

Case No: 2021-0133 Date of visit: 26/05/2021

Time spent on site: 3hrs Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: FS0629 Site Name: Poll Na Gille
Business No: FB0119 Business Name: Mowi Scotland Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 SLI 4 VMD 5 [] 6 []

Water Temp (°C): 9.3 Thermometer No: T152 FHI 045 completed []

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

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

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

Additional Case Information:

Fish came onto site from Glenfinnan at the beginning of May 2020.

Wild caught wrasse on site were caught around Mull, Loch Melfort and some were imported from Ireland (not since last inspection). Wrasse were stocked at 4% however, site staff are not observing many in the cages.

Wellboat was on site during inspection conducting FW treatments. Fish in all cages appeared in good health with minimal physical damage observed across the site. No moribunds were observed.

Some lumpfish observed across the site but not many. Those that were observed appeared to be in good health and no physical damage was noted. Site due to receive a lumpfish input next month from Anglesey.

Wrasse mortality for the site was 13% since input (May 2020). Lumpfish mortality was 30% since input (May 2020)

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Paperwork inspected remoteley 19/05/2021. Site inspection completed on 26/05/2021.

Case No: Site No:

Date of Visit: Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="12"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="12"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="12"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>	<input type="text" value="WRA"/>	<input type="text" value="LUM"/>		
Age group	<input type="text" value="2020 Q2"/>	<input type="text" value="Wildcaught"/>	<input type="text" value="2020"/>		
No Fish	<input type="text" value="609, 411"/>	<input type="text" value="38,800"/>	<input type="text" value="40,812"/>		
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="4.2kg"/>	<input type="text" value="Mixed"/>	<input type="text" value="90g"/>		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Sep 21"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="April 22"/>	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
If yes, detail:	<input type="text" value=""/>				

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

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?

If 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?

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

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 during period checked?

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Report date 27th April 2021.	
Records checked between:	24/11/2020 - 20/05/2021

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

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Average weight	4.2kg	4.2kg	4.2kg									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Glenfinnan	Glenfinnan	Glenfinnan								
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	3	4	5									

Case Number:	2021-0133	Site No:	FS0629	Insp:		
Date of Visit	26/05/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
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 processing	0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					31	HIGH

Case No: **2021-0133**

Site No: **FS0629**

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and
- 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 If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised
- 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)

Tensioned, top 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)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2021-0133

Site No: FS0629

Date of Visit: 26/05/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

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

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

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

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

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

Live Fish Movements

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

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

Harvesting

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

Fallowing

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

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

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

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

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

Management and operation

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

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



Site No: FS0629
Case No: 2021-0133
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0119	DATE OF VISIT	26/05/2021
SITE No	FS0629	SITE NAME	Poll Na Gille
CASE No	20210133	INSPECTOR	██████████

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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 mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

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

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:

Date: 02/06/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No: 2021-0136 Date of visit: 25/05/2021

Time spent on site: 3hrs Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: FS0805 Site Name: Bagh Dail Nan Cean
Business No: FB0119 Business Name: Mowi Scotland Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 SLI 4 VMD 5 [] 6 []

Water Temp (°C): 9.3 Thermometer No: T152 FHI 045 completed []

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

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

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

Additional Case Information:

Fish were transferred onto site from Loch Lochy and Glenfinnan in April 2020. Stocking density has been significantly reduced this cycle.

Thermolicer treatment was completed last Wednesday (12th) and average sea lice numbers have dropped to below 0.15 for all stages.

Ensiled waste is collected by Billy Bowie and taken to Energen, Cumbernauld.

Site manager reported good health and has observed a high feed conversion rate within the stock on site.

Site has done both live and dead haul harvests this cycle.

Fish were sitting deep in the water and only 3 lethargic fish were observed across the site. On the fish that were observed, some physical damage was noted but fish were active and demonstrated a strong escape response.

Lumpfish mortality across the site for April was 4.4%. Lumpfish observed on site appeared to be in good health.

Very few wrasse observed across the site. Mortality for the month of April was 1.2%.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Paperwork inspected remotely on 19/05/2021. Site inspection completed on 25/05/2021.

Case No: **2021-0136** Site No: **FS0805**
 Date of Visit: **25/05/2021** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	12	Facilities stocked	12	No facilities inspected	12
Species	SAL LUM	WRA			
Age group	2020 Q2	2020	Wildcaught		
No Fish	394,350	135,176	35,657		
Mean Fish Wt	4.7kg	200g	Mixed		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Oct 2021		Next Input Date (Site)	May 2022	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	[REDACTED]				

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
 2. Date of last inspection: **10/12/2020**
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
 If other detail: **Ensiled at Kames pier.**
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **Wk19: 2,127 (0.53%); Wk18: 1,176 (0.3%); Wk17: 270 (0.05%); Wk16: 337**
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
[REDACTED]
 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**
 If yes, detail: **Wk50 (2020) - 11,424 (1.13%); Wk48 - 10,518 (1.02%); Wk44 - 18,291 (1.73%)**
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
 If yes, detail action:
[REDACTED]
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. **Y**

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Report Date: 23rd April 2021	

Records checked between:	10/12/2020 - 19/05/2021
--------------------------	-------------------------

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

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2										
	Pool Group												
Stock Details	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	4.7kg	4.7kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
	Stock Origin	Glenfinnan	Glenfinnan										
	Facility No	3	4										

Case Number:	2021-0136	Site No:	FS0805	Insp:			
Date of Visit	25/05/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score		
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0	
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10	
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3	
Exposure via water		Site contacts			0	1-5	6-10
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0					
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2		4	2	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3		6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4		8		
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 processing	0					
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1	
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2					
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4					
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8					
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0					
	Common processes with other farms	3				3	
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0	
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5					
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1		2	2	
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1		2	0	
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0					
	No	1				1	
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0	
	No	3					
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0	
	No	2					
Total Rank					22	MEDIUM	

Case No:

Site No:

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and
- 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 If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised
- 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)

Sealpro nets, tensioned, top 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)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2021-0136

Site No: FS0805

Date of Visit: 25/05/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

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

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

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

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

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

Live Fish Movements

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

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

Harvesting

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

Fallowing

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

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

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

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

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

Management and operation

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

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



Site No: FS0805
Case No: 2021-0136
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0119	DATE OF VISIT	25/05/2021
SITE No	FS0805	SITE NAME	Bagh Dail Nan Cean
CASE No	20210136	INSPECTOR	██████████

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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 been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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 further information or have any queries regarding this report.



Signed:

Date: 28/05/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No: 2021-0137 Date of visit: 25/05/2021

Time spent on site: 2hrs Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: FS0859 Site Name: Port Na Cro
Business No: FB0119 Business Name: Mowi Scotland Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 SLI 4 VMD 5 [] 6 []

Water Temp (°C): 9 Thermometer No: T152 FHI 045 completed []

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

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

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

Additional Case Information:

Stock originally from Glenfinnan but moved onto site from Poll Na Gille the week before inspection.

Fish were sitting deep in the water. No moribunds were observed on the site.

Few lumpfish were seen, but those that were observed appeared to be in good condition. No lumpfish mortality has been observed on the site since input the week prior.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Paperwork inspected remotely 21/05/2021. Site visit completed 25/05/2021.

Case No: **2021-0137** Site No: **FS0859**

Date of Visit: **25/05/2021** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	4	Facilities stocked	3	No facilities inspected	4
Species	SAL	LUM			
Age group	2020 Q2	2020			
No Fish	80,501	1,200			
Mean Fish Wt	4kg	90g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Sep 2021		Next Input Date (Site)	April 2022	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	[REDACTED]				

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: **24/11/2020**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? Y
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? N/A

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? Y
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
- If other detail: **Ensiled at Kames pier.**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **Wk19: 553 (0.08%); Wk18: 1,181 (0.17%); Wk17: 269 (0.07%); Wk16: 563**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: [REDACTED]
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? Y
- If yes, detail: **Wk1 2021: 4,995 (1.98%), 4,213 of which were attributed to post-treatment losses (FW).**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? N/A
- If yes, detail action: [REDACTED]
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. Y

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Report date: 17/02/2021

Records checked between: 24/11/2020 - 19/05/2021

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

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pool - click

Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Average weight	4kg	4kg	4kg									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Glenfinnan	Glenfinnan	Glenfinnan								
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	1	2	3									

Case Number:	2021-0137	Site No:	FS0859	Insp:		
Date of Visit	25/05/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts				
		0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
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 processing	0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				
	No	1				1
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					24	
Rank					MEDIUM	

Case No:

Site No:

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and
- 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 If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

Containment Inspection

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

Top nets, tensioned 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)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2021-0137

Site No: FS0859

Date of Visit: 25/05/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

- 2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?
- 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?
- 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?
- 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?
- 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?
- 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

- 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?
- 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?
- 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?
- 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?
- 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

- 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?
- 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?
- 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?
- 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?
- 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

Live Fish Movements

- 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?
- 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

Harvesting

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

Fallowing

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

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

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

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

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

Management and operation

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

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



Site No: FS0859
Case No: 2021-0137
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0119	DATE OF VISIT	25/05/2021
SITE No	FS0859	SITE NAME	Port Na Cro
CASE No	20210137	INSPECTOR	██████████

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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 been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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 further information or have any queries regarding this report.



Signed:

Date: 28/05/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No: 2021-0138 Date of visit: 26/05/2021

Time spent on site: 1hr Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: SS0709 Site Name: Gigas
Business No: SB0452 Business Name: Rubha Nan Ron Seafoods

Case Types: 1 REG 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 fish present? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
- Clinical signs of disease observed? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
- Gross pathology observed? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
- Diagnostic samples taken?

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

Additional Case Information:

Remaining stock were removed from the site in sealed skips and disposed of in landfill in 2020.

All trestles and bags have been removed from the foreshore and the site can now be deregistered.

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	SB0452	DATE OF VISIT	26/05/2021
SITE No	SS0709	SITE NAME	Gigas
CASE No	20210138	INSPECTOR	██████████

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 to determine that the site is no longer in use and it is to be de-registered.

All aquaculture equipment including trestles and bags have been removed from the site.

Records

Aquaculture animal movement records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

It was reported that the site had been fallow since April 2020. The site is no longer in existence and therefore will be de-registered on the Marine Scotland database.

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



Signed:

Date: 28/05/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No: 2021-0139 Date of visit: 27/05/2021

Time spent on site: 3hrs Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: FS1290 Site Name: Shuna SW (Rubh'an Trilleachain)
Business No: FB0134 Business Name: Kames Fish Farming Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 SLI 4 VMD 5 6

Water Temp (°C): 9 Thermometer No: T152 FHI 045 completed

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

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

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

Additional Case Information:

AGD was the biggest health challenge last cycle so gill swabs are being taken and analysed by PCR every 2 weeks.

Lumpfish arrived on site in October from Otter Ferry and were stocked at 6%. 4 lumpfish mortalities observed across the site, not fresh dead so no diagnostic samples taken. Lumpfish mortality for April was 7.2% attributed to handling.

Fish on site came from Inchmore and Loch Lochy and have been vaccinated against furunculosis and IPN.

Site doing live and deadhaul harvests. Harvest boat was on site during inspection.

Majority of fish were sitting deep in the water so were difficult to observe. A few fish were observed with physical damage but were not moribund or lethargic.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Paperwork inspected remotely 20/05/2021. Site inspection completed on 27/05/2021

Case No: Site No:

Date of Visit: Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="12"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="11"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="12"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>	<input type="text" value="LUM"/>			
Age group	<input type="text" value="2020 Q2"/>	<input type="text" value="2020"/>			
No Fish	<input type="text" value="548,993"/>	<input type="text" value="~88,000"/>			
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="3.9kg"/>	<input type="text" value="90g"/>			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Oct 21"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Mar 22"/>	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>
If yes, detail:	<input type="text" value=""/>				

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

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?

If 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?

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

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 during period checked?

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Records checked between:	<input type="text"/>
	23/07/2019 - 20/05/2021

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

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2										
	Pool Group												
Stock Details	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	3.9kg	3.9kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
	Stock Origin	Loch Lochy	Loch Lochy										
	Facility No	7	10										

Case Number:	2021-0139	Site No:	FS1290	Insp:		
Date of Visit	27/05/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts				
		0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
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 processing	0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				
	No	1				1
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					24	
Rank					MEDIUM	

Case No: **2021-0139**

Site No: **FS1290**

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and
- 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 If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

Containment Inspection

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

Top nets, tensioned 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)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2021-0139

Site No: FS1290

Date of Visit: 27/05/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

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

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

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

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

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

Live Fish Movements

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

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

Harvesting

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

Fallowing

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

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

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

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

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

Management and operation

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

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



Site No: FS1290

Case No: 2021-0139

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0134	DATE OF VISIT	27/05/2021
SITE No	FS1290	SITE NAME	Shuna SW (Rubh'an Trilleachain)
CASE No	20210139	INSPECTOR	██████████

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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 been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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 further information or have any queries regarding this report.



Signed:

Date: 28/05/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2021-0143"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="24/05/2021"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text" value="2 hrs"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text" value=""/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS1327"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Barcaldine Pre-smolt Unit"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0125"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Scottish Sea Farms Ltd"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNI"/>	3 <input type="text" value=""/>	4 <input type="text" value=""/>	5 <input type="text" value=""/>	6 <input type="text" value=""/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="14"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="Site"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value=""/>	
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="N"/>					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						
<input type="text" value=""/>						

Additional Case Information:

Paperwork completed remotely on 20/05/2021 by [REDACTED], shadowed by [REDACTED], physical site inspection on 24/05/2021 by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Site currently at 14C, normally kept between 13-14C

Currently on Batch 9 in the pre-smolt unit: this is split into batch 9-1 and 9-2

Stock on site appeared in good condition during physical inspection with no moribund/lethargic fish noted. Fish responding well when fed.

Water temperature taken from site thermometers for biosecurity reasons.

Case No: Site No:

Date of Visit: Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="18"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="16"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="16"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="2020"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="2,585,761"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="30g"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Mid July 2021"/>	Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="August 2021"/>		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	<input type="text" value="N"/>		Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
If yes, detail:	<input type="text" value=""/>				

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

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?

If 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?

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

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 during period checked?

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Records checked between:

16/09/2019 - 20/05/2021

Case Number:	2021-0143	Site No:	FS1327	Insp:		
Date of Visit	24/05/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	3
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
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 processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					12	LOW

Case No: **2021-0143**

Site No: **FS1327**

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) followed synchronously on a single year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and
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 If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised
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)

Pest Control

If other, detail below:

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0125	DATE OF VISIT	24/05/2021
SITE No	FS1327	SITE NAME	Barcaldine Pre-smolt Unit
CASE No	20210143	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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.

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.

R04

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:

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the Fish Health Inspector.

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 31/05/2021

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

Case No:	2021-0144	Date of visit:	25/05/2021			
Time spent on site:	2 hrs	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	SS0452	Site Name:	Islay			
Business No:	SB0289	Business Name:	G. & J. Archibald			
Case Types:	1 <input type="checkbox"/> ECI	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
Water Temp (°C):	13.5	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/> N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Records and physical inspection carried out by [REDACTED], shadowed by [REDACTED].

Mortalities between feb - march 2021 recorded during grading. The larger oysters had a mortality of 15-30%, mid size ranged from 5-10% and smaller ones were 20-30%. This is an expected range with the bulk of the mortalities coming from predation by green crabs.

Empty shells removed during grading are cleaned and crushed before being used to cover outdoor drains around the house.

Sea water brought in from loch by container and put through UV filtration system prior to use in depuration tanks. Waste water is then fed through to sludge silo which is then used as manure for terrestrial farm.

Empty shells noted in baskets but no tissue visible. Oysters appeared in good condition with medium seaweed fouling on the baskets and trestles.

Case No: 2021-0144

Site No: SS0452

Date of Visit: 25/05/2021

Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	221	Facilities stocked	216	No facilities inspected	216
Species	CGI	CGI	OED		
Age group	2019	2018	2017	2017	
No Fish	1,000,000	300,000	200,000	100	
Mean Fish Wt	30-65g	50-110g	100-200g	unsure	
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Never fallow		Next Input Date (Site)	July 2021	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	N			Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: 11/09/2018
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? Y
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Y

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? Y
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? Other (detail)
- If other detail: Empty shells crushed and used around farm/garden
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): see additional comments
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? N
- If yes, detail:
- 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, enter details on mortality events sheet. N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records1. Recent treatments (see comment)? 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? Y2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? Y3. 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? Y4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and *how* and *when* that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? Y5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? Y6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? YIf no, detail: **Results of Surveillance**1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

11/09/2018 - 25/05/2021

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	SB0289	DATE OF VISIT	25/05/2021
SITE No	SS0452	SITE NAME	Islay
CASE No	20210144	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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: [REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 31/05/2021

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