

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2019-0311"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="26/06/2019"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text"/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS0805"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Bagh Dail Nan Cean"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0119"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Mowi Scotland Ltd"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNI"/>	3 <input type="text" value="SLI"/>	4 <input type="text" value="VMD"/>	5 <input type="text"/>	6 <input type="text"/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="12.5"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="T155"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	M-40
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="N"/>					

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

**Additional Case Information:**

FS in movement records not recorded

Currently treating on site with a thermolicer. Treatment abandoned today as fish were not taking to it very well. (Hot weather) Fish in the pen that had been treated looked very lethargic, the fish were visible a brighter shade of blue (probably due to the stress of crowd, water temperature). The weather was very hot on the day of inspection which probably contributed to the abandoning of the treatment.

2 pens are stocked with wild mixed wrasse and the rest of pens are stocked with lumpfish.

More wrasse arriving over the summer. A consignment of wrasse was due to be received from Northern Ireland on the 30th of June. The consignment contained around 1000 wrasse. Due to the movement of wrasse on site from Northern Ireland, this will increase the surveillance frequency category from medium to high.

There was an input of wrasse during 2018. These wrasse were slowly lost to mortality throughout the year and more so through the winter months. Looking through the records of wrasse mortality there seemed to be a variety of reasons for mortality. Predation, furunculosis being the main ones. Site manager indicated that not many wrasse survived through the 2018/19 winter period.

Winter input of lumpfish into ten pens. Site manager noted that he was pleased with lumpfish survival over the winter, however they have been having issues with mortality increasing with the warmer weather and rise in sea temperature. This was visible when inspecting the pens as some fish looked very lean, and others with a clear fungal challenge. There were a few pens where this was evident, however most pens this did not seem to be an issue from the inspection. Health challenges were reported by site workers to the company vet. Who visited the site to health check the lumpfish, the vets report concluded that there was no visible health challenge with the lumpfish on site.

Slice treatment Started 1st of June finished Friday the 7th of June. Site manager noted that the fish took the treatment well and there no issues getting the medicated feed into the fish over the 7 day period.

The fish observed during the inspection looked healthy and were feeding well. They appeared to be free of lice and the fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy internally and externally.

Sampling, inspection and paperwork was carried out by [REDACTED] under the supervision of [REDACTED]

Case No: **2019-0311** Site No: **FS0805**  
 Date of Visit: **26/06/2019** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **Y**  
 2. Changes made to details? **N**

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<b>12</b>	Facilities stocked	<b>12</b>	No facilities inspected	<b>12</b>
Species	<b>SAL</b>	<b>Wrasse</b>	<b>Lumpfish</b>		
Age group	<b>Q3'sQ4's</b>	<b>2019 wild</b>	<b>18/19</b>		
No Fish	<b>901,000</b>	<b>6,200</b>	<b>100,000</b>		
Mean Fish Wt	<b>2.87kilo</b>	<b>160g</b>	<b>200g</b>		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<b>April 20</b>		Next Input Date (Site)	<b>August 21</b>	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **N** Any escapes (since last visit)? **N**  
 If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**

**Movement Records**

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. Date of last inspection: **14/02/2019**  
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **N**  
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**  
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

**Transport Records**

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? **N**  
 If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **[REDACTED]**

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**  
 If other detail: **Ensiled offsite at Kames pier**  
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **wk25-0.07% wk24-0.03% wk23-0.02% -228 wk22 - 0.03% 325**  
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**  
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**  
 If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**  
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**  
 If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**  
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **N/A**

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	Slice TMS	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	TMS	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

**Biosecurity Records**

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	y
If no, detail:		

**Results of Surveillance**

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	AGD detected at low levels. 2/10 fish positive.	
Reports of lumpfish with craters disease - Fish health manager did observe any on site visit.		

Records checked between: 14/2/19-26/06/19

Case no:  Site No:  Date of visit/  
 Sampling:

Priority samples: VI  BA  PA  MG  HI

Time sampling starts/ends:   Inspector:  VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1  2  3  4  5

Summary samples HIST  BA  MG  VI  PA  Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1	2	3									
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Average weight	2.87kilo	2.87kilo	2.87kilo									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Loch Ness (FS0434)	Loch Ness (FS0434)	Loch Ness (FS0434)								
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	12	8	5									



Case Number:	2019-0311	Site No:	FS0805	Insp:		
Date of Visit	26/06/2019	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
<b>Management practices</b>		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 processing	0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>31</b>	<b>HIGH</b>



Case No: **2019-0311**

Site No: **FS0805**

**Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)**

1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?   
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

Top nets	HDP nets	ADD	MML

If other, detail below:

3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?   
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)



Case No: 2019-0311

Site No: FS0805

Date of Visit: 26/06/2019

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

**Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements**

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

**Arrangements for Fish Health Management**

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

**Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice**

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

**Harvesting**

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

**Fallowing**

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

**Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only**

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

**Management and operation**

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site No: FS0805
Case No: 2019-0311
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology





██████████  
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

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	26/06/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0805	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Bagh Dail Nan Cean
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██	<b>CASE No</b>	20190311

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and found to be inadequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R25

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

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

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

It was found during inspection of movement records that the FS number was not always being recorded in the source/destination section of the movement book. It was agreed with the site manager at the time of inspection that this would be recorded in future. No further action is required.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

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

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

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



Signed:

Date: 03/07/2019

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No:  Date of visit:

Time spent on site:  Main Inspector:

Site No:  Site Name:   
 Business No:  Business Name:

Case Types: 1  2  3  4  5  6

Water Temp (°C):  Thermometer No:  FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA M-40

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Clinical signs of disease observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Gross pathology observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Diagnostic samples taken?

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:



**Additional Case Information:**

Salmosan treatment - pen 1 (Thursday the second of may.) post treatment mortality - 2.4% Cumulative mortality lost from pen.

Thermolicer treatment. 15th of June. Good clearance reported after treatment. Pens that had been treated with the thermolicer more recently had some lethargic fish visible in the pens, some of which had obvious mechanical damage from the thermolicer treatment.

MOWI when fish are below 2 kilos their trigger level for treatment is 0.2 lice / fish. This is a new adaptation to their sea lice policy so treatments are occurring more regularly and a lot earlier in the initial stages of sea lice settlement.

42000 lumpfish put in at end of 2018 - 32000 left. Lots of mortality attributed to post treatment and summer weather. Lethargic and lean lumpfish could be seen swimming round the edges of the pens. There were a lot of healthy ones too. Some had apparent issues with fungus attributed to the warmer weather. Site manager noted that they do really well in the winter months but as the sea warms up in summer they see increases in mortality and increases mortality post treatment.

Wrasse going to be stocked over the summer months. A Combination of wild and farmed - Possibly coming from Ireland, Weymouth or local fishermen. BDNC is currently being stocked with wild wrasse from NI and local areas.

Morts are ensiled off site at a pier owned by Kames. Dead fish are moved to pier using work boats rather than a waste collector, so there are no transport records, just a list of how many bins are taken to the pier periodically.

All fish sample appeared healthy and free from lice, Internally they showed no signs of disease.

Sampling, Inspection and paperwork completed by [REDACTED] supervised by [REDACTED]

Case No: **2019-0312** Site No: **FS0859**  
 Date of Visit: **26/06/2019** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **Y**  
 2. Changes made to details? **Y**

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<b>4</b>	Facilities stocked	<b>4</b>	No facilities inspected	<b>4</b>
Species	<b>SAL LUM</b>				
Age group	<b>2018 Q4's</b>	<b>2018</b>			
No Fish	<b>347,000</b>	<b>30,586</b>			
Mean Fish Wt	<b>2.758kilos</b>	<b>100g</b>			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<b>May 2020</b>		Next Input Date (Site)	<b>July 2020</b>	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **N** Any escapes (since last visit)? **N**  
 If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**

**Movement Records**

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. Date of last inspection: **06/11/2018**  
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **N**  
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **N**  
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **N/A**  
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

**Transport Records**

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? **N/A**  
 If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **[REDACTED]**

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**  
 If other detail: **Ensiled offsite. At kames pier**  
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **week25(0.12% -445\_ week24(0.064% -225) week23 (0.038%-132) week22(0.074 - 262)**  
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**  
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**  
 If yes, detail: **See additional info**  
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**  
 If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**  
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **N/A**

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	Slice TMS	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	TMS	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

**Biosecurity Records**

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If no, detail:		

**Results of Surveillance**

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Health manager visited site. Observed sluggish and lethargic fish hanging at sides. Samples were taken to test for presence of SAV (PD)	

Records checked between:

Case no:  Site No:  Date of visit/  
 Sampling:

Priority samples: VI  BA  PA  MG  HI

Time sampling starts/ends:   Inspector:  VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1  2  3  4  5

Summary samples HIST  BA  MG  VI  PA  Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1	2	3									
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Average weight	2.76kilo	2.76kilo	2.76kilos									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Glenfinnan (FS0742)	Glenfinnan (FS0742)	Glenfinnan (FS0742)								
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	1	2	3									



Case Number:	2019-0312	Site No:	FS0859	Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/06/2019	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0			
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4	2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8	
<b>Management practices</b>		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 processing	0			
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1			1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4			
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8			
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10			
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0			
	Common processes with other farms	3			3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0			0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5			
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0			0
	No	1			
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0			0
	No	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			0
	No	2			
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>23</b> <b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No: **2019-0312**

Site No: **FS0859**

**Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)**

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?   
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

- 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

HDP nets - Top nets with bird poles MML

If other, detail below:

- 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?   
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
- 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
- 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
- 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
- 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)



Case No: 2019-0312

Site No: FS0859

Date of Visit: 26/06/2019

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

**Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements**

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

**Arrangements for Fish Health Management**

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

**Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice**

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

**Harvesting**

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

**Fallowing**

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

**Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only**

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

**Management and operation**

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site No: FS0859
Case No: 2019-0312
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology





██████████  
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

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	26/06/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0859	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Port Na Cro
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██	<b>CASE No</b>	20190312

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and found to be inadequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

R25

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

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

It was found during inspection of movement records that the FS number was not always being recorded in the source/destination section of the movement book. It was agreed with the site manager at the time of inspection that this would be recorded in future. No further action is required.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

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

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

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

Signed:



Date: 04/07/2019

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No:  Date of visit:

Time spent on site:  Main Inspector:

Site No:  Site Name:   
Business No:  Business Name:

Case Types: 1  2  3  4  5  6

Water Temp (°C):  Thermometer No:  FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: TA Water type: F CoGP MA

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
Clinical signs of disease observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
Gross pathology observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
Diagnostic samples taken?

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:



**Additional Case Information:**

Site Inspection accompanied by two APHA Vets.

The site has had historical issues with eye fluke, this is sourced from the influent river water. To prevent this a new disc filter (30 micron) has been installed, this has been shown to be working effectively with no issues with eye fluke since input. There are two water sources available, the hatchery is supplied by borehole water (9.3 degrees), the remaining facilities are supplied by the river.

On the morning of the 16th June the site manager was performing general husbandry duties when he noticed that the water levels were low in the ponds, he immediately went to the disc filter and realised that the filter had been blocked reducing the water flows. The filter bypass was activated to restore water flow. Due to the prolonged period of reduced water 23347 (2.33%) mortalities (average weight of 128g) were recorded in pond 4 (21,235) and pond 8 (2112).

The low water level alarm should have sounded resulting in the on call system being triggered. On inspection of the on-call dialler it became apparent that the manager had neglected to complete the sign out procedure correctly the day before resulting in the on-call system not being activated.

The reason that the filter became blocked was partly due to a large volume of suspended solids coming down the river and also a slight design flaw with the filter. There is a channel that runs inside the filter where the suspended solids are collected and drain out to the back channel of the site. Due to this being internal to the rotating discs a visual inspection cannot simply be conducted, to do this sections of the filter have to be removed to allow access and the channel can then be cleaned of any build up of silt. This is completed once a week currently. The manager is going to have a perspex window cut into the metalwork to allow visual inspections to be conducted on a daily basis and remedial action can then taken when needed. In addition to this additional screening is to be input above the filter (there already is a drum filter upstream).

The alarm system is also to be changed so that there it is in an 'always on' state this will remove the human error element from the procedure. The proposed changes should prevent a similar mortality event occurring.

On inspection of the site the stocks appeared in good general health.

Case No: **2019-0314** Site No: **FS0508**  
 Date of Visit: **27/06/2019** Inspector(s): **[redacted]**

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **Y**  
 2. Changes made to details? **N**

**Site Details**

	12 tanks 8 earth ponds, one concrete lined pond and hatchery	Facilities stocked	18	No facilities inspected	all
Total No facilities					
Species	RTR	RTR			
Age group	2018	2019			
No Fish	253,602	801,000			
Mean Fish Wt	135.3	5.6g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Not planned		Next Input Date (Site)	October 2019	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **Y** Any escapes (since last visit)? **N**  
 If yes, detail: **touch of RTFS , not significant**

**Movement Records**

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. Date of last inspection: **11/03/2019**  
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**  
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **Y**

**Transport Records**

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? **N**  
 If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **N/A**

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Ensiled - on site**  
 If other detail: **Ensiled, then bio-digester in Ellon**  
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **Wk 23 4398 (0.38 swim ups/RTFS), wk 24 6323 (0.57% swim ups, runts and deformities), wk 25 48,751 (4.61% 23239 swim ups, 23347 mortality event), 24th-26th (1627 0.15%, swim ups).**  
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**  
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **see additional info**  
 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**  
 If yes, detail: **[redacted]**  
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**  
 If yes, detail action: **[redacted]**  
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **Y**

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	<input type="text"/>	N/A
If yes, detail:	<input type="text"/>	
If other, detail:	<input type="text"/>	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="text"/>	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="text"/>	N/A
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="text"/>	N/A
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	<input type="text"/>	
If other, detail:	<input type="text"/>	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="text"/>	N/A

**Biosecurity Records**

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="text"/>
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="text"/>
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?	<input type="text"/>
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	<input type="text"/>
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="text"/>
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	<input type="text"/>
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="text"/>
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="text"/>
If no, detail:	<input type="text"/>

**Results of Surveillance**

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="text"/>
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="text"/>
3. Any significant results?	<input type="text"/>
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	

Records checked between:



██████████  
Dawnfresh Farming Ltd  
Bothwellpark Industrial Estate  
Uddingston  
Lanarkshire  
G71 6LS  
██████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0456	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	27/06/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0508	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Kinnaird Mill Trout
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██████████	<b>CASE No</b>	20190314

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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: 01/07/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

Case No: 2019-0318 Date of visit: 27/06/2019

Time spent on site: 0 Main Inspector:

Site No: FS0430 Site Name: Nevis A
Business No: FB0125 Business Name: Scottish Sea Farms Ltd

Case Types: 1 PSI 2 3 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): Thermometer No: FHI 045 completed N/A

Observations: Region: HI Water type: S CoGP MA M-23

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

**Additional Case Information:**

Site contacted following a report of several Billy Bowe tankers and bulk carrier lorries sighted in Mallaig outer harbour on weekend 8th/9th June 2019. Smell of dead salmon over weekend.

Confirmed tankers were used for mortalities from this site and Nevis C. Incinerator on site unable to cope with waste as average size of fish is 5.8kg although mort levels were not above the 1% reporting figure.

Wrasse and lump fish on site but numbers not available at the time, Stocked at 4% level wrasse from wild and lump fish from hatcheries.

Current lice levels 2.1 average adult female at last count.

Recent mort's; wk22 0.27%, 668 fish /week for site; wk23 0.48% 1205 fish/week for site; wk24 0.65% 1625 fish/week for site; wk25 0.29% 689 fish/week for site



Case Number:	2019-0318	Site No:	FS0430	Insp:		
Date of Visit	27/06/2019	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
<b>Management practices</b>		None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>21</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No:  Site No:

Date of case:  Inspector(s):

Business/site contacts correct? (if no update site summary sheet)

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="12"/>	No facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="8"/>
Species	sal	Wrasse	Lump Fish
Age group	2018 S1	wild	hatchery
No Fish	21,600	not provided	not provided
Mean Fish Wt	5.8kg	notprovided	notprovided
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Sept 2019	Next Input Date (Site)	Dec 2019

Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI)

Any recent increased or atypical mortalities? (last 4 weeks.)

If yes, detail:   
 e.g. site average, max per cage

Any increased mortalities? (since last inspection.)

If yes, detail:

How are mortalities disposed of?

If other detail:

Any treatments? (since last inspection)

If yes, detail:

Other:

Any disease on site? (since last inspection)

If yes, detail:

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

Any significant results?

If yes, detail

Is there a history of sea lice issues at the site in previous 4 years

If yes, detail:

Has site been able to keep lice levels below the recommended lice levels?

If no, detail:

Treatment discharge for sea lice in place?

If yes, detail:

Where sea lice treatments have been administered have they had an effect?

If no, detail:

Is a management area agreement in place?

Does your CoGP Farm management area fallow in synchrony?

Any reported escapes? (check prior to phone call)

Any escapes? (since last inspection)

If yes, detail: (include date)

Any significant changes to your biosecurity procedures since previous visit?

N

If yes, detail:

[Redacted area]



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

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0125	<b>DATE OF CASE</b>	27/06/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0430	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Nevis A
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██████████	<b>CASE No</b>	20190318

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

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

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

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

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

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: 25/07/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)