FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2019-0581				Date of visit: 10/10/2019		
Time spent on site:	5 hrs	N	Main Inspector	r:		
Site No: SS0759 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Fearna Loch Striven Mus	sel Farms Ltd			
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4	5	6		
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		]	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed?	•	N/A  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N/A  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N/A  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N/A				
Diagnostic samples taken?						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:				

Export inspection. 16 x 1,200 kg bags (19.2 tonnes) of MED for export to Ireland inspected. Low level of fouling but majority of shells looking clean. Certificate INTRA.GB.2019.0028404 (MD19/125) signed and passed over to accompany consignment to final destination. No issues found and no hitchhiker species observed.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2	2019-0581		Site No:	SS0759				
Date of Visit:		10/10/2019	]		Inspector(s):			]
1. Business/site detail	s summary		ite representa	ative?			N N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	s inspected	0
Age group	Иix							
No Fish 1	10 lines							
Mean Fish Wt	l0g							
Next Fallow Date (Site	e)	no fallow pla	nned	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	natural spa	at collection	
	sease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N/A
Registration/Authorisation Details  1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?  2. Changes made to details?  Site Details  Total No facilities Species Age group Mix No Fish  10 lines Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site) No facilities on fallow planned Next Input Date (Site) No Any escapes (since last visit)? N/A  If yes, detail:  Movement Records  1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?  Transport Records  If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?								
Movement Records								
1. Movement records	available for	r inspection?						Y
. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  Y								
Age group No Fish Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site) No fallow planned Next Input Date (Site) No fallow planned No fallow								
				•				
•		•		abla?				
	es ioi introd	luctions (outw	illi GD) avalla	able :				IV/A
•								
•				•	_			
If yes, is there a syste	m in place to	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	<i>?</i>			
Mortality Records								
•		•						Y
_			1		Other (detail)			
								V
-	•	correctly erite		l mortalities sin	nce last inspec	tion		
5. Evidence of recent	•	typical mortal		i mortanties sin	ice last illspec	LIOIT		N
If yes, facility nos/no n				/reason·				
ii yoo, idomiy iioo/iio ii	nortanty por	racinty/ric ctc	on por raomey					
6. Any other peaks in	mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (un	nexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ever	nts' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	: 08/10/2018
	available for inspection? lete and correctly entered? rawal period? ent(s)?			
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records 2. Has the manner ar 3. Has the manner ar		tify Scottish Ministers or veteri		
is detected been inclu	t will be taken in the event that the uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will tus of aquaculture animals being sation if required)?	be notified to Scottish Minister	rs?	
transmission of disea 7. Is documentation a aquaculture animals	ry and biosecurity measures imple ase been covered (movement of st available regarding the measures i held on site? ity procedures been adequately im	taff, visitors, equipment, live or in place to maintain the physic	r dead fish etc.)?	
Results of Surveilla	nce			
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out	by, or on behalf of, the busine	ess?	N

03/10/2019 - 10/10/2019

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Case No:	2019-0581			Date of visit:	10/10/2019			
Site No:	SS0759	l		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summany								
Report Summary Case Type	Data	lnon	ond .					
MOV	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
MOV	12/10/2019							





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0530
 Date of Visit
 10/10/2019

 Site No
 SS0759
 Site Name
 Fearna

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190581

# Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of 19,200 kg of *Mytilus.edulis* for placing on the market in the Republic of Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 12/10/2019
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0582			Date of visit: 08/10/2019			
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Main Ir	nspector:			
Site No: SS0547 Business No: SB0358	Site Name: Business Name:	South Ardnaclach Farm Creran Oysters	1			
Case Types: 1 DIA	2 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): N/A	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. Y				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:				

Collection of CGI samples from site at request of diagnostic laboratory for further analysis after initial report of increased mortalities and inspection (case 2019-0518) on 17/09/2019. Stock details along with business details not checked as they had already been checked just 3 weeks prior to this inspection. No movements on or off site have been carried out since increase of mortalities was noticed.

Tide was in at time of inspection so unable to get to site but manager had moved some bags closer to shore. On inspection of theses bags an average of 85 CGI were counted per bag with 6 mort's per bag.

	111 000, 10101011 12			_	_				aca by.				
	Case no:	2019-05	582	Site No:		SS0547			Date of Samplin		08/	10/2019	09/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	_	н			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	16:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	0
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		BA	Υ	MG	Υ	VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10	F11	F12
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Pool Group												
	Species	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI						
	Average weight	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750	0.0750
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW						
		Sea	Sea	Sea	Sea	Sea	Sea						
Details		sey	sey	sey	sey	sey	šey	Guernsey 8 Farms	sey	sey	sey	sey	Guernsey ( Farms
		Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	uer	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	Guerns Farms	arm
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	9 12	9 12	<u> О ц</u>	9 12	0 L	9 12	<u>Ө г</u>	9 12	0 12	0 12	<u> </u>	Θц
U,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,												

### 10/2019 Additional Sample Information: Oysters sent back to lab via Royal Mail where they were then sampled. 30 Total Tests assigned 3 F13 F15 F16 F17 F18 F19 F20 F21 F22 F23 F24 F25 F26 F27 F28 F14 13 15 18 20 22 23 24 25 26 28 14 16 17 19 21 27 CGI 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 0.0750 N/A SW Guernsey Sea Farms Guernsey Sea Farms Guernsey Sea Farms Sea Guernsey ( Farms Guernsey Farms Guernsey Farms Guernsey ( Farms Guernsey Farms

Case No:	2019-0582			Date of visit:	08/10/2019			
Site No:	SS0547	l		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
MG OHV	0/30	15/10/2019		15/10/2019		26/11/2019		
VSPE	6/6	08/11/2019		08/11/2019		26/11/2019		
BACT	4/30	08/11/2019		08/11/2019		26/11/2019		
	1							
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
DIA	26/11/2019							
	1							
	1							
	1							
	1							
	1							





Creran Oysters
Failte
Benderloch, by Connel
Argyll
PA37 1QU

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

# SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No SB0358

SITE NO SS0547

INSPECTOR

**DATE OF VISIT** 08/10/2019

SITE NAME South Ardnaclach Farm

**CASE No** 20190582

# **Section 1: Summary**

Following a report of increased mortalities, the site was inspected on the 17 September (case no. 2019-0518). After initial histopathology screening of the samples taken for case 2019-0518 the National Reference Laboratory requested more samples for further analysis.

Histopathology examination revealed features resembling a likely bacterial septicaemia.

Bacteriology examination isolated two *Vibrio* spp. The level and purity of the most predominant *Vibrio* sp. may suggest it could be contributing to the current increased mortality levels experienced on site.

Samples were also screened for oyster herpesvirus by QPCR. All results returned negative.

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

# **Section 2: Case Detail**

# **Observations**

A further 30 *Crassostrea gigas* were collected from the site at the request of the National Reference Laboratory for further analysis after suspicion of a potential bacterial infection was observed from case 2019-0518. Mortality levels were still elevated at the time of shellfish collection.

# Samples

Samples were collected from 30 shellfish according to the table below:

R09

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB Tel – 0131 244 3498 Fax – 0131 244 0944 Email – <u>ms.fishhealth@gov.scot</u> Website - <u>www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science</u>

Shellfish number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1 - 30	Crassostrea gigas	70 – 75g	Guernsey Sea Farms

### Results

**Bacteriology:** Haemolymph material from F1 - 6 was inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

The following bacteria were isolated from all 6 shellfish.

- Vibrio sp.(Isolate A): Fish 1 6 (Haemolymph)
- *Vibrio* sp.(Isolate B): Fish 1 6 (Haemolymph)

DNA sequence analysis was performed on *Vibrio* sp (Isolate A). The results confirmed the isolate to be a *Vibrio* sp. but the exact species could not be confirmed.

**Virology:** Tissue samples from all 30 shellfish were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (QPCR).

The samples tested negative for oyster herpesvirus (OsHV-1).

**Histology:** Tissue samples of gill, mantle and digestive gland were taken from F1 - 30. The tissue samples were fixed in Davidson's fixative.

Histopathological examination revealed the following:

Mild to marked haemocyte agglutination in haemolymph vessels and mild lysis and/or infiltration of the sub-epithelial connective tissue in the mantle and moderate focal gonadal haemocytic infiltration (F1, F4, F12, F22). F4 displayed a focal area of connective tissue necrosis close to the stomach.

Minor gonadal haemocytic infiltration (F21, F28).

Some haemocytic infiltration in the vesicular connective tissue surrounding the stomach (F6, F13, F17, F19 & F23).

Few scattered ciliates (Ancistrocoma-like) within the digestive gland (F2, F5, F8, F23, F27).

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 26/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018									
Case No: 2019-0583			Date of visit: 09/10/2019									
Time spent on site:	5 hrs	Main I	nspector:									
Site No: FS0270 Business No: FB0134	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Avich Kames Fish Farming L	td									
Case Types: 1 REP	2 DIA 3	4 5	6									
Water Temp (°C): 11.9	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed									
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA									
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet.											
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:											

Site started vaccination (PD7) of fish on 4/09/19 (week 36). Formalin treatment started on wk 37 (morts 1%, 3213) but on wk 38 morts suddenly jumped to 5.77% (18477).

Results from FVG from samples taken on the 16th September came back positive for furunculosis on the 19th. FVG also reported haemorrhaging in different organs, including the gills. Internal lesions were not as obvious as external ones. Bacteriology plates cultured by Kames isolated Aeromonas salmonicida, causative agent of furunculosis.

FVG issued prescription for Aquatet (Oxytertacycline, mixed at Kames) on 20/09/19 for 10 days of treatment which has appeared to have stopped the infection. Site still doing formalin treatment for saprolegnia.

Special biosecurity measures have been put in place. Specific vehicles/equipment as well as staff only working at affected sites.

Another Kames site tested positive for furunculosis by histology but mortality levels have not increased.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2019-0583		Site No:	FS0270	]				
Date of Visit:	=	09/10/2019	]		Inspector(s)	:		]	
1. Business/site det	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}	
Site Details									
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	4	No facilitie	s inspected	8	
Species	SAL								
Age group									
No Fish									
Mean Fish Wt	121.6								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Oct. 2019		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Unsure			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?			Any escape	s (since last	vieit\2	N	
If yes, detail:  Morts jumped from 0.01% to over reporting level 1 week after vaccination. Furunculosis & saprolegic confirmed on site by vet. Haemorrhaging noted in different organs inc. gills. Internal lesions not as obvious as external. Bacteriology cultures isolated Aeromonas salmonicida									
Movement Record	s								
2. Date of last inspe	ection:						27/02/2017	Y	
obvious as external. Bacteriology cultures isolated Aeromonas salmonicida  Movement Records  1. Movement records available for inspection?									
Registration/Authorisation Details  1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?  2. Changes made to details?  Site Details  Total No facilities Species SAL Age group No Fish 212,249 Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site) Morts jumped from 0.01% to over reporting level 1 week after vaccination. Furunculosis & sapro confirmed on site by vet. Haemorrhaging noted in different organs inc. gills. Internal lesions not obvious as external. Bacteriology cultures isolated Aeromonas salmonicida  Movement Records  1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?  Transport Records  1. Mortality records available for inspection? 2. How are mortalities disposed of?  [I yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?  Mortality Records  1. Mortality records available for inspection? 2. How are mortalities disposed of?  [I other detail: [Morts moved by bin to kames pier and ensiled daily.]  3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?  4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):  (12.16%)  (12.16%)  (12.16%)  (13.16)  (14.17)  (15.17)  (15.17)  (15.17)  (16.17)  (17.17)  (17.17)  (17.18)  (17.18)  (18.18)  (								Y	
		-		able?				N/A	
		,	,						
· ·		t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?				
Mortality Records									
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y	
Date of Visit:    09/10/2019									
				ensiled daily.					
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente						Y	
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):			(1%), wk38 184	477 (5.77%),	wk39 22827	′ (7.13%), wk	40 33571	
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					Y	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:					
No specific cages s	howing higher	morts than o	thers. Pattern	shows an incr	ease in mort	s 1 week afte	er pen was va	ccinated.	
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N	
•	unexplained) ı							Y	
8 Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no add M	IRT case and e	enter on mort	ality events o	sheet	Y	

If other, detail:											
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?		Y								
3. Are records compl	ete and correctly entered?		Y								
4. Are fish in a withdr	awal period?		Y								
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)?	ormalin, Oxytetracycline									
If other, detail:											
6. Are medicines stor	red appropriately?		Y								
Biosecurity Records	s										
•	s available for inspection?	Ī									
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?											
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any											
increased (unexplain	increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?										
		•									
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 inclu	uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notifi	ied to Scottish Ministers?									
5. Has the health stat	tus of aquaculture animals being stocked	on the farm site been covered (equal or higher									
health status, certifica	ation if required)?										
	•	between each epidemiological unit to minimise									
	ase been covered (movement of staff, visit	_									
	available regarding the measures in place	to maintain the physical containment of									
aquaculture animals											
_	ity procedures been adequately implemen	ited on site?									
If no, detail:											
Results of Surveilla	nce										
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or o	n behalf of, the business?	Y								
_	available for inspection?	,	Y								
3. Any significant res	•		Y								
•	etailed under recent disease problems).	see recent disease problems									

22/02/2017 - 09/10/2019 Records checked between:

	11 000, 10101011 12								aca by. I				
	Case no:	2019-05	583	Site No:		FS0270			Date of v		09/	10/2019	09/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		, HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:4	5:00	14:1	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	0
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST	Υ	ВА	Υ	MG	Υ	VI	Y	PA	Υ	Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
г	Pool/Fish No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	P1		П				
Г	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	1-5						
Н	Pool Group	P1	P1	P1	P1	P1							
Г	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL							
	Average weight	0.1210	0.1210	0.1210	0.1210	0.1210							
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW							
		5		5	7	5							
Details		¶P,	/h	<b>Ah</b> c	<b>Ah</b> c	Å.							
J		Allt Mhor	Allt Mhor	Allt Mhor	Allt Mhor	Allt Mhor							
tock	Stock Origin Facility No	< AF1		∢ AF1		AF1							
S.	T dollity 140	AFI	AFI	AFT	AFI	AFI							

# 10/2019 Additional Sample Information: Fish showing clear signs of saprolegnia. Some fish also noted to have haemorrhaging at the vents and on the throat. Not a lot of internal signs. Only weak haemorrhaging of the body wall noted. Total Tests assigned 2

FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 08/10/2018 Method of killing: Percussive Case no: Site No: FS0270 2019-0583 Inspector(s): Sheet Relevant: Y Date of visit: 09/10/2019 S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes) External Signs Behaviour Moribund W Lethargic Hanging vertical Spiralling Flashing Loss of equilibrium Body Dark Distended abdomen Scale Oedema Opercula Shortened Flared Haemorrhaging Throat W W Ventrum Base of fins Elsewhere Eyes Exophthalmic Enophthalmic (sunken) Cataract Haemorrhagic Gills Pale Zoned Necrotic Lesions Flank Elsewhere Vent Inflamed Trailing faeces Lice Load Estimate numbers Internal Signs Clear Ascites Bloody Oedema In tissues Heart Pale/anaemic Granulomas Deformed Liver Petechial haem Gross haem Tissue breakdown Enlarged Colour number(s) Granulomas Lesions Pyloric caeca Petechial haem Tubules mauve Lack of fat Spleen Enlarged Granulomas Gut No food present Yellow pseudo-faeces External haem Internal haem Body wall Haemorrhaging W W W W Swim bladder Haemorrhaging Fluid filled Kidney Swollen Grey Granular Liquefied Parasites present General

Anaemia

Case no: 2019-0583

Date of visit: 09/10/2019

Date of visit.	09/10/20	3					
<b>S</b> for strong preser	nce: M for medium presence: W fo	ги					
Fish Number	The second secon						
	er death (if > 45 minutes)						
External Signs	,		-				
Behaviour	Moribund						
	Lethargic						
	Hanging vertical						
	Spiralling						
	Flashing						
	Loss of equilibrium						
Body	Dark						
	Distended abdomen						
	Anorexic						
	Scale Oedema						
Opercula	Shortened						
	Flared						
Haemorrhaging	Throat						
	Ventrum						
	Base of fins						
	Elsewhere						
Eyes	Exophthalmic						
	Enophthalmic (sunken)						
	Cataract						
	Haemorrhagic						
Gills	Pale						
	Zoned						
	Necrotic						
Lesions	Flank						
	Elsewhere						
Vent	Inflamed						
	Trailing faeces						
Lice Load	Estimate numbers						
Internal Signs							
Ascites	Clear						
	Bloody						
Oedema	In tissues						
Heart	Pale/anaemic						
	Granulomas						
	Deformed						
Liver	Petechial haem						
	Gross haem						
	Tissue breakdown						
	Enlarged						
	Colour number(s)						
	Granulomas						
Didanie	Lesions						
Pyloric caeca	Petechial haem						
	Tubules mauve						
Coloor	Lack of fat						
Spleen	Enlarged Granulomas						
Gut							
Gut	No food present Yellow pseudo-faeces						
	External haem						
	Internal haem						
Body wall							
Swim bladder	Haemorrhaging						
Swiiii biauder	Haemorrhaging						
Kidney.	Fluid filled Swollen						
Kidney	Grey						
	Granular Liquefied						
General	Parasites present						
General	Anaemia						
	Allacilla						

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Additional comments:		

Case No: 2019-0583 Date of visit: 09/10/2019 Site No: FS0270 Inspector: Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Writing Database Phone Insp Insp Insp 2<sup>nd</sup> Insp MG\_IHN 26/11/2019 0/1 21/10/2019 21/10/2019 MG\_IPN 0/1 26/11/2019 21/10/2019 21/10/2019 MG\_SAV 0/1 21/10/2019 21/10/2019 26/11/2019 MG\_VHS 26/11/2019 0/1 21/10/2019 21/10/2019 **GPAT** 26/11/2019 5/5 08/11/2019 08/11/2019 **BACT** 5/5 08/11/2019 08/11/2019 26/11/2019 **AERO** 5/5 26/11/2019 08/11/2019 08/11/2019 **FPSY** 4/5 26/11/2019 20/11/2019 20/11/2019 NSIG 5/5 08/11/2019 08/11/2019 26/11/2019 SAPR 2/5 26/11/2019 08/11/2019 08/11/2019 MG\_SAL\_POX 26/11/2019 1/5 20/11/2019 20/11/2019 Report Summary 2<sup>nd</sup> Insp Case Type Date Insp REP, DIA 26/11/2019





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

# SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0134
SITE NO FS0270
INSPECTOR

 DATE OF VISIT
 09/10/2019

 SITE NAME
 Loch Avich

 CASE NO
 20190583

# **Section 1: Summary**

The above site was inspected following a report from the company of a recent increase in mortality. During the inspection several lethargic fish were observed across the site and five fish were removed for further examination and subsequent diagnostic sampling.

Histopathology examination revealed mild bacterial branchitis. Samples were also screened by QPCR for salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV) and tested positive in one of the fish. However, histopathology results did not revealed lesions consistent with clinical salmon gill poxvirus.

Two Aeromonas spp. and a bacterium from the Enterobacteriaceae family were identified, the level and purity of growth would not suggest these bacteria are the primary source of morbidity. Flavobacterium psychrophilum was identified, the level of growth may indicate a risk to fish health.

A fungus-like organism matching the characteristics of *Saprolegnia* sp. by microscopic examination was also identified, the level of growth would not suggest it would be a implicated as a primary pathogen.

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

# **Section 2: Case Detail**

# Observations

The above site was inspected following a report from the company of a recent increase in mortality. The site was stocked with 212,249 2019 S0 Atlantic salmon at an average weight of 121 g.

R09

Mortality levels had increased at the site from 1% on week 37 to 5.77% on week 38 and continued to increase to 12.16% by the end of week 40.

Furunculosis and saprolegnia had been confirmed on site by the company prior to inspection. The site had also undergone a 10 day antibiotic (oxytertacycline) treatment 2 weeks earlier and was still carrying out formalin treatments to combat saprolegnia.

Several lethargic fish were observed across site with some also having patches of fungus-like infection around the dorsal fin.

Externally fish 3 and 4 had weak haemorrhaging on the ventral surface with fish 3 also showing weak haemorrhaging around the throat area. Internally all five fish showed weak haemorrhaging on the body wall.

# Samples

Samples were collected from 5 fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Pool number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1 - 5	P1	AF1	Salmo salar	19 S0 (121g)	Allt Mhor

# Results

**Bacteriology:** Kidney and spleen material from F1 - 5 were inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

The following bacteria were isolated from fish 1-5.

- Flavobacterium psychrophilum (Isolate D): (F1, 2, 3 & 4 (spleen)
- Aeromonas sp. (Isolate E): F1 5 (kidney)
- Aeromonas sp. (Isolate F): F1 − 5 (kidney)

A bacteria from the Enterobacteriacaea family was also identified on F1 - 5, however it did not match the characteristics of a known fish pathogen.

A fungus-like organism matching the characteristics of *Saprolegnia* sp. was also identified on F2 & 4 (kidney).

**Virology:** Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (QPCR).

Salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV)

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value		Reported Result (PCR)		
F1	-	-	-	-	Negative
F2	-	-	-	-	Negative
F3	-	-	-	-	Negative
F4	27.50	40	40	39.33	Positive
F5	-	-	-	-	Negative

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV) and viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV).

**Histology:** Tissue samples of gill, skin and skeletal muscle, heart, pyloric caeca, pancreas, hind gut, liver, spleen and kidney were taken from F1 - 5. The tissue samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin.

Histopathological examination revealed the following:

<u>Gill</u>: Mild multifocal presence of aggregates of rod-shaped bacteria that stained Gram negative. These bacteria are colonizing the lamellar surface and shows affinity to the chloride cells (F1-F5). Lamellae also displayed some hypertrophic and displacement chloride cells (F1-F5). Presence of cell debris among gill filaments with Gram negative bacteria associated.

Skin & Muscle: Within normal range.

Heart: Within normal range

Gut and pyloric caeca: Within normal range.

Pancreas: Within normal range.

<u>Liver</u>: Within normal range.

Kidney: Within normal range.

Spleen: Within normal range.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 26/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0590			Date of visit: 30/10/2019
Time spent on site:	h	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: SS0893 Business No: SB0539	Site Name: Business Name:	Keoldale Kyle of Durness Cowrie Associates Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 3	5	6
Water Temp (°C): N/A	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

No gaping shells observed. Small number of native oysters remaining on site. No plans to bring more natives on, in future planning to only grow pacific oysters.

No temperature measured as it was a low tide and the water was out.

FHI 059, Version 12			Iss	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0590		Site No:	SS089	3			
Date of Visit:		30/10/2019	9		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represen	tative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
		750 bags, 100 ortac			750 bags, 100 ortac			750 bags, 100 ortac
Total No facilities		baskets	Facilities st	tocked	basket	No facilities inspected		baskets
Species	OED	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI	Порсолос	
Age group	2015	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019		
No Fish	20,000	10,000	40,000	180,000	350,000	550,000		
Mean Fish Wt	10g	80g	80g	45g	20g	5g		
Next Fallow Date (Si		N/A		Next Input D	•	May 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease prob	lems?			N Any escapes	(since last v	/isit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement records	s available fo	or inspection?	,					Y
2. Date of last inspec							17/04/2018	
3. Are records comp	lete and corr	rectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement red	cords availab	ole for dead fi	sh and waste	?				N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	rectly entered	?					N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for intro	ductions (out	with GB) avai	ilable?				Y
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the b	ousiness (not u	sing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	of?			Other (detail)			
If other detail:		s used to fill p						
3. Mortality records of	•	d correctly en						Y
4. Recent mortality (	•			ies observed in	n the last month			
5. Evidence of recen		• •						N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no st	ock per facilit	ty/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in								Y
If yes, detail:	September	2019: approx	imately 1000	CGI smothere	ed by sand. Only	/ empty shel	s recovered	N/A
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		arted to EL	IIO If the load	MDT sage and	ter en merte	lite avente e	le a mile	N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	гропеа то гн	i ? it no, add i	MRI case and	enter on morta	lity events si	neet.	IN/A

If no. detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

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

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

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

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

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

Records checked between:

17/04/2018 - 30/11/2019

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0590 Site No: SS0893 Date of Visit 30/10/2019 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 25 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 0 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 5 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 5 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 2 1 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 Areas 0 3 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2019-0590	Date of visit: 30/10/2019  Inspector:						
Site No:	SS0893							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summary								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Inco	and Image					
Case Type		Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI	01/11/2019							





Cowrie Associates Ltd Chateau Balfreish Cawdor Nairn IV12 5XY

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0539 SITE NO SS0893 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT SITE NAME CASE NO 30/10/2019 Keoldale Kyle of 20190590

**Durness** 

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

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

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

### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 01/11/2019
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0591			Date of visit: 21/10/2019
Time spent on site:	.5 hours	Main Inspec	etor:
Site No: FS1134 Business No: FB0472	Site Name: Business Name:	Upper Avon Angling Associa Upper Avon Angling Associa	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 7.5	Thermometer No:	T275	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional inf	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Site is used as a restocking facility for the local angling club. Currently there are not many fish onsite. Club plan to use fish from local river as broodstock (after obtaining appropriate licences).

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0591		Site No:	FS1134				
Date of Visit:		21/10/2019	9		Inspector(s)			]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	]
Site Details		16	<b>7</b> 5:::::	ماده ما	1		. :	5
Total No facilities Species	TRT	5	Facilities sto	Скеа	'	No raciliue	s inspected	5
Age group	2018					+		
No Fish	200		<del>                                     </del>					
Mean Fish Wt	80g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Next year		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						,	,	
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							13/12/2016	
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availab	e for dead fis	sh and waste?	•				N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	?					N/A
<ol><li>Are health certific</li></ol>	ates for introd	luctions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records	;							
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (	last 4 wks):		No recent m	ortality				
<ol><li>Evidence of recer</li></ol>		* 1						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:	in mortality du	ing period c	ricereu:					
7. Have increased (	unexplained) i	mortalities be	en reported to	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 mort	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
4.5		NI NI
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?  If yes, detail:		N
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection	n?	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly enter		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<u> </u>	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		N/A
Biosecurity Records		
<ol> <li>Biosecurity records available for inspection</li> </ol>		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortali	•	
3. Has the manner and period in which the	•	ry professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site	e been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the evis detected been included and how and whe	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture anim health status, certification if required)?	nals being stocked on the farm site been co	vered (equal or higher Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity mea transmission of disease been covered (mov	•	
7. Is documentation available regarding the aquaculture animals held on site?	measures in place to maintain the physical	containment of Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been ad If no, detail:	equately implemented on site?	Y
Results of Surveillance		

13/12/2016 - 21/10/2019

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0591		Site No:	FS1134		Insp:	
Date of Visit	21/10/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			(	) 1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS		5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone o		9	18	26	
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers		5 5		14	-
Movements off	Frequency of n			) 3	6	10	3
Wovernerits on	Number of des			3		10	3
Exposure via water		Site contac	ts (	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	(				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion		1 2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion		3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion		1 4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent wate		1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	(				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)		ī			$\overline{}$
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2			ш
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4	1			
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	3			
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10	)			
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.					0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	;	3			-
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed		_ 5]			0
	Feeding unpas	<u> </u>		5			-
Biosecurity		Number of site	es '	1 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	(	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	(	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes						0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1			ш
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		(				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		;	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes						0
	No			2			ш
					Total Rank		8 LOW
					I\allK		LOW

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)  Electric fence Bird Nets	Case No:	2019-0591	Site No:	FS1134	
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 emament the prozotate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and an these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?  4. Is there a slighed 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)  5. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)  5. 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)  5. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wib 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from wib 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)  5. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wib 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from wib 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  5. Level of the salmonis of the salmonis inspected or 10 or 5 or 3		• •			
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath see lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and meanacult hezioate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and an these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?  1. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent).  3. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)  5. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in 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 wib 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from wib 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  7. Are sea lice for middle to the Fish Health inspectorate? If no, Fill 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 fevels 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 lic	•				
azamethiphos and emametin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and ant hase 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?  7 (yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, Firl see comment.  8. 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 containment Inspection  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienc					
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 5. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from who 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? 7 yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 11. Has any other 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.  17. Proceedings of the site of the site of the site since the last FHI inspection? 18. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? 19. A Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 19. A Have these been reported to local DSFB for	azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed 4. Is there a signed doo	amectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biolog I in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agreement or statement r	ical and/or med	chanical control measur	es, and
S. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)  7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that ecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (Fes. have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)  10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)  11. Has any other 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 cenarios during the escalation of a sea lice linestation?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  18. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  19. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. What action was taken to prevent and minimise th	•				
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the sea discondered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) (from w/b 10/6/19) during the excended the suggested criteria for treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) (from welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) (from welfare implications? (from w/b 10/6/19) during the excendence of the administered or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? (from w/b 10/6/19) (from welfare implications are held without treatment for sea lice? (from welfare and suggested criteria for treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? (from welfare and without treatment for sea lice sea lice sea lice with the sea harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice? (from welfare and welfare populations are held without treatment for sea lice sea lice sea lice instances and sea lice lines are sea lice sea lice se					
secords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no. FHI see comment.  If yes, law these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no. FHI see comment.  If yes, law these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no. FHI see comment.  If yes, law these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no. FHI see comment.  If yes, law the see been reported to the see administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatments or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)  In Have therapeutic treatments or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)  In Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?  In Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?  In Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?  In Has a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?  In It is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?  In It 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?  In Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  In Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  If other, detail below:  In Has the site experienced on site? (Detail below)  In Has the site experienced on site? (Detail below)  In Has the site experienced on the site in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  I	6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard specified in the SSI an	d the CoGP? (I	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  fyes, 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.  17. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  18. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  19. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  19. The sproceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10  19. Has these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be conside			atment in the C	CoGP during the period t	that
10. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)  11. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)  11. Has any other 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 lices a lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  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.  17. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  18. It has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  19. A remeasures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  19. The proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10  19. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  29. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  29. 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)	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6	6/19) or
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)  11. Has any other 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.  17. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  18. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  19. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  19. The site since the last FHI inspection?  19. A Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Alave these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Alave these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  29. 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)	If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI se	ee comment.		
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)  Y Electric fence Bird Nets  16 other, detail below: 2. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to Iocal 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)	9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered to cause significar	nt welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50)
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)  Y  Electric fence Bird Nets  16 other, detail below:  3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  17 of Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10  18					
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)  Y  Electric fence Bird Nets  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 Scottlish 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)	11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable)?			
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.  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. Containment Inspection  18. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  19. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  20. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  21. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  22. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  23. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  24. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  25. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  26. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  27. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail  28. 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)  28. 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)	12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions taken had a significant impact	upon the lice le	evels recorded?	
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?   N     2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)   Y     2. Electric fence   Bird Nets       3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?   N     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)	13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried out in cooperation between part	ticipating farms	?	
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)  Y  Electric fence Bird Nets  15 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)	14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part	populations are	e held without treatment	t for
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)  Y  Electric fence Bird Nets  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)			describing set	actions to deal with reco	ognised
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)  Electric fence Bird Nets  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)	16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no	please detail	reasons.	
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)  Electric fence Bird Nets  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)					
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)  Electric fence Bird Nets  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)	Containment Inspecti	ion			
Electric fence Bird Nets  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  3. 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)	•		nt or previous p	roduction cycles?	N
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)	2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the predation experienced on site	e? (Detail belov	w)	Υ
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)	Electric fence	Bird Nets			
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)	If other, detail below:				
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)					N
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)	•		the site since th	ne last FHI inspection?	IN
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)		· · ·			
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)	4. nave tilese beeli let	ported to Scottish Ministers?			
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)	5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoG	SP - 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)	
B. 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)	6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (	where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)
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)	7. Were methods (if an	ny) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail			
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)	8. If all nets were dent	oved was this action agreed with local wild fish interest	s and was pern	mission given by Scottist	h
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)			z unu mus pom		
	9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	? (Not covered	in code but could	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	be considered under	r satisfactory measures of the Act)			
	10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, ple	ease detail reas	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0591			Date of visit:	21/10/2019						
Site No:	FS1134	l	Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification								
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp			
D10											
Report Summary Case Type											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp								
ECI, CNI	24/10/2019										





Upper Avon Angling Association 2 George Allan Place Strathaven

ML10 6EH

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0472 SITE NO FS1134 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 21/10/2019
SITE NAME Upper Avon Angling Association
CASE NO 20190591

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

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

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

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

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 24/10/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0592			Date of visit: 16/10/2019
Time spent on site:	5 hours	Main Inspec	etor:
Site No: FS0090 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Broodstock Unit Landcatch Natural Selection	Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.8	Thermometer No:	T275	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: B	CoGP MA M-44
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional inf	formation/clinical score sheet. formation/clinical score sheet. formation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

## **Additional Case Information:**

No issues on-site, VMD fish appeared healthy when sampled.

Some paperwork conducted over phone, as case sheet was part lost due to technical error.

Date of Visit: 16/10/2019 Inspector(s):  Registration/Authorisation Details  1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?  2. Changes made to details?  Site Details  Total No facilities Species Species Species SAL	FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Registration/Authorisation Details  1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?  2. Changes made to details?  Site Details  Total No facilities  Species  SAL  Age group  18 S1  No Fish  4,267  8,772  Mean Fish Wt  Next Fallow Date (Site)  No plans  Next Input Date (Site)  Nany escapes (since last visit)?  No Wovement Records  1. Movement records available for inspection?  2. Date of last inspection:  3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  NAN  Y  NAN  Y  NO facilities inspected  21  No facilities inspected  31  No facilities insp	Case No:	2019-0592	]	Site No:	FS0090				
1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? 2. Changes made to details?  Site Details  Total No facilities Species SAL	Date of Visit:		16/10/2019	]		Inspector(s):			]
Total No facilities  Species  SAL  Age group  No Fish  No Fish  Mean Fish Wt  Next Fallow Date (Site)  No plans  No plans  No Any escapes (since last visit)?  Movement Records  1. Movement records available for inspection?  2. Date of last inspection:  3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  5. Are records complete and correctly entered?  No facilities inspected  1. No facilities	1. Business/site deta	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Species SAL SAL SAL Age group 18 S1 19 S1	Site Details								
Age group No Fish No Fish A,267 R,772 Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site) No plans Next Input Date (Site) April 2020  Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? No plans	Total No facilities		21	Facilities sto	cked	11	No facilitie	s inspected	21
No Fish Mean Fish Wt  Mean Fish Wt  No plans  Next Input Date (Site)  No plans  Next Input Date (Site)  April 2020  Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?  No plans  N	Species	SAL	SAL						
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site) No plans Next Input Date (Site) No plans Next Input Date (Site) April 2020  Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? No Any escapes (since last visit)? No plans No Plans No Any escapes (since last visit)? No plans No pla	Age group	18 S1	19 S1						
Next Fallow Date (Site)  Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?  Nany escapes (since last visit)?	No Fish	4,267	8,772						
Next Fallow Date (Site)  No plans  Next Input Date (Site)  April 2020  No plans  No pl	Mean Fish Wt	6.44	1.256						
If yes, detail:  Movement Records  1. Movement records available for inspection?  2. Date of last inspection:  3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  5. Are records complete and correctly entered?		ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	April 2020		
1. Movement records available for inspection?  2. Date of last inspection:  3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  5. Are records complete and correctly entered?  N/A	Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
1. Movement records available for inspection?  2. Date of last inspection:  3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  5. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Movement Records								
2. Date of last inspection:  3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  5. Are records complete and correctly entered?			r inspection?						Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered?  N/A			r mopeodorr.					29/11/2017	
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?  N/A  N/A  N/A	•		ectly entered?	•					Y
,	•		•		•				N/A
0 A 1 10	5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	•					N/A
6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?	6. Are health certific	ates for introd	ductions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records	Transport Records								
Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?  Y	•		t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	isiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?	_				•	_			Y
	Mortality Records	·		·					
Mortality records available for inspection?  Y	-	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities disposed of?  Incinerated - on site	•		•			Incinerated -	on site		
	If other detail:						0., 0.,0		
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?	3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Wb 16/09 0.01% 23/09 0.01% 30/09 0.05% 7/09 0.01% 14/09 0.01%	4. Recent mortality (	last 4 wks):		Wb 16/09 0.	01% 23/09 0.0	1% 30/09 0.0	5% 7/09 0.0	1% 14/09 0.0	1%
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?	5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:	If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?	<ol><li>Any other peaks in If yes, detail:</li></ol>	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?	•	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
(	If yes, detail action:	enpisiniosi) i							
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.	•	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

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?	Y
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?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between:

29/11/2017 - 16/10/2019

FHI 059, V	ersion 12							ISS	uea by: r	-11			
Case n	o:	2019-05	592	Site No:		FS0090			Date of v		16/	10/2019	16/ <i>*</i>
Priority	samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		y. HI			
Time sa starts/e		11:0	0:00	11:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. <b> </b>	3
Environ	mental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summa	ry samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Add Fish/	Pools - click												
Pool/Fis	sh No												
Fish no	s	1											
Pool Gr	oup												
Species		SAL											
	e weight	1.2 Kg											
Sex		N/A											
Water	Гуре	SW											
		an											
S		Loch Geirrean FS0195											
Details		Loch Ge FS0195							I				
Δ Δ		301											
Stock C	Origin Na												
ਲੋਂ Facility	NO	F2											

10/2019	0/2019 Additional Sample Information:													
0	1	Total To	ests ass	ianed	0	1								
			200											

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0592		Site No:	FS0090		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/10/2019		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 species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	-
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0		6	10	10
iviovements on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contact	s 0		6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	s 0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent statu		4				
		n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			$\Box$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				ш
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	ınpasteurised feed	0	1			一
·	Feeding unpas	·	5	1			ш
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		T 0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			Н
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes			1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		1 0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		18 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0592		Si	ite No:	FS0090		
Sea Lice Inspection (		s in the previous 4 years	s?				N
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		a single ve	ear class basis?		N
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of lic	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medica	ations (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	ıres, and	Y
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or		ement agreement or sta	atement relevan	t to the si	te and CoGP Farm		Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the C	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ria for treatment	in the Co	oGP during the period	l that	Υ
	•	<i>monis</i> ) numbers per fish od that records are insp		l of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or	N
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see com	ment.			N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfa	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)	N
•		istered or other actions belongatus is considered					N/A
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where	applicable)?					N/A
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon t	he lice le	vels recorded?		N/A
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation betw	veen participatir	ng farms?	•		Υ
		where fewer population		_		nt for	Υ
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waith with infestation?	aypoints describ	oing set a	ctions to deal with red	cognised	Υ
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	e detail re	easons.		Υ
Containment Inspecti	on						
•		ge due to predators in the	he current or pre	evious pro	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (Det	tail below	)		Υ
Fence	Nets around tanks						
If other, detail below:							
·							
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been ex	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site	since the	e last FHI inspection?		N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No ski	p to question 10					
4. Have these been rep	oorted to Scottish Mini	sters?					
5. Have these been rep	oorted to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP - 4.	.4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il				
8. If aill nets were denly	oved was this action a	greed with local wild fish	interests and v	vas permi	ission given by Scotti	sh	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		g. Journal Took Wild Hot		. ac poiiii		I	
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not o	covered in	n code but could		
be considered under							
	•	egards to containment?	If no, please de	etail reaso	on(s)		Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0592	Site No: FS0090	
Date of Visit: 16/10/201	9 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	d within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	pletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	n Management Agreements and Statements	
<ul><li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for</li><li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant</li><li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa</li></ul>	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statemen of review?	Y Y Y
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minin farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccinum 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the special 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxindividual farm?	num health standards for the stocks to be introdu nation requirements for stocks held in the area or cies of fish which may be stocked into the area or timum stocking density of any pen on any farm in ngements for the storage and disposal of any dea	r farm? r farm? Y r farm? Y the area or the
Arrangements for The Management	t of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice number	s and treatments?
of statement?  15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual to the circumstance of the FMAg/S identify the circumstance of the farms in the area or individual to the circumstance of the farms in the area or individual to	umstances under which biological controls and cl	eatments for sea  Y  eaner fish are to be
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	umstances when live fish may be introduced or re	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of Issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	ole harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	ividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be resto	s by which the area or individual farm will be fallo	ow and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept?	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreer parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	d operated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? Mar-19	

Site No: FS0090

Case No: 2019-0592

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2019-0592			Date of visit:	16/10/2019			
Site No:	FS0090	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
			<u> </u>					
	1							
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	18/11/2019							
	+							
	+							





Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd Ormsary Fish Farm Lochgilphead Argyll **PA31 8PE** 

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

**BUSINESS No** FB0061 SITE NO FS0090

INSPECTOR

**DATE OF VISIT** 16/10/2019

Ormsary Broodstock Unit SITE NAME

CASE NO 20190592

## 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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 18/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0593			Date of visit: 17/10/2019
Time spent on site:	Hours	Main I	nspector:
Site No: FS1332 Business No: FB0575	Site Name: Business Name:	Saheliya Aquaponics Saheliya	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 28.3	Thermometer No:	T275	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Site uses catfish as part of an aquaponics system and there are plans to sell fish for food at the end of the cycle.

The site has recently taken in consignments of catfish from the Netherlands and plan to grow the larger of these fish and use them for broodstock.

A small number of mortalities on site. When fish arrived they were kept in brightly lit rooms, this caused the fish to become aggressive and several died due to suspected secondary infections caused by lesions. Fish are now kept in darkened containers and there are no issues now.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0593		Site No:	FS1332				
Date of Visit:		17/10/2019	<b>9</b>		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site detaction 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		5	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	es inspected	5
Species	CLZ	CLZ						
Age group	1 year	4 months						
No Fish	6	20						
Mean Fish Wt	1.2 Kg	7 g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	No plans		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	alocado propi				Tary cocuped	7 (511100 1451	violey.	
Movement Record	s							
1. Movement record	ls available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							First inspect	tion
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				N/A
5. Are records comp	olete and corre	ectly entered	?					N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the hu	isiness (not ils	ing a STR\?			Y
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			Y
					•			
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records	available for i	nenection?						
2. How are mortalitie		•			Domestic wa	ete - <25ka		
If other detail:	es disposed o				Domestic wa	231C - 123Ng		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (	•		4 fish					
5. Evidence of recer	•	typical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
ii yoo, idomiy iioo	mortunity por	- Commy///ic on	on per reeming					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	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	ality events	sheet.	N/A

aquaculture animals held on site?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

Results of Surveillance

If no. detail:

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

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0593		Site No:	FS1332		Insp:	
Date of Visit	17/10/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Special Control	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5
Mayamanta off							
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	<b>⊢</b>
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts	_				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,	•	or in a coastal zone with category III					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		-
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	namio apotroan	Tot walling a data execution					
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		_
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	·	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			-
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2	]			
					Total		11
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0593		Site No	: FS1332	
Sea Lice Inspection (	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the pr	revious 4 vears?			
·	lanagement Area (or equivalent	•	ronously on a single	e vear class basis?	
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	access to a range of licenced in- amectin benzoate) as well as a in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management ag	feed and bath se	a lice medications ( biological and/or m	(including deltamethrin, echanical control measu	res, and
	ecords available for inspection?	(Legal SSI, CoGI	P Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required standard			(Legal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the set (CoGP Annex 6)	uggested criteria	for treatment in the	CoGP during the period	that
_	female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) no 0/6/19) during the period that re	•		or above (prior to w/b 10/	(6/19) or
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish Health Ins	spectorate? If no,	FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is consid	dered to cause sig	gnificant welfare pro	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)
	reatments been administered or reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable	e)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions taken h	nad a significant in	mpact upon the lice	levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried out in co	operation between	en participating farm	is?	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where fe				
	ific written lice management pro scalation of a sea lice infestation		points describing se	et actions to deal with red	cognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect se	ea lice count data	? If no please deta	il reasons.	
Containment Inspecti  1. Has the site experier	on nced equipment damage due to	predators in the	current or previous	production cycles?	N
•	ce to mitigate against the preda	tion experienced	on site? (Detail bel	ow)	Υ
Site inside					
If other, detail below:					
Have escape incide	nts or events been experienced	l on or in the vicin	ity of the site since	the last FHI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ques		<b>,</b>		
	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been rep	oorted to local DSFB forthwith (	where they exist)?	? (CoGP - 4.4.37,	5.4.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fis	sheries trusts forth	nwith (where they e	xist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? It	f yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed with FP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	h local wild fish in	terests and was pe	rmission given by Scotti	sh
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the	risk of further eso	capes? (Not covere	d in code but could	
be considered under	r satisfactory measures of the	e Act)			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If	no, please detail re	ason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0593			Date of visit:	17/10/2019			
				'				
Site No:	FS1332			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
							<b>-</b>	
							-	
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI, CNI	24/10/2019		2 11155					





Saheliya St Rollox House 130 Springburn Road Glasgow G21 1YL

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0575 SITE NO FS1332 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 17/10/2019
SITE NAME Saheliya Aquaponics
CASE No 20190593

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

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

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

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

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 24/10/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0594			Date of visit: 15/10/2019
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: SS0759 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Fearna Loch Striven Mussel Farms Lt	d
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

## **Additional Case Information:**

Export inspection. 16 x 1,200 kg bags of MED for export to Ireland inspected. No issues found and no hitchhiker species observed

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0594		Site No:	SS0759				
Date of Visit:		15/10/2019	Ð		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	]
Site Details						<b>-</b>		
Total No facilities Species	MED	10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	0
Age group	MIX							
No Fish	8 Lines							
Mean Fish Wt	10g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Natural sp	atfall	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	S							
1. Movement record	ls available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							10/10/2019	
<ol><li>Are records comp</li></ol>		•						Y
4. Are movement re								N/A
5. Are records comp		•		hla?				N/A N/A
6. Are health certific		luctions (out	vitii Gb) avalia	able?				IN/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any moveme If yes, is there a sys				•	_			
	tem in place i	or maintenan	ice of transpor	riation records	<b>f</b>			
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities					Other (detail	)		·
	Dead shells		d			,		
3. Mortality records								N/A
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		No observed	l mortality				
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:	Thortality du	ing period ci	iconcu:					1
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	l? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?  If yes, detail:  If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:  6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records  1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?  2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal,  3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will no increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been inclinated.	tify Scottish Ministers or veterinary profession	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being shealth status, certification if required)?	be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures imple transmission of disease been covered (movement of s 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures aquaculture animals held on site?  8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately in If no, detail:	taff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc. in place to maintain the physical containment	)?
Results of Surveillance		

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

10/10/2019 - 15/10/2019

Case No:	2019-0594			Date of visit:	15/10/2019			
Site No:	SS0759	1	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Poport Summan								
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	lnen	ond .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
MOV	24/10/2019							
			<b>—</b>					





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0530
 Date of Visit
 15/10/2019

 Site No
 SS0759
 Site Name
 Fearna

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190594

#### Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of 19,200 kg of *Mytilus.edulis* for placing on the market in the Republic of Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 24/10/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0595			Date of visit: 16/10/2019
Time spent on site:	Hours	Main In	spector:
Site No: SS0759 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Fearna Loch Striven Mussel Far	rms Ltd
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additiona	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Export inspection. 16 x 1,200 kg bags of MED for export to Ireland inspected. No issues found and no hitchhiker species observed

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0595		Site No:	SS0759	<u>}</u>			
Date of Visit:		16/10/2019			Inspector(s)	):		]
Registration/Autho  1. Business/site deta  2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	0
Species	MED							
Age group	MIX							
No Fish	10 lines							
Mean Fish Wt	10g							
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Natural sp	patfall	
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	nocace prom	011.0			7 317 32334	0 (0.11.00 1.11.11	vicity.	
Movement Records	5							
Movement records		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							10/10/2019	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement red		•						N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					N/A
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed o	f?			Other (detai	il)		
If other detail:	Dead shells	fall to sea be	d					
3. Mortality records of								N/A
4. Recent mortality (	last 4 wks):		No observed	l mortality				
5. Evidence of recen	it increased/a	typical mortal	lities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no				/reason:				
O Amir ather meets in	talita ( al.	······································						N
<ol><li>6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:</li></ol>	n mortality du	ring perioa cr	пескеа?					N
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 FHI	? If no, add N	IRT case and e	enter on mort	tality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?  If yes, detail:  If other, detail:  2. Medicines records available for ins 3. Are records complete and correctly 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)?  If other, detail:	•	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately	?	
<ul><li>3. Has the manner and period in which increased (unexplained) mortality at</li><li>4. Has the action that will be taken in is detected been included and how a</li></ul>	mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinathe site been included?  the event that the presence or suspicion of the presend when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? The animals being stocked on the farm site been contained.	esence of a listed disease ?
transmission of disease been covered 7. Is documentation available regardinaquaculture animals held on site?	ty measures implemented between each epidemic d (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or d ing the measures in place to maintain the physical een adequately implemented on site?	lead fish etc.)?
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance	e been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business	s? N/A

10/10/2019 - 16/10/2019

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Case No:	2019-0595	Date of visit: 16/10/2019							
Site No:	SS0759		Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
	<u> </u>								
Poport Cummon				1					
Report Summary Case Type	Dete	lman	ond .						
Case Type	Date 24/40/2040	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
MOV	24/10/2019								





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0530
 Date of Visit
 16/10/2019

 Site No
 SS0759
 Site Name
 Fearna

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190595

## Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of 19,200 kg of *Mytilus.edulis* for placing on the market in the Republic of Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 24/10/2019
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0598			Date of visit: 15/10/2019
Time spent on site:	hour	Main Ins	pector:
Site No: FS1065 Business No: FB0439	Site Name: Business Name:	FAI Shetland FAI Aquaculture Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA None
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	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 detail reas	son below:	

Site is currently fallow last fish to leave the site was July 2019. APB is looking to sell the site to another company - not necessarily for cleanerfish possibly for salmonids.

Site being made inactive - until another business buys site or site is deregistered.

Site had issues with their water pumping system, pipes not specified correctly for the required flow. Issues with site not being ready for fish. Lack of customers to sell lumpfish to.

Inspection and paperwork carried out by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0	598	Site No:	FS1065				
Date of Visit:	15/10/2019	]		Inspector(s)	):		]
Registration/Authorisation 1. Business/site details summ 2. Changes made to details?	mary checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details							
Total No facilities	60	Facilities sto	cked	0	No facilities	s inspected	60
Species Fallow							
Age group							
No Fish							
Mean Fish Wt							
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Fallow		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	No plans to	o stock	
D 1/1 14 1 \ F	0		NI/A	1.	/ ·	: :::0	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease	problems?		N/A	Any escape	s (since last )	/ISIt)?	N
If yes, detail:							
Movement Records							
1. Movement records availab	ole for inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspection:						31/05/2018	
3. Are records complete and	correctly entered?	•					Y
4. Are movement records av	ailable for dead fis	h and waste?	•				Y
5. Are records complete and	correctly entered?	•					Y
6. Are health certificates for	introductions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records							
1. Are any movements carrie	ed out by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a system in pl	ace for maintenan	ce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records							
1. Mortality records available	for inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities dispos				Incinerated	- Shetland W	aste to Ener	av
If other detail:							37
3. Mortality records complete	and correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wh	•	June 2019 (3	3049 - 5.9%)				
5. Evidence of recent increase							N
If yes, facility nos/no mortalit	* *		/reason:				
, ,	71	1 2					
6. Any other peaks in mortal	ty during period ch	ecked?					Y
If yes, detail: Post in	out mortality June 2	2018 - aggres	sion. (20,000)				
7. Have increased (unexplain	ned) mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:							
8 Have 'mortality events' be	en reported to FHI	? If no ladd M	IRT case and e	enter on mort	ality events s	heet	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments	(last 4 wks)?			
If yes, detail:				
If other, detail:				
	s available for inspection?			
	lete and correctly entered?			
4. Are fish in a withdo	•			
5. If yes, what treatm	ient(s)?			
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?			
<b>Biosecurity Record</b>	ls			
_	s available for inspection?			
•	nd frequency of mortality removal	l, recording and safe disposa	al been considered?	
	and period in which the APB will no	_		
	ned) mortality at the site been incl	•		
			•	
4. Has the action tha	at will be taken in the event that the	e presence or suspicion of the	ne presence of a listed disease	
	luded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will		•	
5. Has the health sta	itus of aquaculture animals being	stocked on the farm site bee	en covered (equal or higher	
health status, certific	ation if required)?			
6 Have the bushend	dry and biosecurity measures impl	lomented between each onic	lomiological unit to minimica	
o. Have the husband	iry and piosecurity measures impi	iemented between each epid	terniological unit to minimise	

If no, detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Records checked between:

31/5/18-15/10/19

Case No:	2019-0598	Date of visit: 15/10/2019								
Site No:	FS1065	1	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp		
	-									
Report Summary				1						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp							
REG	18/10/2019									
		_								





FAI Aquaculture Ltd Ardtoe Marine Research Facility Ardtoe, Acharacle Argyll PH36 4LD

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0439
 Date of Visit
 15/10/2019

 Site No
 FS1065
 Site Name
 FAI Shetland

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190598

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

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow.

#### Records

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:

Date: 18/10/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12	l:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0599			Date of visit: 14/10/2019
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspe	ctor:
Site No: SS0770 Business No: SB0356	Site Name: Business Name:	Marine Hatchery NAFC Marine Centre	
Case Types: 1 REG 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	If yes, see additional inf	formation/clinical score sheet. formation/clinical score sheet. formation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Site is currently fallow and no plan to stock the site currently. Issues with funding to stock site. No major projects planned in the future.

BMP was checked although not part of the inspection.

Inspection and paperwork carried out by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 20	019-0599	Site No:	SS0770	<u> </u>			
Date of Visit:	14/10/	2019		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Authoris 1. Business/site details 2. Changes made to de	summary checked	l by site representa	ative?			Y N	-
Site Details							
Total No facilities	11	Facilities sto	cked	0	No facilitie	es inspected	11
	allow						
Age group No Fish							
Mean Fish Wt							
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Current	ly fallow	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	no plan to	stock in futur	re.
		,		7			
Recent (last 4 wks) dise	ease problems?		N/A	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:							
Movement Records							
1. Movement records a	•	ion?					Y
2. Date of last inspection						23/08/2018	
<ol><li>Are records complete</li></ol>	•						N
4. Are movement recor							Y
5. Are records complete	•						Y
6. Are health certificate	s for introductions	(outwith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records							
1. Are any movements	carried out by (or c	n behalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a system	n in place for maint	enance of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records							
1. Mortality records ava		n?					Y
2. How are mortalities of	disposed of?			Incinerated -	Shetland V	Vaste to Ener	gy
If other detail:							
3. Mortality records con							Y
4. Recent mortality (las		n/a					
<ol><li>Evidence of recent in</li></ol>	• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no mo	ortality per facility/n	o stock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in m	nortality during peri	od checked?					l N
If yes, detail:	lortainty during pend	Ju checkeu:					
7. Have increased (une	explained) mortalitie	es been reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:							
8. Have 'mortality event	ts' been reported to	FHI? If no, add N	IRT case and e	enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	У
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	У
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	У
is detected been included and <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	У
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	У
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	У
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	У
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 23/08/2018-14/10/2019	

Case No:	2019-0599			Date of visit:	14/10/2019					
Site No:	SS0770									
		Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification								
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp		
Report Summary				1						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp							
REG	18/10/2019		2 11135							
	I									





NAFC Marine Centre Port Arthur Scalloway Shetland ZE1 0UN

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0356 Date of Visit 14/10/2019
SITE No SS0770 SITE Name Marine Hatchery
INSPECTOR CASE No 20190599

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

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow.

#### Records

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

-The SS number was not always recorded in the source/destination section of the movement book. This was discussed with the site manager at the time of inspection and it was agreed that this would be recorded moving forwards.

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

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



Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 18/10/2019

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0601			Da	ate of visit: 15/10/2019
Time spent on site:	hour	M	ain Inspector:	
Site No: FS1095 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Cliff Site Cooke Aquaculture	e Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 UNI	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:	T148	] FH	II 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see add	ditional informati	ion/clinical score sheet. ion/clinical score sheet. ion/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	il reason below:		

Batch from Cairndow fish arrived on site (6/08/2019) with BGD and fungus issues. The decision was made after enduring significant mortality in wb: 16/09/19, to cull the remaining stock received from Cairndow. Mortality in wb: 16/09/2019 was reported to the FHI, however because it was within 6 weeks of the fish being stocked, this was not required.

Unannounced inspection was conducted, this was carried out in response to an anonymous complaint made to the FHI that morts were being dumped on the shore of the loch in which Cliff site is located. When the site manager was asked about this claim, he remarked that there had been no occasion or occurrence where morts could have ended up on the shore. Upon inspection of site, no dead fish were observed around the site, or the shores of the loch the site is located in.

Only one pen of fish remain on site. Fish could not easily be observed due to the dark peaty water. Ones that were observed appeared healthy and in good condition.

Paperwork and inspection carried out by and and

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0601		Site No:	FS1095				
Date of Visit:		15/10/2019	]		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site det	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	]
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	1
Site Details								
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilitie	s inspected	8
Species	SAL							
Age group	2020 S1's							
No Fish	46,103							
Mean Fish Wt	40.4g							
Next Fallow Date (S	site)	Mid Novemb	er 2018	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	August 202	20	
		_			1.			
Recent (last 4 wks)				Y	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	Bacterial gill	disease, fung	jus					
<b>Movement Record</b>	s							
1. Movement record	ls available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							03/10/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	•					Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y
5. Are records comp	olete and corre	ectly entered?	•					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records	<b>3</b>							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed o	f?			Incinerated -	Shetland W	aste to Ener	ду
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente						Y
4.5	/I (		•	%-16 fish)40(0	0.04%-18 fish)	39(0.05%-2	1 fish)38(3.99	9% -14270
4. Recent mortality	•	4 !	fish)					V
5. Evidence of recei				<b></b>				Y
If yes, facility nos/no	•	•						
One batch of fish fro				a.				
6. Any other peaks if yes, detail:	See above -		ieckeu?					1
7. Have increased (			en reported to	vet or FHI2				V
If yes, detail action:	unexplained)	Cull	erricported to	VCC OF TTHE				'
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re		? If no. add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A
			,			,		

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

3/10/2017 - 15/10/19

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0601		Site No:	FS1095		Insp:	
Date of Visit	15/10/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Special Control	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off			0			10	
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water	irtainiber or des	Site contacts		_			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				oxdot
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	or in a coastal zone with category III					$\vdash$
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		-
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8		
	iaims apstream	TOT WILLIEF T LIGHT EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			-
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	1			$\overline{}$
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī			$\overline{}$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				-
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	·	5				-
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				Н
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				┝─┤
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		12
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0601		Si	te No:	FS1095		
Sea Lice Inspection ( 1. Has the site experie	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years	s?				
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	Nanagement Area (or equi	ivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a	single y	ear class basis?		
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licent amectin benzoate) as we I in a reasonable period of cumented farm managem	ll as access to suitab f time?	ole biological and	d/or mec	hanical control mea	asures, and	
Management Area (or		ioni agreement or sa			ne una coor i um	'	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspec	ction? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required sta	andard specified in th	e SSI and the C	oGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Ar	nnex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criter	ria for treatment	in the Co	oGP during the per	iod that	
_	female sea lice ( <i>L. salmo</i> , 0/6/19) during the period			l of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b	10/6/19) or	
	n reported to the Fish Hea	•					
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause	significant welfa	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.8	1, 5.3.50)	
	reatments been administe reatment or where <i>C. elor</i>						
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	olicable)?					
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the actions to	aken had a significar	nt impact upon th	ne lice le	vels recorded?		
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried ou	ut in cooperation betw	veen participatin	ng farms?	?		
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, wh						
	cific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infe		aypoints describ	oing set a	actions to deal with	recognised	
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks re	flect sea lice count d	ata? If no please	e detail r	easons.		
Containment Inspect	ion						
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage	due to predators in t	he current or pre	evious pr	oduction cycles?		N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experience	ed on site? (Deta	ail below	<b>'</b> )		Υ
Bird nets							
If other, detail below	:						
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been experi	ienced on or in the vi	icinity of the site	since the	e last FHI inspectio	nn?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to		control of the site	Silice til	c last i ili ilispectio	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
	ported to Scottish Minister	•				1	
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forth	with (where they exis	st)? (CoGP - 4.	4.37, 5.4	l.17)		
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and lo	ocal fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where t	they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37	', 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give deta	il				
0.16-31			. !			-10-1	
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Co	oyed was this action agre SP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	ed with local wild fish	n interests and w	vas perm	ission given by Sc	ottish	
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimis	se the risk of further	escapes? (Not c	covered i	n code but could		
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures	s of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with rega	ards to containment?	If no, please de	etail reas	on(s)		Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0601			Date of visit:	15/10/2019			
Cita Na						•		
Site No:	FS1095			Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
							<b>-</b>	
							-	
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI CNI UNI	22/10/2019		2 11135					





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

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0095 DATE OF VISIT 15/10/2019
SITE NO FS1095 SITE NAME Cliff Site
UNSPECTOR CASE NO 20190601

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

The above site was inspected, without prior notification, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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

#### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 22/10/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of is	ssue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0602			Date of visit: 1	6/10/2019
Time spent on site:	hours	Maii	n Inspector:	
Site No: FS1275 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Flaeshins Cooke Aquaculture S	Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 11.5	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 complet	ted
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	S CoGP MA	S-3
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see addit	ional information/clinical sco ional information/clinical sco ional information/clinical sco	re sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Fish on site showing pathology of CMS, Grumbling mortality due to size of fish with CMS complication.

Site is currently being harvested out.

Mortality event in week 18 2019 (1.06%) - was not reported to FHI - event was due to post treatment mortality following a thermolicer treatment.

Flaeshins is not fallowed synchronously with the rest of the sites in the area as it located across the Loch away from the other sites, and is situated by itself.

All fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Inspection and paperwork carried out by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019	-0602	Site No:	FS1275	5			
Date of Visit:	16/10/201	9		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Authorisation  1. Business/site details sur  2. Changes made to detail	mmary checked by	site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details							
Total No facilities	16	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilities	s inspected	16
Species SAL							
Age group 18 S <sup>2</sup>	l's						
No Fish 242,2	.38						
Mean Fish Wt 7.6kg							
Next Fallow Date (Site)	end of nove	meber	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Feb 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) diseas	e problems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last)	/isit\?	N
If yes, detail: CMS	•			Arry Cocapco	(Sirice last)	visit):	IV.
Movement Records							
Movement records avai	lable for inspection?	,					Y
2. Date of last inspection:	able for inopection.					29/08/2017	
3. Are records complete a	nd correctly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement records	•		•				Y
5. Are records complete a	nd correctly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certificates for	or introductions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records							
Are any movements car	ried out by (or on bo	ehalf) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a system in		•		_			
Mortality Records							
Mortality records available	ole for inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities disp	•			Incinerated -	Shetland W	aste to Energ	
If other detail:	osca or:			momerated -	Officialia VV	dote to Energ	37
Mortality records complete	ete and correctly en	tered?					Y
	•	41(1529 fish	- 0.58%)40(16	639 fish-0.59%	5)39(1428 fis	sh-0.52%)38(	1905 fish-
4. Recent mortality (last 4	•	0.65%)					
5. Evidence of recent incre	• •		,				Y
If yes, facility nos/no morta			/reason:				
whole site seeing elevated							· V
6. Any other peaks in mort If yes, detail:	k 18 2019 (5414 - 1.		atment mertali	hy Thermelia	or.		<u> </u>
7. Have increased (unexpl				ty - Thermone	21		Y
If yes, detail action:		et contacted	J VCL OI I I II :				<u>'</u>
8. Have 'mortality events' h			IRT case and	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N

Y
Y
Y
Y
V
У
У
ıse У
У
У
У
У
Y
Y
Y
any biologist.
and profession

	11 055, VEISION 12							133	ueu by. i				
	Case no:	2019-06	602	Site No:		FS1275			Date of v Sampling		16/	10/2019	16/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		ı. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	18
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	_	5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	F	PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	7.6kg	7.6kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
		(6)	(68										
		33	)33										
		FS.	FS										
ails		— —	) —										
Details	1	ac	ac										
X	Stook Origin	Furnace (FS0339)	Furnace (FS0339)										
tock	Stock Origin Facility No	1	4										
S	I acility NO		4										

10/2019	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0	1	Total To	ests ass	ianed	0	1					
			200								

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0602		Site No:	FS1275		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/10/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	. 0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n		T 0	3	6	10	10
IVIOVEITIETIIS OII	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contact	:s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		Ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	s O	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
	_	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes			1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		1 0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		21 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0602	Site No: FS1275	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)			
<ol> <li>Has the site experien</li> </ol>	iced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	N
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 doc Management Area (or e		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	У
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	У
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	n
_	•	<i>monis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?	n
•	•	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is <i>C. elongatu</i> s infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N
		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)	Υ
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Y
		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Y
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	Υ
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspection	on		
1. Has the site experien	ced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ
Bird nets, Sinker tubes, Centre weights, MML			
If other, detail below:			
<ol><li>Have escape incider</li></ol>	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 skip	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-	wod was this satisfact	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: 2019-0602	Site No: FS1275	
Date of Visit: 16/10/2019	9 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
<ul><li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i</li><li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva</li><li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa</li></ul>	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statement of review?	Y Y Y
	num health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the area of ties of fish which may be stocked into the area of imum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arranger	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	uirements for the sensitivity testing of available to arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and c farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	imstances when live fish may be introduced or r	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date	of issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting			
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the are	ea or individual farms?	Υ
Fallowing			
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	•	ill be fallow and the earliest	Υ
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stock	ked onto sites covered by the	Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement?	The state of the s	to be kept on any site	Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ement Agreements Only		
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons	s to become, or cease to be,	Y
Management and operation			
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agree	ement or statement?	Y
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? Sep-18		

Case No: 2019-0602 Site No: FS1275 Date of visit: 16/10/2019

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
29/04/19	05/05/2019	≥750g	not known		18 S1's	Weekly	1.06	Explained	Treatment

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	5414		Picked up during inspection (2019-0602) - No further action required.

Case No:	2019-0602			Date of visit:	16/10/2019				
Site No:	FS1275	ı		Inspector:		l			
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
D 10									
Report Summary Case Type									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
ECI CNI SLI VMD	22/10/2019								





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

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0095Date of Visit16/10/2019Site NoFS1275Site NameFlaeshinsInspectorCase No20190602

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

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

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

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

·

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 22/10/2019

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of is	ssue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2019-0603			Date of visit: 1	7/10/2019					
Time spent on site: 5	hours	Mai	n Inspector:						
Site No: FS0292 Business No: FB0440	Site Name: Business Name:	Bight of Foraness Grieg Seafood Shetl	and Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 11.2	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 complet	ed					
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	CoGP MA	S-4					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  N									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Site is currently treating for sea lice. Using an optilicer and a fresh water well boat. Some trouble has been encountered with the fresh water well boat. Strong tides make the site dangerous to work on when the large boat is tied up to the cages.

Sea lice levels went over the reporting threshold wb: 9/10/2019 - 2.28 average adult females and wb:16/10/2019 - 2.90 average adult females

Treatments are helping keep sea lice numbers down.

In wb: 23/09/2019 a salmosan treatment in pen 10 caused the site mortality to rise above the reporting threshold. (7183 - 1.36%)

All fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy and in good condition

Inspection and paperwork carried out by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0603		Site No:	FS0292				
Date of Visit:		17/10/2019			Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		te representa	itive?			Y Y	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL							
Age group	19 s1's							
No Fish	518,448							
Mean Fish Wt	2.5kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Spring 2020		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Mid 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) (	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		пореспол.					26/07/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?					20/01/2017	Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?						Y
6. Are health certification		•		ıble?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemer		t by (or on bel	nalf) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst			•	•	_			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Incinerated -	Shetland W	aste to Energ	av V
If other detail:	<u> </u>				•		,	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	red?					Y
4. Recent mortality (	last 4 wks)·		41(2347 Fish 0.14%)	1-0.45%)40(14	21 fish-027%)	39(7183 fisl	h-1.36%)38(7	35 fish-
5. Evidence of recen	•	tvnical mortali	•					Y
If yes, facility nos/no		••		reason:				
Pen 10 - Post treatm		•			information			
6. Any other peaks in								N
If yes, detail:		0,						
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities bee	en reported to	vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:		Company vet	ts was notified	d				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI?	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N

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:  T.M.S.	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records  1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
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?  If no, detail:	1
Results of Surveillance	
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?	ĭ
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).  Sea lice numbers increasing. Treatme	ent planned.
Peccific sheeked between: 26/07/2017-17/10/2019	

	11 055, VEISIOII 12							153	ded by. I				
	Case no:	2019-06	803	Site No:		FS0292			Date of v		17/	10/2019	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		<sub>g.</sub> HI		1	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	11:0	0:00	12:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	6
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	2.5kg	2.5kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Railsbrough (FS0501)	ഗ Railsbrough (FS0501)										
S	I acility NO	1	9										

	Additional Sample Information:													
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0603		Site No:	FS0292		Insp:	
Date of Visit	17/10/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Specific	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	0
Movements off			0			10	10
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Transcr or doo	Site contacts	5 0		6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
		from Category III farm	8				ш
	Processing fish	from Category ∀ farm	10				ш
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				$\overline{}$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				-
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Ιο	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	]			0
	No		2	j			
					Total Rank		23 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0603	Site No: FS0292	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •		
1. Has the site experien	iced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ
	mectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, d of time?	and Y
<ol> <li>Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e</li> </ol>		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
6. Do records adequate	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	N
_	•	<i>monis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19 od that records are inspected?	) or Y
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N
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	0) 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, 5.3.5)	1) Y
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ
•	•	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Y
		out in cooperation between participating farms?	· V
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recogninfestation?	sed Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspection	on		
1. Has the site experien	ced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ
Top nets, ADD, MML			
If other, detail below:			
ii otilei, detaii below.			
3. Have escape incider	nts or events been ex	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	·		
4. Have these been rep		•	
		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 will make	wood woo thisti	grand with local wild find interests and was named in a size by Continu	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
9. What action was take	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under	satisfactory measu	res of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

Case No: 2019-0603 Site No: FS0292  Date of Visit: 17/10/2019 Inspector:	
Date of Visit: 17/10/2019 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance	
1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require completion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements	
<ul> <li>2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?</li> <li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?</li> <li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?</li> <li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?</li> <li>6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?</li> <li>7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?</li> </ul>	Y Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Management	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area farm?	or Y
<ul><li>9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?</li><li>10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?</li><li>11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?</li></ul>	Y Y Y
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?	Y
Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatment	s? Y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreen of statement?	nent Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sealice 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 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?	Y
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?	

FHI 059, Version 12	issued by: FHI	Date of Issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or in	ndividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be ficked?	allow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked on	to sites covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement?	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be ?	kept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to be	come, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement	or statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? Feb-19	

Case No: 2019-0603 Site No: FS0292 Date of visit: 17/10/2019

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
23/09/19	29/09/2019	≥750g	2.5kg	SAL	2019 S1's	Weekly	1.36	Unexplained	Treatment

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	7183	Salmosan treatment - fish started to turn towards the end of the treatment. Treatment finished early. No more salmosan treatments were used in this cycle of treatments. Freshwater well boat and optilicer being used to treat fish instead.	

Case No:	2019-0603	Date of visit: 17/10/2019						
Site No:	FS0292	l	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
	1							
Report Summary				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI CNI SLI VMD	23/10/2019	шэр	Z IIISP					
EGI GITI GEI VIIIB	20/10/2010							
	1							





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 OPX

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0440 DATE OF VISIT 17/10/2019
SITE NO FS0292 SITE NAME Bight of Foraness
INSPECTOR CASE NO 20190603

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

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.

On this occasion the site was found to have had average adult female *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* ('sea lice') per fish counts of 2 or above. These counts had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as part of the required measures to demonstrate that satisfactory measures are in place for the control of sea lice. Where the average adult female sea lice per fish count reaches 2 or above this must be reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate within seven days of the date of the count. Please ensure that future counts that exceed the reporting level are reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate.

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

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 23/10/2019

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/20	)18	
Case No: 2019-0612			Date of visit: 29/10/2019		
Time spent on site:	ır	Mair	n Inspector:		
Site No: SS0876 Business No: SB0533	Site Name: Business Name:	Ardveenish Traigh Mhor Oysters		3	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 10.2	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed N	J	
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:			

#### **Additional Case Information:**

No mortality records maintained. However, if the site observed a higher than expected mortality (see below), this would be reported and investigated. See below for reporting thresholds:

3-7mm >35%

7-14mm >15%

5g-25g >2-5%

25g-market size >2-5%

SS numbers missing from movement book. Discussed with site manager who agreed to include going forward. No further action required.

Inspection and paperwork completed by under supervision.

FHI 059, Version 12	Issu	ed by: FHI		I	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No: 2019-0612	Site No:	SS0876					
Date of Visit:	29/10/2019		Inspector(s):				
Registration/Authorisation Deta 1. Business/site details summary of 2. Changes made to details?		ative?			Y Y		
Site Details				_			
Total No facilities	1 longline Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilities	inspected	1	
Species CGI							
Age group 2019  No Fish 222.000							
, 5.40m							
WCarr i isir vvt	No plan.	Next Input Da	te (Site)	April 2020			
Next I allow Date (Oile)	No plan.	Next Input Da	ie (Oile)	April 2020			
Recent (last 4 wks) disease proble	ems?	N	Any escapes	(since last vi	sit)?	N	
If yes, detail:							
Movement Records							
1. Movement records available for	inspection?					Y	
Date of last inspection:					23/05/2017		
3. Are records complete and corre	•					Y	
4. Are movement records available						N/A	
<ul><li>5. Are records complete and corre</li><li>6. Are health certificates for introd</li></ul>	•	abla2				N/A N/A	
	uctions (outwith GD) availa	able:				I W/A	
Transport Records	1/1		OTD)O				
<ol> <li>Are any movements carried out If yes, is there a system in place for</li> </ol>		•	_				
	n maintenance of transpor	riation records:					
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records available for in	spection?					V	
2. How are mortalities disposed of			Other (detail)			<u> </u>	
	are taken up to owners ho	ouse, crushed a	, ,		local roads.		
3. Mortality records complete and		,		po		N/A	
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	No mortality	observed.					
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?							
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per	facility/no stock per facility/	/reason:					
6. Any other peaks in mortality dur If yes, detail:	ing period checked?					N	
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?  N/A  If yes, detail action:							
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.							

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

23/05/17 - 29/10/19

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0612 Site No: SS0876 Date of Visit 29/10/2019 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 10 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 2 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 0 3 6 Areas 0 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 0 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2019-0612	Date of visit: 29/10/2019						
Site No:	SS0876	l	Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
	-							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI	05/11/2019		2 11150					





Traigh Mhor Oysters 27a Eoligarry Isle of Barra HS9 5YD

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0533
 Date of Visit
 29/10/2019

 Site No
 Site Name
 Ardveenish

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190612

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 05/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No: 2019-0613			Date of visit: 29/10/2019		
Time spent on site:	ır	Main	Inspector:		
Site No: SS0899 Business No: SB0533	Site Name: Business Name:	Ba'Charais Traigh Mhor Oysters			
Case Types: 1 REG 2	2 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed N		
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry					
	Site inaccessable at	time of inspection. Site also	fallow.		

## **Additional Case Information:**

Site fallow. No plans to use currently, but site owner wishes to keep site active.

Inspection and paperwork completed by under supervision.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0613	]	Site No:	SS0899	,			
Date of Visit:		29/10/2019	9		Inspector(s)	):		]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	- -
Site Details								
Total No facilities		4 ratts	Facilities sto	cked	0	No facilitie	es inspected	0
Species	N/A							
Age group	N/A							
No Fish	N/A							
Mean Fish Wt	N/A							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Site fallow.		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	No plan.		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N/A	Any escape	e (since last	visit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:	uiscase presi	ems:			Ally Coupe	3 (Sillee last	VISIC):	NA
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement record	ls available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							23/05/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					N/A
4. Are movement re		•		,				N/A
5. Are records comp	olete and corr	ectly entered	?					N/A
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	,							
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	of?						
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality (	(last 4 wks):							
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical morta	lities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N/A
If yes, detail:	Thoram, an	illig period s.	iconcu.					
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add N	IRT case and e	enter on mor	tality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
4. Decembly set 4 vides 2		
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?  If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection	on?	
3. Are records complete and correctly enter	red?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		_
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection		
• •	lity removal, recording and safe disposal bee	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinar	y professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the sit	te been included?	
	vent that the presence or suspicion of the present that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture anir health status, certification if required)?	mals being stocked on the farm site been cov	vered (equal or higher
•	asures implemented between each epidemio	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	vement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or de	
/. Is documentation available regarding the aquaculture animals held on site?	e measures in place to maintain the physical	containment of
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been a	dequately implemented on site?	
lf no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		

23/05/17 - 29/10/19

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Date of issue: 08/10/2018 FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2019-0613 Site No: SS0899 Date of Visit 29/10/2019 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen Yes No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal 10 excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 n Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 0 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 0 3 6 Areas 0 3 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent treatment) practices None treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 0 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2019-0613			Date of visit:	29/10/2019			
Cubb No.	2010 0010			Date of Visit.	20/10/2010			
Site No:	SS0899	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
,	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
			<u> </u>					
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
REG	05/11/2019							
			<u> </u>					
			<b></b>					
			<b>—</b>					





Traigh Mhor Oysters 27a Eoligarry Isle of Barra HS9 5YD

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0533
 Date of Visit
 29/10/2019

 Site No
 SS0899
 Site Name
 Ba'Charais

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190613

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

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

On this occasion, the site was reported to be fallow.

#### 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.

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

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



Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 07/111/2019