FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0133			Date of visit: 26/03/2019
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Ins	pector:
Site No: FS1093 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Teisti Geo Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 7	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed N
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-11
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Thermolicer treatment at the beginning of February 2018, increase in mortalities attributed to physical damage and stress.

Currently trialling a feed that aims to increase the fish's ability to combat gill problems, by increasing haematocrit levels in the blood. Control cages are 8 and 9 and are therefore not receiving this trial feed. Awaiting results.

Thermolicer is reported to give very good clearances of sea lice. Site manager reported that they had used the hydrolicer, but the system could not handle fish over 3.5 kg and the grade of fish is important to provide consistent clearance. Only chemical theraputants used this cycle for sea lice control are two SLICE treatments and one hydrogen peroxide treatment, one of the SLICE treatments was administered to reduce the levels of caligus on site and was reported to give a good clearance rate. Due to caligus settlement fish were jumping in to the top net support and causing physical damage to themselves. During this caligus were at a level of 6 per fish. May not use SLICE during next production cycle, currently unsure if Tiesti Geo will be stocked or fallowed for next cycle.

Several moribund fish identified across site.

Fish taken for VMD sample appeared healthy and feeding well.

No site specific lice strategy or harvest strategy. Discussed with manager who has agreed to draft these documents and submit to MSS.

Inspection, paperwork and VMD sampling completed by under supervision.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0133]	Site No:	FS1093				
Date of Visit:		26/03/2019	9		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	
Site Details			_			_		
Total No facilities		9	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilities	sinspected	9
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	2018 S1s	2018						
No Fish	396,065	47,207						
Mean Fish Wt	2.55kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Oct 2019		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Jan/Feb 20	20	
					1			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last v	risit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records comp 6. Are health certificator Transport Records 1. Are any movement fyes, is there a system Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. How are mortalities If other detail:	s available fo ction: olete and corre cords availab- olete and corre ates for introd ints carried out tem in place for intess disposed of	ectly entered le for dead fis ectly entered ductions (out t by (or on be for maintenar inspection?	? sh and waste? ? with GB) availa ehalf) of the bu	able? usiness (not us	_	·	16/03/2017 aste to Energ	Y Y Y Y N/A Y Y Y Y
	High tonnag							
Mortality records of the second	last 4 wks): nt increased/a	typical morta	week 9: (4,0 week 12: (1, lities?	60, 0.46%), we 511, 0.15%) ad /reason:	* *		ek 11: (2,523	Y 3, 0.26%), N
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?					Y
If yes, detail:	June and Ju	ly 2017, rise	to 4% across	whole site for v	whole month, a	attribited to th	nermolicer tre	eatment.
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FH	l? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events sl	heet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspec	tion?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly en	tered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspe	ction?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mor	tality removal, recording and safe disposal bee	en considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which the	ne APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterina	ary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	site been included?	Y

2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Υ
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 16/03/17-26/03/19	

ы	11 059, Version 12							ISS	suea by: r	-HI			
	Case no:	2019-0°	133	Site No:		FS1093			Date of v		26/0	03/2019	26/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		0:00 Indoors		0:00	3	Inspecto	or: 4		5	VMD No	p. [13
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		 VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight		2.55kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	6	8	11									
S	T domey 110	V	0	-									

	,										,		
03/2019	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:									
	Fish killed by percussive blow.												
0	1	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	1							

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0133		Site No:	FS1093		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/03/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible		novements on from equivalent zone or	_				
species		cluding third country	0		18	26	0
	Number of sup	oliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
	Number of desi		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	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		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
	•	or in a coastal zone with category V					H
	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				0
	-	from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0	Ī			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				0
					Total		21
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0133	Site No: FS1093					
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •						
•	•	s in the previous 4 years?	Υ				
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ				
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?							
Management Area (or e	equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y				
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y				
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ				
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Y				
8. Have average adult f records are inspected?	· ·	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that	N				
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A				
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N				
		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	N/A				
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ				
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ				
		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ				
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	N				
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	N				
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ				
Containment Inspection	on						
 Has the site experient 	iced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N				
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ				
ADD, seal pro nets, s	inker tubes, tension	nets, top nets.					
If other, detail below:							
Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N				
If Yes proceed with que	stions 4 – 9. If No skij	o to question 10					
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	sters?					
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)					
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail					
O If all note were deal-	wood was this satisfier	ground with local wild fish interests and was normissing siven by Coefficients					
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish					
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could					
be considered under	•	·					
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ				

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-01	33 Site No:	FS1093		
Date of Visit:	26/03/2019	Inspector:		
Point of Compliance				
1. Is the farm under inspe	ction located within a far	m management area	a?	Y
If N, no further questions	require completion.			
Points of Compliance for	or Both Farm Manageme	ent Agreements an	d Statements	
 2. Has a current farm man 3. Is the current FMAg/S at 4. Does the FMAg/S ident 5. Does the FMAg/S ident 6. Does the FMAg/S ident 7. Does the FMAg/S ident 	available for inspection? tify the relevant farm man tify the fish farm site(s) to tify the date of commence	nagement area? which it applies?		Y Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish H	lealth Management			
8. Does the FMAg/S ident farm?	tify the minimum health s	tandards for the stoo	cks to be introduced to the are	a or Y
 Does the FMAg/S ident Does the FMAg/S ident Does the FMAg/S ident Individual farm? 	ntify the species of fish w	hich may be stocked		Y Y Y
		r the storage and dis	sposal of any dead fish from a	ny Y
Arrangements for The M	lanagement of Sea Lice			
13. Does the FMAg/S idea	ntify arrangements for the	sharing of data on	sea lice numbers and treatme	ents?
14. Does the FMAg/S idea of statement?	ntify the availability and th	ne use of medicines	on farms covered by the agree	ement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S idealice on farms in the area of		the sensitivity testing	ng of available treatments for s	
	ntify the circumstances u	nder which biologica	l controls and cleaner fish are	to be Y
		r synchronous treatr	ments on farms within the area	a? Y
Live Fish Movements				
area or farm?		·	introduced or removed from t	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	vidual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	y which the area or individual farm will be fallo	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether bro covered by the agreement or statement?	oodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager	nent Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	nt include arrangements for persons to becor	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and op	perated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	f the FMAg/S? 01/09/2019	

Site No: FS1093
Case No: 2019-0133
Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2019-0133			Date of visit:	26/03/2019					
Site No:	FS1093	Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	+									
	+									
	+									
Report Summary	T									
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	01/04/2019		Z INSP							
LOI, OIVI, OLI, VIVID	01/04/2010									
	1									
	1									
	1									
	1									
	1									





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 26/03/2019

 Site No
 FS1093
 Site Name
 Teisti Geo

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190133

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

However, the following records relating to sea lice were not available at the time of inspection:

- A harvest strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice.
- 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

Please ensure that these points have been addressed by 01/05/19. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below). The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above points not be taken within the time period stipulated.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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: 01/04/2019