Is there a site specisecenarios during the es	_	•	aypoints describing set a	ctions to deal with reco	ognised Y		
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count da	ata? If no please detail re	easons.			
Containment Inspection	on						
•		ge due to predators in th	e current or previous pro	oduction cycles?	N		
2. Are measures in plac	e to mitigate against t	he predation experience	ed on site? (Detail below))	Υ		
ADD .	Seal Blinds	Top nets	Mort Cone in place	<u> </u>			
If other, detail below:							
Totrici, detail below.							
3. Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vic	cinity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N		
f Yes proceed with que			•	·			
4. Have these been rep	·						
			t)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4				
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	rthwith (where they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)		
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detai	I				
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoGl		greed with local wild fish	interests and was permi	ission given by Scottis	h		
9. What action was take	en to prevent and mini	mise the risk of further e	escapes? (Not covered in	n code but could			
be considered under	satisfactory measu	res of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment?	lf no, please detail reaso	on(s)			

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: 2019-0075	Site No: FS1175	
Date of Visit: 20/02/20	19 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection locate	d within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require com	pletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Fare	m Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relev5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish f	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statement of review?	Y Y Y
8. Does the FMAg/S identity the minit farm?	mum health standards for the stocks to be introd	duced to the area or
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	ination requirements for stocks held in the area cies of fish which may be stocked into the area ximum stocking density of any pen on any farm	or farm?
	angements for the storage and disposal of any of farm?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemen	t of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ements for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the ava of statement?	ilability and the use of medicines on farms cove	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any red lice on farms in the area or individual	uirements for the sensitivity testing of available farms?	
	sumstances under which biological controls and	cleaner fish are to be y s within the area?
	angements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circ area or farm?	eumstances when live fish may be introduced or	removed from the
	angements for the movement of live fish on and	off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify 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?	y 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
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether covered by the agreement or statement	r broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ent?	on any site y
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,
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 27/02/18	

Case No:	2019-0075	Date of visit: 20/02/2019							
Site No:	FS1175	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summany				1					
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Inch	and Image						
DEC	05/03/2019	Insp	2 nd Insp						
REG	03/03/2019								





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
 20/02/2019

 Site No
 FS1175
 Site Name
 Gob na Hoe

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190075

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

On this occasion, the site inspection could not be conducted as adverse weather conditions prevented access to the pens.

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.

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

On this occasion the site was not accessible due to adverse weather conditions so the measures in place for the control of parasites and containment of stock could not be assessed.

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: 5/02/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018				
Case No: 2019-0077				Date of visit: 18/02/2019				
Time spent on site:	nrs		Main Inspector	r:				
Site No: SS0233 Business No: SB0155	Site Name: Business Name:	Site 1 (north) Loch Eishort Mus	ssel Centre					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	3	4	5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	Site	⊐ .	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	S	CoGP MA				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? 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:						

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0077		Site No:	SS0233	3			
Date of Visit:		18/02/2019	9		Inspector(s)):]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		11	Facilities sto	ocked	1	No faciliti	es inspected	1
Species .	MED							
Age group	Adult							
No Fish	Not Known							
Mean Fish Wt	ADU							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Feb 19		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	natural se	ettlement.	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escape	es (since last	t visit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	s							
Movement record		r inspection?	,					Y
2. Date of last inspe							22/03/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availabl	e for dead fi	sh and waste?	?				N/A
5. Are records comp	olete and corre	ectly entered	?					N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detai	il)		
	empty shells							
3. Mortality records			tered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality (•		No observed	d mortality				
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		//reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?					N/A
If yes, detail:	lain a d	1 116 1		, FINO				NI/A
7. Have increased (nortalities pe	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		ported to EL	12 If no add N	APT cose and	enter on mor	tality avente	choot	N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	rents been re	ported to FIT	re ii no, add iv	in i case and e	enter on mor	lanty events	Sheet.	IN/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If you detail:		
If yes, detail: If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspec	ction?	
Are records complete and correctly er		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for insper	ection?	Y
•	rtality removal, recording and safe disposal been	considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which the	he APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary	y professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	site been included?	Y
	e event that the presence or suspicion of the pres	sence of a listed disease Y
	when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
•	animals being stocked on the farm site been cove	ered (equal or higher Y
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity m	neasures implemented between each epidemiolo	ogical unit to minimise
•	novement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or de	
·	the measures in place to maintain the physical c	
aquaculture animals held on site?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been	adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance be	een carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N

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?

22/3/18-18/2/19

On the day of Inspection there was only 1 line remaining with mussels on it. Harvesting of this last line was in progress and would take approximately 1-2 more days to complete before site was in fallow. Lines were being redeployed to collect wild spat for the following 2 years. 2020 and 2021. Due to an extended period of illness the site manager has no stock for harvesting for the rest of 2019.

Paperwork and inspection carried out by and supervised by

Total Risk

LOW

Case No:	2019-0077			Date of visit:	18/02/2019			
Site No:	SS0233	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
FCI	27/02/2019		2 insp					
ECI	2110212010							





Loch Eishort Mussel Centre 9 Drumfearn Sleat Isle of Skye IV43 8QZ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0155
 Date of Visit
 18/02/2019

 Site No
 Site 1 (north)

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190077

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 fourth 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.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

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

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

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



Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

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: 27/02/2019

FHI 059, Version 12	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2019-0082			Date of visit: 14/02/2019					
Time spent on site:	15 mins	Main Ins	pector:					
Site No: SS0881 Business No: SB0309	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Glencoul Loch Laxford Shellfish Ltd	i.					
Case Types: 1 PSI	2 3	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:						

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0082 Site No: SS0881 Date of Visit 14/02/2019 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 0 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 3 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent practices None treatment) treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No

Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc

0

Total Risk 0

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0082	Site No: SS0881	
Date of case: 14/02/2019	Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no, upda	te site summary sheet)	Y
Site Details		
Total No facilities: 7	No facilit	ties stocked: 4
Species MED		
Age group 2016		
No shellfish 4 longlines		
Mean fish Wt 20g Next fallow date (site) No plans	Next input date (site)	Summer 2010
Next fallow date (site)	Next input date (site)	Sulliller 2019
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	05/10/2016	
Any recent increased or atypical mortalities	? (last 4 weeks):	N
If yes, detail:	. (last 4 weeks).	<u></u>
e.g. site		
average, max		
per facility		
A	-1:>	N
Any increased mortalities? (since last inspe	ction)	N
If yes, detail:		
How are mortalities disposed of?		Other (detail)
If other detail: No mortality on site.		
Are there any diseases on your site?		N
If yes, detail:		
Have you experienced predation on site?	-1	Y
If yes, detail: Eider ducks, starfish and cr	aps	
Has the site experienced increased or abno	ormal fouling?	N
If yes, detail:	innariouning:	PK .
ii yes, detaii.		
Have you observed any invasive species or	ı your site?	Y
If yes, detail: Japanese skeleton shrimp	•	
Do you have an up to date BMP, and are the	ere any issues?	N
If yes, detail:		
What quantity of spat fall have you had in the	ne last 12 months? (mussel sites only):	
Good	ic last 12 months: (musser sites only).	

Case No:	2019-0082			Date of visit:	14/02/2019			
Site No:	SS0881			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
PSI	14/02/2019							
			<u> </u>					





Loch Laxford Shellfish Ltd. Foindle By Lairg Sutherland IV27 4SU

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0309 Site No SS0881 Inspector DATE OF CASE 14/02/2019
SITE NAME Loch Glencoul
CASE NO 20190082

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

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

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

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

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

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

Date: 14/02/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018						
Case No: 2019-0097			Date of visit: 20/02/2019						
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Ins	pector:						
Site No: FS0062 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Duartmore Hatchery Loch Duart Ltd							
Case Types: 1 REP	2 ECI 3 CNI	4 UNI 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8.1	Thermometer No:	T148	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? 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:									

Site inspected following receipt by APHA of a non site-specific welfare complaint regarding Loch Duart. Accompanied APHA vets on visit.

Ova are stripped at Geisgeil Tank Site and transferred to Ormsary Hatchery for fertilisation and incubation. Ova are brought back to Duartmore Hatchery for hatching. Site grows fish to 5g and then transferred to Duartmore for ongrowing.

Very few treatments administered per cycle - a couple of treatments with formalin for Costia, but looking at using artificial seawater for this in future.

Mortalities are transferred to Badcall office for uplift to Gray Composting.

Mortality of 18% in 2017/2018 crop of ova due to issues incubating ova from point of fertilisation in comp-hatch system. Have decided to incubated eyed ova only in the future and no issues with 2018/2019 crop to date.

Site is going to be refurbished after the current crop are transferred to Duartmore and will be fallow until February 2021. Landcatch will contract the grow the ova during the refurbishment. The outside tanks which will be replaced and the hatchery building will be extended to cover them.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0097		Site No:	FS0062				
Date of Visit:		20/02/2019	1		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Authornal Business/site details 2. Changes made to	ails summary		te representa	tive?			Y N	
Site Details						_		
Total No facilities Species	SAL	18 tanks + hatchery	Facilities sto	cked	Hatchery	No facilitie	s inspected	18 tanks + hatchery
Age group No Fish	OVA 646,000							
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S	N/A ite)	June/July 20	19	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	February 2	019	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	 S							
 Movement record Date of last inspe Are records comp Are movement re Are records comp Are health certific 	ction: plete and corre cords available plete and corre	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered?	h and waste?				05/12/2016	Y Y Y Y N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movement fyes, is there a systematical systems.	nts carried out			•	_			Y
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. How are mortalities	es disposed of	f?			Other (detail))		Y
If other detail: 3. Mortality records (4. Recent mortality (complete and			from Badcall o	office			Y
5. Evidence of recer If yes, facility nos/no				reason:				N
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	18% of ova i	n 2017/2018 y	ear class ove	er period of fou	ır months. Issı	ues using co	mp-hatch sys	
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action:			•					N/A
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/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: If other, detail:		N
2. Medicines records available for inspec		Y
3. Are records complete and correctly er	ntered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		IV
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for insper	ection?	Y
	rtality removal, recording and safe disposal be	een considered?
•	the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or vetering	ary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	site been included?	Y
	e 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)?	animals being stocked on the farm site been c	overed (equal or higher Y
•	measures implemented between each epidem movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or	
7. Is documentation available regarding aquaculture animals held on site?	the measures in place to maintain the physica	al containment of Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures beer If no, detail:	n adequately implemented on site?	Y
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance be	een carried out by, or on behalf of, the busines	ss? N

5/12/16 - 20/2/19

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0097		Site No:	FS0062		Insp:	
Date of Visit	20/02/2019		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		ncluding third country	0		18	26	0
	Number of sup	pilers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	6
	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	I :	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		1
,		or in a coastal zone with category III		_			-
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V		,			
	tarms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
and raids of the amounts	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish	from zone or compartment of		1			-
	equivalent statu	us	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 was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
lles of companion described	No fooding of	ann anto win and for an		J 1			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	Feeding unpas	•	5	4			
Piit-	reeding unpas	Number of sites		2 or 3	≥4		
Biosecurity Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	1		= 4		
Contacts with other sites		taff and equipment	0		2		
		tan and equipment	0	1	2		ټــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry	No		2	1			
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				0
					Total		15
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0097	;	Site No:	FS0062	
Sea Lice Inspection (
•	nced sea lice problems in the previous	•			
	lanagement Area (or equivalent) for		•		
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed 4. Is there a signed do	access to a range of licenced in-feet amectin benzoate) as well as acce in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agree	ess to suitable biological a	nd/or mech	hanical control measu	res, and
Management Area (or					
	ecords available for inspection? (Le	-			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard sp	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 sugger (CoGP Annex 6)	gested criteria for treatmen	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) num	bers per fish been at a lev	el of 3 or a	above during the perio	d that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Health Inspe	ctorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is considere	ed to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
	eatments 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 coop	eration between participat	ting farms?	•	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where fewer				
	ific written lice management proce scalation of a sea lice infestation?	dure with waypoints desci	ribing set a	ctions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea	lice count data? If no plea	ise detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	on				
•	nced equipment damage due to pr	edators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the predation	n experienced on site? (De	etail below)	Y
Tanks covered	site inside				
If other, detail below:					
					N
•	nts or events been experienced or	•	te since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question ported to Scottish Ministers?	1 10			
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Ministers:				
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (whe	ere they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisher	ries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If ye	es give detail			
8. If all nets were deal	oyed was this action agreed with lo	ocal wild fish interests and	was permi	ission given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		and and	- Perili	J. 10.1. 1. J. 1000 Mile	
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the risi	k of further escapes? (Not	t covered ir	n code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures of the A	Act)			
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with regards to co	ntainment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

Case No:	2019-0097			Date of visit:	20/02/2019			
Site No:	FS0062	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Poport Cummon				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	la a a	and .					
Case Type	Date 25/02/2010	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/CNI/REP	25/02/2019							
	<u> </u>							





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 FS0062 INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 20/02/2019

SITE NAME Duartmore Hatchery

CASE NO 20190097

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected without prior notification in conjunction with veterinary officers from the Animal and Plant Health Agency following a report of a potential welfare issue by a member of the public at an unspecified site operated by Loch Duart Ltd.

The inspection was carried out 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 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.

R04

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

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



FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0098			Date of visit: 20/02/2019
Time spent on site:	5	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS0065 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Laxford Loch Duart Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REP 2	2 UNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-3
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	nil reason below:	

Site inspected following receipt by APHA of a non site-specific welfare complaint regarding Loch Duart. Accompanied APHA vets on visit.

Currently harvesting by dead haul using the Viking Junior.

Lice levels are very low on the site as the wrasse have been working very well. Wrasse are wild caught and only use ballan above a minimum size. Stock wrasse numbers at 0.5% of salmon numbers. Wrasse are removed at the end of the cycle using creels or during transfer of the salmon onto the wellboat. They are held on the site for a couple of months and disease screening tests are carried out. The wrasse are then transferred to another sea site as the origin sea site is left fallow for approx. 4-5 months before restocking. Ballan are reused until they reach a maximum size.

As wrasse have been working well at keeping sea lice numbers low, only treatment on site over production cycle has been freshwater following the gill issues.

Mortality event occurred on site in September 2018 due to plankton, low oxygen and gill issues. Mortality levels elevated above reporting level through until December 2018, but are now low. Company have over-estimated mortality numbers during the peak of the event as an additional 5,300 fish have been harvested so far.

Fish appeared to be in good condition and no moribund fish observed.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0098]	Site No:	FS0065				
Date of Visit:		20/02/2019	3		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho	risation Det	ails						
1. Business/site deta			site representa	ative?			N	1
2. Changes made to	•						N/A	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		42	Facilities sto	ocked	23	No facilities	sinspected	28
Species	SAL	WRS						
Age group	2017 S0	Adult						
No Fish	99,000	8,900						
Mean Fish Wt	4.5Kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	March/April 2	2019	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	September	/October 20	19
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease nroh	lome?		N N	Any escapes	(cince last v	ricit\2	N
If yes, detail:	disease probi	ems:		<u> </u>	Arry escapes	(Silice last v	isit):	IN
Movement Records								
		r inapaction?						
Movement record Date of last inspec		r inspection:					30/10/2018	'
 Date of last inspects. Are records comp 		costly entered	2				30/10/2016	V
Are records comp Are movement re-		•		,				Ÿ
5. Are records comp								Ÿ
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
		additions (out.)	vitir OD) araiis	abic:				
Transport Records		t by (or on bo	half) of the bu	reinage (not us	ing a STR\2			
 Are any movement If yes, is there a syst 			•	•	_			
•	leni in piace i	Of Illallician	ce or transpor	riation records				
Mortality Records	ilabla for i	tion2						
Mortality records a		•			Other (deteil)			'
How are mortalities If other detail:			- time of finds two	of made De	Other (detail)			
Mortality records (Whole fish to	o Grey Compo	osting (fish tra	ansferred to Ba	adcall Office to	r upiiπ)		
3. Mortality records (complete and	Correctly eric		% (267), wk 5 -	0.20/ (261) w	4. G 0 160/	(472) wk 7	0.000/. (01)
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		WK 4 - 0.197	6 (207), WK 5 -	0.2% (201), w	K 0 - 0.1076	(173), WK 7 -	- 0.06% (61)
5. Evidence of recer	5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?							
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i								Y
If was alstails		,	· · ·	December 201	`	,	uation of gill i	issues that
If yes, detail:				caused by plar	nkton and low	oxygen		N/A
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vecor chi:				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	rente' been re	enorted to EHI	12 If no add N	APT case and	enter en morta	lity ovente el	hoot	N
o. Have inortality ev	curs neemie	ported to rim	r: II IIO, auu iv	III Case and t	sillei on morta	ility everits si	HEEL.	I N

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 inspecti 3. Are records complete and correctly ente 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspect Has the manner and frequency of morts	iion <i>?</i> ality removal, recording and safe disposal be	en considered?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	APB will notify Scottish Ministers or vetering	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the s	•	,
	event that the presence or suspicion of the prevent that will be notified to Scottish Ministers'	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture an	imals being stocked on the farm site been co	overed (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity me	easures implemented between each epidemic	ological unit to minimise
	ovement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or o	
	e measures in place to maintain the physical	containment of
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been a	dequately implemented on site?	

If no, detail:

Results of Surveillance

3. Any significant results?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

1/11/18 - 20/2/19

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

Case No: 2019-0098 Site No: FS0065 Date of visit: 20/02/2019

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):
29/10/18	04/11/2018	≥750g	2.7Kg	SAL	2017 S0	Weekly	2.41	Explained	Plankton, low oxygen and gill health issue
05/11/18	11/11/2018	≥750g	2.7Kg	SAL	2017 S0	Weekly	1.81	Explained	Plankton, low oxygen and gill health issue
12/11/18	18/11/2018	≥750g	2.7Kg	SAL	2017 S0	Weekly	1.69	Explained	Plankton, low oxygen and gill health issue
19/11/18	25/11/2018	≥750g	2.7Kg	SAL	2017 S0	Weekly	1.52	Explained	Plankton, low oxygen and gill health issue
26/11/18	02/12/2018	≥750g	2.7Kg	SAL	2017 S0	Weekly	1.75	Explained	Plankton, low oxygen and gill health issue
03/12/18	09/12/2018	≥750g	2.7Kg	SAL	2017 S0	Weekly	1.27	Explained	Plankton, low oxygen and gill health issue

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):
	event (ii available).	company).	apphoasie).
	4,462	Vets attended, freshwater treatments carried out and aerators deployed during incident (started September 2018)	Site was inspected by FHI on 31/10/18. NFA as figures collected during inspection in February 2019
	3,281	Vets attended, freshwater treatments carried out and aerators deployed during incident (started September 2018)	Site was inspected by FHI on 31/10/18. NFA as figures collected during inspection in February 2019
	3,004	Vets attended, freshwater treatments carried out and aerators deployed during incident (started September 2018)	Site was inspected by FHI on 31/10/18. NFA as figures collected during inspection in February 2019
	2,651	Vets attended, freshwater treatments carried out and aerators deployed during incident (started September 2018)	Site was inspected by FHI on 31/10/18. NFA as figures collected during inspection in February 2019
	3,011	Vets attended, freshwater treatments carried out and aerators deployed during incident (started September 2018)	Site was inspected by FHI on 31/10/18. NFA as figures collected during inspection in February 2019
	2,149	Vets attended, freshwater treatments carried out and aerators deployed during incident (started September 2018)	Site was inspected by FHI on 31/10/18. NFA as figures collected during inspection in February 2019

Case No:	2019-0098			Date of visit:	20/02/2019			
Site No:	FS0065	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	Date of Notification			
,		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REP, UNI	25/02/2019		2 11150					
,								





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0398Date of Visit20/02/2019Site NoFS0065Site NameLoch LaxfordInspectorCase No20190098

The above site was inspected without prior notification in conjunction with veterinary officers from the Animal and Plant Health Agency following a report of a potential welfare issue by a member of the public at an unspecified site operated by Loch Duart Ltd.

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 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.

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

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



FHI 059, Version 12	ls	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0100			Date of visit: 26/02/2019
Time spent on site:	10 mins	Main Inspect	tor:
Site No: SS0522 Business No: SB0043	Site Name: Business Name:	Cutter Rock Douglas Wilson	
Case Types: 1 PSI	23	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit detail r	eason below:	

No reliable spat fall on this site at the moment so no plans to farm in the immediate future. Hope to use it in the future if the company have the resource.

Anchors marker buoys on site at the moment but no longlines or floats.

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0100 Site No: SS0522 Date of Visit 26/02/2019 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 0 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0100	Site No: SS0522	
Date of case: 26/02/2019	Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no, upda	te site summary sheet)	Y
Site Details		
Total No facilities: 0	No facili	ties stocked: 0
Species fallow		
Age group		
No shellfish		
Mean fish Wt		
Next fallow date (site) N/A	Next input date (site)	Unsure
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	12/08/2014	
Any recent increased or atypical mortalities	? (last 4 weeks):	N/A
If yes, detail:		
e.g. site		
average, max		
per facility		
Any increased mortalities? (since last inspe	ection)	N/A
If yes, detail:	Calcily	1.07.1
,		
How are mortalities disposed of?		Other (detail)
If other detail: N/A		
Are there any diseases on your site?		N/A
If yes, detail:		N/A
n yes, detail.		
Have you experienced predation on site?		N/A
If yes, detail:		
lles the site symposium and impressed on these	annal faulia m2	NI/A
Has the site experienced increased or abnormal fyes, detail:	rmai fouiing?	N/A
ii yes, detaii.		
Have you observed any invasive species or	n vour site?	N/A
If yes, detail:	,	
Do you have an up to date BMP, and are the	ere any issues?	N/A
If yes, detail:		
What quantity of spat fall have you had in the	ne last 12 months? (mussal sites only):	
N/A	ie last 12 months: (musser sites only).	
1477		

Case No:	2019-0100			Date of visit:	26/02/2010					
0430 140.	2010-0100			Date of visit.	20/02/2019					
Site No:	SS0522			Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
PSI	26/02/2019		2 11155							
			<u> </u>							





Inverlussa Ardura, Craignure, Isle of Mull

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0043 SITE NO SS0522 INSPECTOR DATE OF CASE 26/02/2019
SITE NAME Cutter Rock
CASE NO 20190100

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

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

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

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

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 26/02/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0101			Date of visit: 26/02/2019
Time spent on site:	mins	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: SS0653 Business No: SB0039	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Stockinish Harris Fish Farming Co.Ltd.	
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fit Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry o	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Site has been fallow for approximately 2 years.

All facilities and equipment moved off the site in June 2018 (apart from 1 buoy and an anchor)

The Crown Estate lease for the site is still held.

There are no immediate plans to use the site, but the site maybe used in the future.

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0101 Site No: SS0653 Date of Visit 26/02/2019 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 0 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FH	l l	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0101	Site No: SS0653		
Date of case: 26/02/2019		Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no, upda	te site summary sheet)	I	Y
Site Details			
Total No facilities:		No facilities stocked:	0
Species Fallow			
Age group			
No shellfish			
Mean fish Wt			
Next fallow date (site) N/A	Next in	put date (site) Unsure	
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	01/08/2017		
Any recent increased or atypical mortalities	? (last 4 weeks)·		N/A
If yes, detail:	· (last i wooks).		
e.g. site			
average, max			
per facility			
Any increased mortalities? (since last inspe	ection)		N/A
If yes, detail:	outorry		14/7 (
<u> </u>			
How are mortalities disposed of?			Other (detail)
If other detail: N/A			
Are there any diseases on your site?			N/A
If yes, detail:			
Have you experienced predation on site?			N/A
If yes, detail:			
Has the site experienced increased or abno	ormal fouling?		N/A
If yes, detail:			
<u> </u>			
Have you observed any invasive species or	n your site?		N/A
If yes, detail:			
Do you have an up to date BMP, and are th	ere any issues?		N/A
If yes, detail:	c. s arry roomso.		
<u> </u>			
What quantity of spat fall have you had in the	ne last 12 months? (musse	el sites only):	
N/A			

Case No:	2019-0101			Date of visit:	26/02/2019			
Case No.	2010-0101			Date of visit.	20/02/2013			
Site No:	SS0653	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
PSI	26/02/2019							





Harris Fish Farming Co.Ltd. 6 Stockinish Isle of Harris Western Isles

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0039 Site No SS0653 Inspector DATE OF CASE 26/02/2019
SITE NAME Loch Stockinish
CASE NO 20190101

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

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

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

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

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

Signed:



Date: 26/02/2019