

Case No:	2019-0576		Date of visit:	16/10/2019	
Time spent on site:	8hrs		Main Inspector:		
Site No:	FS0881	Site Name:	Uig		
Business No:	FB0440	Business Name:	Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd		
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNA	3 SLI	4 VMD	5
Water Temp (°C):	12.9	Thermometer No:	T205	FHI 045 completed	
Observations:	Region:	HI	Water type:	S	CoGP MA M-24
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>				

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Site was inactive for several years, site status changed to active on 8/5/19.

Slice treatment started 27/6/19. wk29 high Caligus levels on site, coinciding with increased morts due to concussion (jumping) following by slice treatment and a decrease in morts and Caligus numbers.

No Salmosan consent for the site.

Net tags onsite checked and correspond with records. Small hole above the waterline observed on pen 5 repaired immediately. Seals observed in the vicinity of the site.

CNA document requirements received and checked on 13/01/2021.

Case No: **2019-0576** Site No: **FS0881**  
 Date of Visit: **16/10/2019** 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>8</b>	Facilities stocked	<b>7</b>	No facilities inspected	<b>8</b>
Species	<b>SAL</b>				
Age group	<b>2019 Q2</b>				
No Fish	<b>1,073,659</b>				
Mean Fish Wt	<b>736g</b>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<b>September 2020</b>	Next Input Date (Site)	<b>Spring 2021</b>		

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **N** Any escapes (since last visit)? **Y**  
 If yes, detail: **reported escape on 22/5/2019 human error, approximately 500 fish lost**

**Movement Records**

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **reactivated 8/5/19**
- 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? **N/A**

**Transport Records**

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

**Mortality Records**

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
- If other detail: **fish go off whole from Dunvegan, SSE Barkip, Dalrigh KA24 4JJ**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **wk38 918 morts, 0.08%; wk39 2,688 morts, 0.25%; wk40 2,083 morts, 0.19%; wk41 1,123 morts 0.11%**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:  
**wk 39 increased morts were runts after FW treatment**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**
- If yes, detail: **July 2019: 9,001 morts, 0.82% majority attributed to concussion due to slightly raised Caligus numbers, slice treatment and FW have reduced Caligus numbers. Approximately 1,300 morts per pen.**
- 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)?  Y  
 If yes, detail:   
  
 If other, detail:   
 2. Medicines records available for inspection?  Y  
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  Y  
 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?  Y  
 5. If yes, what treatment(s)?   
 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 is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?  Y  
 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?  Y  
 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?  Y  
 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?  Y  
 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?  Y  
 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).

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	700g	700g	700g									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Girlista Hatchery	Girlista Hatchery	Girlista Hatchery								
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	6	7	4									



Case Number:	2019-0576	Site No:	FS0881	Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/10/2019	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			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	0
	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>18</b> <b>MEDIUM</b>



Case No: **2019-0576**

Site No: **FS0881**

**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)

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   
**hand netted some fish out of the water, but discussed deploying nets but it was decided against it as the smolts were very small.**
- 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: 2019-0576

Site No: FS0881

Date of Visit: 16/10/2019

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: FS0881

Case No: 2019-0576

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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



Case No: 2019-0576 Site No: FS0881

Date of visit: 16/10/2019 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)</b>				
<b>a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures</b>				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events <sup>1</sup> been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		Y		
<b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b>				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH Regs <sup>4</sup> 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO <sup>2</sup> and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	N	CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	DSFB reported, unsure about SSPO
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees?		N		A few fish were able to be recovered by hand net but it was decided with the DSFB against deploying nets due to the size of the smolts and the mesh would have needed to be fairly small.
<b>If yes give detail</b>				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		Wrong valve was opened and fish spilled on the deck and washed over site side of the boat. Scupper guards were not fitted at the time of the escape. These were put in place after the escape took place and these must be in place in future before any fish will be discharged. Procedures have not been updated yet to include check for scupper guards being in place.
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9	General procedures available with site specific risk assessments for different activities and possible escapes scenarios (e.g. equipment failure).
<b>b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site</b>				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary																																													
General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1																																														
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Facilities</th> <th>Moorings</th> <th>Nets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>Y</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Facilities	Moorings	Nets	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y				N/A	N/A	Y	All cages, moorings and nets are brand new in May 2019.
Facilities	Moorings	Nets																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
N/A	N/A	N/A																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
Y	Y	Y																																															
N/A	N/A	Y																																															
a) The name of the manufacturer b) Any special adaptations c) The name of the supplier d) The date of purchase e) Each inspection including i) the name of the person conducting the inspection  ii) the date of each inspection iii) the place of each inspection iv) the outcome of each inspection f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	Low Low Low Low Low  Low Medium Low High High																																																
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:																																																	
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2																																														
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y																																															
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y																																															
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y																																															
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:																																																	
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3	constructed 2019																																													
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y																																															
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y																																															
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-																																																	
i) The date of installation	Low	Y	SSI, 2,4	put in 2019																																													
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y																																															
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y																																															
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5																																														
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters <sup>3</sup>																																																	
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low		SSI, 2,6																																														

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low			None so far this would be recorded in daily checklist.
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low			
2.6 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)	
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
<b>Pen and mooring systems</b>				All site staff have completed a containment course.
2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	nets go for servicing and testing at the end of every cycle
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	reports show net panels put in place for small holes (few meshes deep) by divers
<b>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	all staff have a minimum of powerboat level 2
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	general escapes contingency plan
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	every cycle
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,8,b  CoGP 4.4.27	all pens have bird nets, double mesh panels at the water line and around the base
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A		
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A		
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.18	
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags? Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	Top nets, seal blinds, tension nets, double mesh around the waterline and the base of the net, looking to trial new ADD system in due course - currently none on site
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)	Low	N/A		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA <sup>5</sup> 2010 P4, S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5	
<b>d. Inspection of site specific procedures</b>				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.31	No site specific procedures were observed during the inspection.
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A		
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>Additional actions</b>	<b>Powers</b>			<b>Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary</b>
<b>e) Collection of samples</b> If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection	Power granted under the Act – section 5 (3) (a)			
<b>h) Enforcement Notice.</b> If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)			

1 An 'escape event' can be defined as any circumstances on or in the vicinity of a fish farm which are believed to have caused an escape, or which may have given rise to a significant risk of an escape of fish.

2 FHI interpretation – Informing the SSPO is only a requirement where the site belongs to an Authorised Production Business which is signed up to the CoGP.

3 being waters which do not form part of the sea or any creek, bay or estuary or of any river as far as far as the tide flows

4 The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010



██████████  
Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd  
Gremista  
Lerwick  
Shetland  
ZE1 OPX  
████████████████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0440	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	16/10/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0881	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Uig
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██████████	<b>CASE No</b>	20190576

### ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

An enhanced inspection to ascertain the risk of escape from the fish farm was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of facilities, records and the provision of advice.

#### **a) Inspection of i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures**

The following recommendations are made for improvement.

**It is recommended that in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (chapter 4, section 4.37) any escape, or suspected escape, of live fish should be reported to all relevant stakeholders including the trade body (SSPO) immediately (or at the latest, within 48 hours of discovery).**

**It is also recommended that in accordance with CoGP (chapter 4, sections 4.34 and 4.35) contingency plans are reviewed and updated to include the procedure for making relevant notifications following an escape or suspected escape incident.**

#### **b)i) Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site**

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

#### **b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training**

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

R10

**b)iii) Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments**

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice, the following recommendations are made due to the circumstances of the reported escape incident on 22 May 2019.

**It is recommended that in accordance with CoGP (chapter 4, sections 4.29 and 4.30) a documented review of the written procedures, risk assessment and contingency plan for pumping fish from a wellboat on site are reviewed with a view to updating them to ensure that only the correct valves can be opened and that appropriate mitigations are in place to prevent fish from escaping if containment is breached. Staff should be trained in any updates to the procedures put in place.**

**c) Inspection of site and site equipment**

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

**d) Inspection of site specific procedures**

No site specific procedures were observed during the inspection.

**Further Action**

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by **27 August 2020**. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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: 27/05/2020

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)

[REDACTED]  
Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd  
Gremista  
Lerwick  
Shetland  
ZE1 OPX  
[REDACTED]

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0440	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	16/10/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0881	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Uig
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>CASE No</b>	20190576

#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 27 August 2020. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

This case will now be closed. This site may be subject to further audit and recommendations in the future.

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

Signed: [REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 13/01/2021

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/>



██████████  
Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd  
Gremista  
Lerwick  
Shetland  
ZE1 OPX  
████████████████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0440	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	16/10/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0881	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Uig
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██████████	<b>CASE No</b>	20190576

#### 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 parasites, and fish farm management agreements and statements.

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

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 30/10/2019

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)