FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017							
Case No: 2018-0003			Date of visit: 17/01/2018							
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Main Ins	spector: ALW							
Site No: FS1239	Site Name:	Grampian								
Business No: FB0544	Business Name:	Scotland								
Case Types: 1 IMP	2 3	4 5	6							
Water Temp (°C): N/A	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed							
Observations:	Region: GR	Water type: B	CoGP MA:							
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	N If yes, see additiona	Il information/clinical score sheet.							
Clinical signs of disease observ	red?		l information/clinical score sheet.							
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additiona	Il information/clinical score sheet.							
Diagnostic samples taken?		N								
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Inspection of facilities at Moray Koi and discussion on import procedure.

Company sells varieties of koi. Currently holding ~1,700 fish from sources in England, Poland and Japan. Polish stock from Yoshikigoi and transported fish themselves (~34 hour journey). Fish certified as originating from a source free of KHV and SVC. Japanese stock are imported on behalf of Moray Koi by Gatwick Koi who hold the fish in isolation for a few weeks before transfer to Moray Koi. Fish are sourced from different dealers in Japan.

Site currently has 5 facilities, but planning to add another couple. New stock are held in separate tank for at least a month to allow them to acclimatise and for health checks to be carried out. Owner carries out routine health checks and bath or topical treatments are carried out if required. Each facility is independent with own water supply, filtration and UV. Effluent discharged via sewage system. Use Virkon Aquatic as a disinfectant for equipment and tanks between batches.

Moray Koi provide customers with a guidance leaflet summarising care of fish and water quality requirements and will assist customers to set up their ponds and filtration systems.

Paperwork by ALW, accompanied by WJM.

Case No:	2018-0003			Date of visit:	17/01/2018					
Site No:	FS1239	1		Inspector:	ALW]				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
Nesults Summary	1 164.	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	ļ									
	<u> </u>									
	 									
	-									
	 									
	Ì									
Report Summary	_									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
IMP	22/01/2018	ALW	KAS							
	-			1						
	 									
	 									





Moray Koi 62 East Church Street Buckie Moray AB56 1ER

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0544Date of Visit17/01/2018Site NoFS1239Site NameGrampianInspectorAndrea Warwick & Warren MurrayCase No20180003

A visit was conducted to discuss the procedures for importing aquatic animals from the EU and third countries. The holding facilities were inspected and no issues were raised.

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

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 22/01/2018

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	sued by: FHI		Date of	issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0004				Date of visit:	15/01/2018
Time spent on site:	? hours	\supset	Main Inspecto	r: [OCB
Site No: FS0822	Site Name:	Hoghill Fish Farn			
Business No: FB0551	Business Name:	Hoghill Trout Far	m Ltd		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4	5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 4	Thermometer No:	Site		FHI 045 compl	eted
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see a	dditional inforr	mation/clinical so	core sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?	N If yes, see a	dditional inforr	nation/clinical so	core sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see a	dditional inforr	mation/clinical so	core sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail r	eason below:			

Fish were in good condition and no issues were reported. VMD fish looked healthy inside.

FHI 059, Version 11			Is	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0004		Site No:	FS08	22			
Date of Visit:		15/01/20)18		Inspector(s)	: DCB]
Registration/Authoral Business/site details 2. Changes made to	ails summary		y site represe	ntative?			Y N	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		8	Facilities s	stocked	7	No faciliti	ies inspected	8
	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR				
Age group	1	2	3	5				
No Fish	15,000	10,000	4,000	800				
Mean Fish Wt	100g	400G	1.5 Kg	8 Kg				
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	no plans		Next Input	Date (Site)	Feb 17		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?			N Any escape	s (since las	t visit)?	N
·								
Movement Records								V
 Movement records Date of last inspect 		or inspection	ነ?				16/11/2016	T
 Date of last inspect Are records comp 		rectly enter	ad?				10/11/2010	Y
4. Are movement red		•		te?				Y
5. Are records comp				.0.				Y
6. Are health certification				ailable?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst		• '		,	~ /			Y
Mortality Records	en in place	ioi mainton	arioc or trains	portation recen	us:			
Wortainty Necords								
1. Mortality records a	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed o	of?			Incinerated	- on site		
If other detail:			10					
3. Mortality records of	•	d correctly e						Y
4. Recent mortality (I	•	turninal man		nd per week				N
5. Evidence of recently 15 feet 15 fee		· ·		lity/reason:				IV
11 900, 140	morta, p	TGG	oteon po					
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring period	checked?					N
If yes, detail:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	a a set a litica a	L vers remented	' ta seek aw FUIIC				NI/A
7. Have increased (ull figure 1) If yes, detail action:	inexplained)	mortalities	been reported	to vet or FHI?	<u></u>			N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	eported to F	HI? If no, add	MRT case an	d enter on mort	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N/A
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	IN/A
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
	V
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	V
If no, detail:	•
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	11
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between:

16/11/2016 - 15/01/2018

٠.	ii 055, version i i							100	ueu by.				
	Case no:	2018-00	004	Site No:		FS0822			Date of Samplin		15/	01/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	g. HI		1	
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:	DCB		VMD No	о.	1
	Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2	Cloudy	3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	200g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	N Dunsop bridge trout farm											
U,	T domey 140	_											

	Additional Sample Information:											
0	1	Total Te	ests ass	signed	0	l						

Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/201
Live fish movements Live fish movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species Frequency of movements on from equivalent XD S 10 14 Species Spec	Case Number:	2018-0004		Site No:	FS0822		Insp:	DCB
Movements on (from out within 15) of succeptible opecies opecies of succeptible opecies opecie	Date of Visit	15/01/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Feguency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 9 18 26 26 26 26 27 26 27 27	Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Image: content Compartment including third country 0 3 18 26	Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
Number of suppliers				0	0	10	26	
Trequency of movements off Frequency of movements off Number of destinations 0								_
Number of destinations Site contacts O	Mayara anto aff							10
Site contacts Site contacts O	Movements on							6
Water contacts with other arms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 2 4 4 Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole) 0 1 2 4 4 Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 2 4 4 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 VI farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 3 6 Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category VI farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 3 6 Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category VI farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 4 8 8 Focure Unsecure Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters 1 2 Contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters 1 2 Contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters 1 2 Contacts with other directive 1 Contacts with other status 2 Processing fish from Zone or compartment of equivalent status 2 Processing fish from Zone or compartment of equivalent status 3 Forcessing fish from Category VI farm 1 10 Forcess	Exposure via water	1.10		0				
Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category II farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category II farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Management practices Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) Processing fish from XS of equivalent status Processing fish from XS of equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with other farms Site's own waste only processed. Ocumen processes with othe	Water contacts with other			0				
farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1	susceptible to same		•					_
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 8 Management practices Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing fish from MS of equivalent status 2 Processing fish from MS of equivalent status 2 Processing fish from Category III farm 8 Processing fish from Category V farm 10 Disposal of fish and fish by Processes with other farms 3 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed 5 Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 O Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of No Processing from single shorebase 0 1 2 O Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of No Processing from Sites 0 O No 1 O Disposal of practice 1 O No 2 O No	diseases)	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
Management practices Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from Zone or compartment of equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment Ves Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of lootbaths etc. COGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Yes No Total 1 4 8 None Disposal of fish and fish by Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment O 1 2 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of lootbaths etc. OGOP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Yes No No Total 17				1	3	6		
Management practices Water contacts with processors Water contacts with processors On farm processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing fish from Zone or compartment of equivalent status Processing fish from Zone or compartment of equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category III farm Site's own waste only processed. Collection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc COGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Ves No Total 10 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 2 0 3 24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								
Water contacts with processors Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters O 1 2 On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by-products Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites operating from single shorebase O 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of lootbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No 170 170 100 1 2 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 17		farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
On farm processing within the rules of the directive 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 Ill farm 8 Processing fish from Category V farm 10 Disposal of fish and fish byproducts Site's own waste only processed. 0 Common processes with other farms 3 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 5 Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 ≥ 4 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc OcoP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 1 Practices in accordance Wes 0 No 2 Total 17	Management practices	I			Secure	Unsecure		
the rules of the directive Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from Zone or compartment of equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish form Category V farm Disposal		Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters		1	2		0
Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from category III farm Processing fish from Category VI farm Disposal of fish and fish by- products Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites operating of unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Sites operating from single shorebase Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of No CodP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
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 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 5 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 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc Ves No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 2 Platform access to cages Yes 0 No 2 Total 17	the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			
equivalent status		Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
Processing fish from Category V farm 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1				4				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Sites operating from single shorebase Ontacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CogP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total		Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	1			
Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solution point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solution point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solution point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solution point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solution point f		Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Use of unpasteurised feeds Feeding unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Number of sites Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total O Total	Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			0
Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 5 Biosecurity	products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
Feeding unpasteurised feed Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 ≥ 4 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CogP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Yes No 0 No 1 Total Total		Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 ≥ 4 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc Yes 0 No 1 0 Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Yes 0 No 3 0 Platform access to cages Yes 0 No 2 0	Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase O Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total O 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 2 0 1 1 1 1		Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total O 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total O Total	Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
between sites, use of footbaths etc		Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
footbaths etc No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 3 Platform access to cages Yes 0 No 2 Total 17		Yes		0				0
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No No 10 No Total O Total	footbaths etc	No		1				
with regulator or industry code of practice No No Second Platform access to cages No No Total Total	CoGP/Regulator							
Code of practice No 3 Platform access to cages Yes 0 No 2 Total 17	Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
No 2 Total 17	code of practice	No		3				
No 2 Total 17	Platform access to cages	Yes						0
				2				
					•	Total		

Case No:	2018-0004		Site No:	FS0822	
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems i	n the previous 4 years?			
•	lanagement Area (or equ			year class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licer amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period of cumented farm manager	ell as access to suitable of time?	e biological and/or me	echanical control measu	res, and
•	ecords available for inspe	ection? (Legal SSI, CoG	SP Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required st		·	(Legal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteria	a for treatment in the	CoGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (L. salmo	onis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 o	r above during the perio	d that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see comment.		
9. Is <i>C. elongatu</i> s infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause s	ignificant welfare pro	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
	reatments been administ reatment or where <i>C. elo</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	plicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions	taken had a significant	impact upon the lice	levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried o	ut in cooperation between	en participating farm	s?	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, w				
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice inf		ypoints describing se	t actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Does the stock on streasons.	site appear satisfactory i	n relation to sea lice lev	el and sea lice coun	t data? If no please deta	il
Containment Inspecti	ion				
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	e current or previous	production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	e predation experience	d on site? (Detail belo	ow)	Y
Top Nets					
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que	nts or events been expe estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Ministe	o question 10	inity of the site since	the last FHI inspection?	N
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fort	hwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)	
	ported to the SSPO and		•		4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	pees? If yes give detail			
	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish i	interests and was per	mission given by Scottis	sh
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	·				
	en to prevent and minim	_	scapes? (Not covered	d in code but could	
	r satisfactory measure	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with reg	gards to containment? I	r no, please detail rea	ason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Site No: FS0822

Case No: 2018-0004

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0004			Date of visit:	15/01/2018					
Site No:	FS0822	l		Inspector:	DCB					
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, CNI	08/02/2018		WJM							
	00,00,00	202	*****							
	Ì									





Hoghill Trout Farm Ltd Aswing Buccleuch Square Langholm Dumfries-shire DG13 0AW

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0551Date of Visit 15/01/2018Site NoFS0822Site NameHoghill Fish FarmInspectorDavid BradleyCase No20180004

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last 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) Regulations 1997

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 08/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0005			Date of visit: 16/01/2018
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Main Inspec	otor: DCB
Site No: FS0188 Business No: FB0353	Site Name: Business Name:	Yarrowford The Yarrow Fishery	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: BO	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	N If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit detail re	ason below:	

No issues on site, VMD fish looked healthy inside

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0005		Site No:	FS0188	3			
Date of Visit:		16/01/2018			Inspector(s)): DCB]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	RTR	4						
Age group No Fish	<1	>1						
	50,000 40g	100,000 150g-1.5kg						
Mean Fish Wt				Next Input D	oto (Sito)	Morch 19		
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	no plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 18		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? N Any escapes (since last visit)? N yes, detail:								N
Movement Records	s							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							23/05/2016	
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?						Y
4. Are movement re-								Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		• '		•				Y
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Ensiled - on	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of		correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (`	t missi mortal		pond per mon	th			N
Evidence of recerIf yes, facility nos/no		•		/reason:				IV
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:	Thortanty da	ning ponou on	COROG.					
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI'	? If no, add M	IRT case and	enter on mort	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
T		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
•	14/71
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
	V
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Υ
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
22/05/46 46/04/2049	

Records checked between: 23/05/16 - 16/01/2018

•	mi 059, version i i							133	sueu by.				
	Case no:	2018-00	005	Site No:		FS0188			Date of Samplin		16/0	01/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	11:0	0:00	11:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:	DCB		VMD No	o.	1
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Δ	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	300g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
Stock Details		Hebden (Brow Well)											
Ċ	Facility No	5											

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
0		Total Te	ests ass	igned	0					

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2	017
Case Number:	2018-0005		Site No:	FS0188		Insp:	DCB	
Date of Visit	16/01/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	$\overline{}$	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	_	
5,550	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	⊢	-
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	-	10
iviovements on	Number of des		0		6	10	⊢	10
Exposure via water		Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		_	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0					
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	4		_	1
uiseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	<u>'</u>	2	4		⊢-	-1
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		or in a coastal zone with category V	1	4	0		_	
	rarms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		_	_
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2			0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0					0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2					
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	1					
		i from Category III farm	8				⊢	-
		from Category V farm	10	4			_	-
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Sita's own was	ta only processed] 7			-	=
products		esses with other farms	0	+			⊢	0
		t for waste from other farms	3	4			⊢-	_
			5	<u>'</u>			<u> </u>	
Use of unpasteurised feeds		inpasteurised feed	0	_			⊢-	0
	Feeding unpas		5	_				_
Biosecurity Contacts with other sites	Sites operation	Number of sites from single shorebase	1		≥4		_	
Contacts with other sites		taff and equipment	0		2		⊢-	-0
			-	'			⊨	믁
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				_	0
footbaths etc	No		1					
CoGP/Regulator				_				
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0					0
code of practice	No		3					
Platform access to cages	Yes		0					0
	No		2					一
					Total Rank		MEDIU	21 M

Case No:	2018-0005		Site No:	FS0188	
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems i	the previous 4 years?			
•	lanagement Area (or equ		ronously on a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licer amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm manager	ell as access to suitable of time?	biological and/or mecl	hanical control measure	es, and
	ecords available for inspe	ction? (Legal SSI, CoGI	P Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required st		·	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	v the suggested criteria	for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period th	nat
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	onis) numbers per fish b	een at a level of 3 or a	above during the period	that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no,	FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause sig	nificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)
	reatments been administrate reatment or where <i>C. elo</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	olicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions	aken had a significant ir	mpact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried o	ut in cooperation betwee	en participating farms?	?	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, w				
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice inf		points describing set a	actions to deal with reco	gnised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory i	n relation to sea lice leve	el and sea lice count d	lata? If no please detail	
Containment Inspecti	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	current or previous pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced	on site? (Detail below)	Υ
Top Nets					
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que	nts or events been expe estions 4 – 9. If No skip t ported to Scottish Ministe	o question 10	ity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fort	nwith (where they exist)?	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)	
·	oorted to the SSPO and I	•	·	·	.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail			
	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish in	terests and was perm	ission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	•				
	en to prevent and minim		capes? (Not covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measure	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with reg	ards to containment? If	no, please detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Site No: FS0188

Case No: 2018-0005

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0005			Date of visit: 16/01/2018						
Site No:	FS0188]		Inspector:	DCB	l				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	1									
	1									
	Ì									
	ļ									
	1									
Report Summary Case Type ECI, CNI, VMD										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, VMD	12/02/2017	DCB	WJM							
				4						





The Yarrow Fishery Yarrow Selkirk

TD7 5JZ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0353Date of Visit 16/01/2018Site NoFS0188Site NameYarrowfordInspectorDavid BradleyCase No20180005

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last 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) Regulations 1997

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 12/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09	9/2017					
Case No: 2018-0006		Date of visit: 16/01/2018						
Time spent on site: 2 hours	s	Main Inspector: DCB]					
	e Name: Newmill Fish Newmill Fish							
Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CN	J 3 4	5 6						
Water Temp (°C): 2 The	ermometer No:	FHI 045 completed						
Observations: Reg	gion: ST Water ty	pe: F CoGP MA:						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Site is winding down production. No fish in freshwater ponds, or in the hatchery. There are still fish in the raceway and it's expected that once this batch has passed through, the site will be made inactive.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0006		Site No:	FS0082	2			
Date of Visit:		16/01/2018	8		Inspector(s):	DCB		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	ocked	1	No facilitie	es inspected	6
Species	RTR							
Age group No Fish	3 yr 600							
	1.25 Kg							
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S		March		Next Input Da	rata (Sita)	No plans		
Next Fallow Date (5	ite)	March		Next Input Da	ate (Sile)	NO plans		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	N Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	S							
1. Movement record		or inspection?	?					Y
2. Date of last inspe	ection:	·					16/11/2016	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement re								Y
5. Are records comp6. Are health certific		•		abla?				Y N/A
		Juctions (out	Willi GD) avail	ible:				147.
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried or	it by (or on b	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys					-			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Domestic wa	aste - <25kg	1	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	d correctly en						Y
4. Recent mortality (•		10 - 20 Per v	week				, N
5. Evidence of recer		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no su	ock per racility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality du	uring period c	checked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u		mortalities be	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		in the FI	112 16 a alal N			" vata		NI/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been re	eported to FH	I? If no, add iv	IRT case and	enter on morta	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		N

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

Records checked between: 16/11/2016 - 16/01/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0006		Site No:	FS0082		Insp:	DCB
Date of Visit	16/01/2018		ovements/s	Score			
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS			5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or			9	18	26	
	compartment including third country Number of suppliers			5		14	\vdash
Mayamanta off				3		10	10
Movements off	Frequency of movements off Number of destinations			3		10	3
Exposure via water				1-5			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I						
diseases)	farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion			2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion			3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	n 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 pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status						
	Processing fish from Category III farm			1			
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	-]			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes		0				0
	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
	No		0				0
	140			I			
					Total		15
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2018-0006		Si	te No:	FS0082]
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	n the previous 4 years	?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or equ	uivalent) fallowed synd	chronously on a	single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licer amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm manager equivalent)?	ell as access to suitable of time?	le biological and	d/or mech	nanical control mea	sures, and
	ecords available for inspe	ection? (Legal SSL Co	GP Annex 6)			
	ely reflect the required st		•	oGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP An	nex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteri	ia for treatment	in the Co	oGP during the perion	od that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> o	onis) numbers per fish	been at a leve	l of 3 or a	above during the pe	riod that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no	o, FHI see com	ment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause	significant welfa	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81	, 5.3.50)
	reatments been administ reatment or where <i>C. elo</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	plicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions	taken had a significan	t impact upon th	ne lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried o	ut in cooperation betw	een participatin	ng farms?	•	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, w					
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice inf		aypoints describ	oing set a	ctions to deal with r	recognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory i	n relation to sea lice le	evel and sea lice	e count d	ata? If no please de	etail
Containment Inspecti	ion					
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	ne current or pre	evious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	e predation experience	ed on site? (Det	ail below))	Y
Site inside, Top Nets	i					
If other, detail below:						
If Yes proceed with que	nts or events been expe estions 4 – 9. If No skip t ported to Scottish Ministe	o question 10	cinity of the site	since the	e last FHI inspection	n? N
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fort	hwith (where thev exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.	4.37. 5.4	.17)	
·	ported to the SSPO and					, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	pees? If yes give detail	l			
8. If gill nets were depl	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish	interests and w	vas permi	ission given by Sco	ottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)			·		
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minim	ise the risk of further e	escapes? (Not o	covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measure	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with reg	gards to containment?	If no, please de	etail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0006	Date of visit: 16/01/2018							
Site No:	FS0082	Inspector: DCB							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI	12/02/2018		WJM						
	-								





Newmill Fish Farm Newmill Cleghorn Lanark ML11 7SL

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0054Date of Visit 16/01/2018Site NoFS0082Site NameNewmill Fish FarmInspectorDavid BradleyCase No20180006

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 12/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Γ	Date of issue: 12/09/2017								
Case No: 2018-0007			Date of	visit: 17/01/2018								
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Mair	n Inspector:	DCB								
Site No: FS0552 Business No: FB0456	Site Name: Business Name:	St Mungos Dawnfresh Farming I	td									
Dusiness 140.	Dusiness Name.	Dawrinesir i arriing i	10									
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6	\Box								
Water Temp (°C): 7.6	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045	completed								
Observations:	Region: TA	Water type: F	CoG	P MA:								
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N										
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	JNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:											

FHI 059, Version 11		Issı	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017			
Case No: 20	2018-0007	Site No:	FS0552	2						
Date of Visit:	17/01/20	018		Inspector(s):	DCB]			
Registration/Authoris 1. Business/site details 2. Changes made to details	s summary checked b	by site representa	ative?			Y N				
Site Details										
Total No facilities Species	21 RTR	Facilities sto	cked	2	No facilitie	es inspected	21			
No Fish 38	88,000									
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site	o.74g No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Feb 18					
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? N Any escapes (since last visit)? N Movement Records										
_										
 Movement records a Date of last inspection 	ion:					27/02/2017	Y			
3. Are records complete4. Are movement records. Are records complete	ords available for dead	d fish and waste?	,				Y			
6. Are health certificate	•		able?				Ý			
Transport Records										
1. Are any movements If yes, is there a system	- `	,	•				N			
Mortality Records										
Mortality records ava How are mortalities	·	,		Ensiled - on s	site		Y			
If other detail: 3. Mortality records con	mplete and correctly	entered?					Y			
4. Recent mortality (las	st 4 wks):	Between 10	and 20 per tan	nk			N			
Evidence of recent in If yes, facility nos/no m	• •		//reason:				N			
6. Any other peaks in r	mortality during perior	d checked?					N			
If yes, detail:			ust on ⊑∐(2				N/A			
7. Have increased (und If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality even				enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A			

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

Treatments and Me	edicines Records		
1. Recent treatments	s (last 4 wks)?		Y
If yes, detail:	Pyceze		
If other, detail:			
	s available for inspection?		Y
•	elete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdr	rawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)?	Pyceze	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stor	red appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Record	is		
•	·		Y
		· ·	Y
increased (unexplain	ned) mortality at the site been included	?	Y
			V
	•	·	Y
		ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
nealin status, certino	sation ii requireu) !		
6 Have the husband	dry and hiosecurity measures implemen	ated between each enidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	•	·	
			Y
		is the maintain the physical containing it	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance		Υ	
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	ance		
1 Has any animal ha	ealth surveillance been carried out by, o	or on hehalf of the husiness?	N
	available for inspection?	or or borian or, the business:	- 10
3. Any significant res	•		
, ,	suits : letailed under recent disease problems)		
ii yos, actaii (ii not de	ctalica ariadi recent disease problems)		

Records checked between: 27/02/17 - 17/02/17

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0007		Site No:	FS0552		Insp:	DCB
Date of Visit	17/01/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	10
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5
Mayamanta aff			0				
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3
Exposure via water	1.1020. 0. 0.0	Site contacts	0	ļ			
Water contacts with other		red (secure water supply through	0				
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or l	or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0
100000 10 00000	No		2				
					Total Rank		HIGH
					Nailk		ПОП

Case No:	2018-0007		Site No:	FS0552	
	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the	e previous 4 years?			
•	·	ent) fallowed synchronously o	n a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and em can these be deployed	amectin benzoate) as well as I in a reasonable period of tin cumented farm management	in-feed and bath sea lice med s access to suitable biological ne? agreement or statement relev	and/or mec	hanical control measu	res, and
•		n? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6))		
		ard specified in the SSI and the		egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. saln records are inspected?		e suggested criteria for treatme	ent in the Co	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?) numbers per fish been at a le	evel of 3 or a	above during the perio	od that
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish Health	Inspectorate? If no, FHI see co	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is cor	sidered to cause significant we	elfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)
		or other actions taken when <i>L</i> tus is considered to have welfa			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applica	ble)?			
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the actions take	n had a significant impact upor	n the lice le	vels recorded?	
		cooperation between participal fewer populations or part populations	~		nt for
	cific written lice management scalation of a sea lice infesta	procedure with waypoints descition?	cribing set a	actions to deal with rec	cognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in rel	ation to sea lice level and sea	lice count d	data? If no please deta	nil
Containment Inspect	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage due	e to predators in the current or	previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ice to mitigate against the pre	edation experienced on site? (E	Detail below	<i>y</i>)	Υ
If other, detail below					
SITE INSIDE PEST CO					
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been experience	ced on or in the vicinity of the s	site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with qu	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to qu	estion 10			
4. Have these been re	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forthwit	n (where they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and local	fisheries trusts forthwith (whe	re they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	.4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escapees	? If yes give detail			
		with local wild fish interests an	d was perm	nission given by Scottis	sh
Ministers? (Legal, Coo	·	ho riok of further as a second (A)	ot oours al.	n oodo kut sauld	
		he risk of further escapes? (No	or covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of	the Act) s to containment? If no, please	detail reas	on(s)	Υ
To the one maperie	a as callolactory with regards	to contaminant: ir no, piease	- dotail reas	J(0)	,

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Database Insp Phone Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Data of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp 2 nd Insp Inspector: Data of Notification Inspector: Data of	Case No:	2018-0007			Date of visit:	17/01/2018					
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Insp Phone Ins	Site No:	FS0552]		Inspector:	DCB]				
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2nd Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp	Daguita Summary	Erog	_								
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 rd Insp	Results Sulfilliary	rieq.	Database	Insp				Insp	2 nd Insp		
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp							Ŭ	·	2 1105		
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		_					ļ				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp							.				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		+				-	 				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp							-				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp							 				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp											
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI 12/02/2018 DCB WJM											
ECI, CNI 12/02/2018 DCB WJM	Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
	ECI, CNI	12/02/2018	DCB	WJM							
					4						
					-						
		-									
		-									





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0456Date of Visit 17/01/2018Site NoFS0552Site NameSt MungosInspectorDavid BradleyCase No20180007

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 12/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0008			Date of visit: 17/01/2018
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Main Insp	ector:
Site No: FS0598 Business No: FB0007	Site Name: Business Name:	Trossachs Trout Ltd Invicta Trout Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 1.5	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	N If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail re	eason below:	

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017				
Case No:	2018-0008		Site No:	FS0598	3							
Date of Visit:		17/01/2018	3		Inspector(s):]				
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			y n					
Site Details												
Total No facilities		33	Facilities sto	ocked	25	No facilitie	s inspected	33				
Species	RTR	CAR					l .					
Age group	8 MONTHS											
No Fish	300,000	1,000										
Mean Fish Wt	75G	200G										
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Jan 18						
·		<u> </u>		_	1							
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N				
f yes, detail:												
Movement Records	3											
Movement record		r inspection?						Y				
2. Date of last inspec		i inspection:					27/02/2017					
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				21702/2011	Y				
4. Are movement red		•		•				Y				
5. Are records comp								Y				
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A				
Transport Records			,									
1. Are any movemer	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y				
If yes, is there a syst		• `	•	•	,			Y				
Mortality Records												
Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y				
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	on site						
If other detail:												
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y				
				and 50 (mostly				• •				
4. Recent mortality (, in the second second			nd 500 fish tak	en out during (grading bec	ause of defor					
5. Evidence of recen		• •						N				
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:								
6. Any other peaks in	o mortality du	ring period of	nockod?					N				
Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	i mortality du	nng penoa ci	ieckeu?					IN				
7. Have increased (u	inevalained)	mortalities be	en reported to	Net or FHI2				N/A				
If yes, detail action:	inexplained) i	nortailles be	cir reported to	J VELOTITI!				13//				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no. add M	IRT case and	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A				
			,			,						

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? Aquatet	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
Biosecurity Records	
 Biosecurity records available for inspection? Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 	Y 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?5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	Y Y
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Y Y N
Records checked between: 27/02/17 - 17/01/18	

11	al 059, version i i							155	ueu by. r	1 11			
	Case no:	2018-00	800	Site No:		FS0598			Date of v		17/0	01/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:3	0:00	16:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	0
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2										
	Pool Group	P1	P1										
	Species	RTR	RTR										
	Average weight	75g	75g										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	FW	FW										
<u> S</u>													
Details		Invicta											
충	Stock Origin	īVi											
Stock	Facility No	C1											

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017	
Case Number:	2018-0008		Site No:	FS0598				
Date of Visit	17/01/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26		
	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	-	
Mayamanta off			0				10	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10	
Exposure via water	1.14.11.50.01.450	Site contacts	0		6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through	0					
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					-	
diseases)	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1	
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		or in a coastal zone with category V						
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		$\overline{}$	
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0	
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	ĺ				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4					
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	1				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			0	
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3					
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5					
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2			
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1					
CoGP/Regulator				-				
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3					
Platform access to cages	Yes						0	
	No		2				$oxed{egin{array}{c} oxed{eta}}$	
				•	Total		- 04	
					Total Rank		MEDIUM	

Case No:	2018-0008		Site No:	FS0598	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)				
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years	?		
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed syn-	chronously on a single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	mectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period cumented farm manag	well as access to suitab d of time?	sea lice medications (inc le biological and/or mech tement relevant to the si	nanical control measures, a	nd
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ia for treatment in the Co	GP during the period that	
8. Have average adult frecords are inspected?	emale sea lice (L. sali	monis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or a	bove during the period that	
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
				evels have exceeded the ons? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	, 🗀
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tre	eatments or the action	s taken had a significan	t impact upon the lice lev	vels recorded?	
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	g strategy for the site, fic written lice manage	where fewer population		held without treatment for ctions to deal with recognise	ed
•			evel and sea lice count d	ata? If no please detail	
Containment Inspection		ne due to predators in th	ne current or previous pro	aduction eveles?	N
•		•	ed on site? (Detail below)	•	Y
	top net	electric fence	netting		
If other, detail below:	top not	CICOLIIO ICIIOC	neung		
ii otilei, detaii below.					
Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	·		,		
4. Have these been rep		•			
5. Have these been rep	orted to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	et)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detai	ı		
If gill nets were deployments.(Legal, CoG)		greed with local wild fish	interests and was permi	ssion given by Scottish	
, <u> </u>		mise the risk of further	escapes? (Not covered in	code but could	
be considered under	satisfactory measur	res of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with re	egards to containment?	If no, please detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0008	Date of visit: 17/01/2018							
Site No:	FS0598	1	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	-								
	 								
Poport Summers									
Report Summary	Doto	laan	and .						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI, VMD	12/02/2018								
	-								
	 								
	 								
	 								
	 								





Invicta Trout Ltd Newtonairds Dumfries Dumfries and Galloway DG2 0JL

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0007 SITE NO FS0598 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 17/01/2018
SITE NAME Trossachs Trout Ltd
CASE No 20180008

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last 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) Regulations 1997

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 08/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by	/: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0009			Date of visit: 11/01/2018
Time spent on site:		Main Inspector	r: DJT
		erpolly fish Ltd	
Case Types: 1 IMP 2	3 4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	hermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations: Re	egion: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed?	N/A	If yes, see additional inform If yes, see additional inform If yes, see additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out	intended visit detail reason l	pelow:	

Inspection at Aberdeen Airport of three boxes of Atlantic salmon containing 87,639 ova from Norway certificate NO-0023283/INTRA.NO.2018.0000057 inspected, no issues to report. Ova imported by MH (Scotland).

Case No:	2018-0009	Date of visit: 11/01/2018							
Site No:	fs0264	l	Inspector: DJT						
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	1								
Donort Cum									
Report Summary	Date		and .						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
imp	11/01/2018	DJT	AJW						
	1								





Finfish Ltd Inverpolly Ullapool Ross-shire IV26 2YB

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0132Date of Visit11/01/2018Site NoFS0264Site NameInverpollyInspectorDavid TomlinsonCase No20180009

Inspection of a consignment introduced into Scotland

An inspection was conducted at Aberdeen Airport on a consignment of 87,639 Atlanntic salmon ova introduced into Scotland from Norway by Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd.

The accompanying health certificate met the requirements of the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 and the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012.

The consignee must retain the original health certificate for at least 3 years.

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

Signed: Date: 11/01/2018
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

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0011			Date	e of visit: 16/01/2018
Time spent on site:	Hr	Mai	n Inspector:	WJM
Site No: FS0831	Site Name:	Mill Burn (Old Mill)		
Business No: FB0108	Business Name:	Kintail Hatchery		
Case Types: 1 IMP	2 3	4 5	6	\Rightarrow
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI	045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	= 0	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•			n/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed?	:d?			n/clinical score sheet. n/clinical score sheet.
Grood pamology about tour		N/A		
Diagnostic samples taken?		Ш		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Import inspection at Aberdeen airport of 73 boxes (2,000,000) of Atlantic salmon ova from Norway, certificate number INTRA.NO.2018.0000058/ NO-0023298. No issues to report.

Case No:	2018-0011			Date of visit:	16/01/2018			
Site No:	FS0831	Inspector: WJM						
Deculto Cummony	Ггод					tion		
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Insp		te of Notifica Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
								2 11100
	-							
	+	-						
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
IMP	16/01/2018	WJM	ASM	1				
				1				
	-							
	+							





Kintail Hatchery Ruarach Inverinate, Kyle of Lochalsh Ross-shire IV40 8HG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

SITE NO FS0831 SITE NAME Mill Burn (Old Mill)
INSPECTOR Warren Murray CASE NO 20180011

Inspection of a consignment introduced into Scotland

An inspection was conducted at Aberdeen Airport on a consignment of 2,000,000 Atlantic salmon ova introduced into Scotland from Norway by Kintail Hatchery.

The accompanying health certificate met the requirements of the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 and the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012.

The consignee must retain the original health certificate for at least 3 years.

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

Signed: Date: 16/01/2018
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

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0012			Date of visit: 17/01/2018
Time spent on site:	2 hours	Main Ins	spector: AJW
Site No: FS0575 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Smolt Unit Landcatch Natural Select	tion Ltd
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavior Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional	I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	rry out intended visit detail	reason below:	

S1 going to Scottish seafarms, TSSC and tanks E18 and E19 to Dubai.

Fry have been moved on from the hatchery and will be expecting more.

Treating with formalin. Morts peak 20-30 per tank per day (60000 fish in tank) in worst tanks. This is in about 75% of tanks which have been vaccinated. Fish in E18 and E19 have not and will not be vaccinated. Morts in these two tanks are very low, less than 5/week.

Morts on site 1/12/17 to 17/1/18; 8,457 morts, 0.68% site. Attributed to fungus and lesions (possible associate with vaccination).

MD18/001 Export of smolts to United Arab Emirates - Dubai. 1600 in 2 containers. Thought the optimum packing density is 40kg/ M2. Shipment that went out 80kg/m2 lost a significant amount of fish. Future transports will be at 40kg/m2. O2 added in container. CO2 not removed. PH at Ormsary about 5. When arrived in Dubai it was very slightly lower. Are considering raising PH in transport containers at Ormsary with bicard soda, caustic soda and calcium carbonate. The fish are going into tanks of desalinated sea water in Dubai

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0012		Site No:	FS0575				
Date of Visit:		17/01/2018	3		Inspector(s):	AJW		
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		108	Facilities sto	cked	61	No facilitie	s inspected	2
Species	sal	sal						
Age group	S1	fry						
No Fish	1,230,691	1,323,466						
Mean Fish Wt	58g	0.17g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	no		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	this or nex	t week from h	natchery
					1			
Recent (last 4 wks)	·				Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	fungus, fin r	ot and lesions	s in vaccinated	stock				
Movement Records	S							
1. Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							13/12/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				N/A
5. Are records comp	olete and corr	ectly entered	?					N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for intro	ductions (out	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a sys		• •		•				Y
•	tom in place	ioi illalittorial		radion rocordo	•			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality ((last 4 wks):		see additiona	al info				
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	uring period c	hecked?					N/A
If yes, detail:		, , , , ,						
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	remtel k	nomed to Ell	10 lf no 1 - 1 8 4	IDT cost and		lite : a : : : : t = : :	haat	N1/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	eported to FH	ił it no, add M	IK I case and e	enter on morta	iity events s	ineet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		

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

13/12/17- 17/1/18 Records checked between:

Case No:	2018-0012	Date of visit: 17/01/2018						
Site No:	FS0575	l		Inspector:	AJW	1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
		-			-			
		<u> </u>			<u> </u>			
Donort Cummon								
Report Summary Case Type MOV	Data		and .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
IVIOV	19/01/2018	AJVV	ASM					
		-						
			1					





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 17/01/2018

SITE NO FS0575 SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit

INSPECTOR Amanda Walker Case No 20180012

Inspection for export to a third country

Fish Health Inspector

The above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon smolts for export to United Arab Emirates was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Signed: Date: 19/01/2018

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

FHI 059, Version 11	1	Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/09/201
Case No: 2018-0013			[Date of visit: 17/01/2018
Time spent on site:	hour	M	lain Inspector:	AJW
Site No: FS0681 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Hatchery Landcatch Natural		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	5	6
Water Temp (°C): 10	Thermometer No:	T146] -	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:				

Ova, yolk sac fry and alvins on site. Alvins will be moved to smolt unit next week. Water for ova treated routinely with formalin. Very little fungus reported in ova and none observed. Eggs not picked until shocked.

Approximatly 450 buckets of ova on site, own stock and stofniskus - Iceland for Scottish sea farms.

Hatchery will be fallow by June/July.

Morts incinerate at Ormsary; broodstock unit, smolt unit and hatchery all in same incinerator which is located off sites.

Mort figure for hatched for site for period 1/12/17 - 17/1/18; 624613, 7.5% - comprising; unhatched eggs; 5%:, mort/deforms 2.55%. Mortality has been normal this year with majority being unhatched eggs. No fungal issues. Egg batches with more than 3% polarised eggs are disposed of, this was only 2 buckets. No IPN positive batches this year. Do not use pyzees on site. They have moved from 80% survival to 90% survival in ova partly due to the use of only fresh milt so less unfertilised eggs

3/10/2017 -Fish vet group visit for broodstock and hatchery audit.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI		Da	ate of issue: 12/	09/2017
Case No:	2018-0013		Site No:	FS0681]			
Date of Visit:		17/01/2018	3		Inspector(s):	AJW		
Registration/Author 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	itive?		Y		
Site Details								
Total No facilities		1	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilities in	spected 1	
Species	sal	Sal						
Age group	ova	yolk sac						
No Fish	5 million	2 million						
Mean Fish Wt	<0.15g	<0.15g						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	Jul-18		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Autumn 2018		
Decemb (last 4 wks)	diagona prob	lomo?		N	Any escaper	(ainee leet vieit	t)? N	
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	alsease probl	lems :			Arry escapes	s (since last visit	.) ? IN	
Movement Records								
1. Movement records		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		the sustained				23	3/01/2017	V
3. Are records comp		•						N/A
4. Are movement red								N/A N/A
5. Are records comp6. Are health certification		•		ble?				Y
		Juctions (out	vitir OD, availa	DIC:				
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	ots carried or	it by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst								Y
Mortality Records								
Wortainty Necords								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed c	of?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of		correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (I	last 4 wks):		normal - see	additional info).			
5. Evidence of recen		* *						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility/	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period of	haakad2					N
If yes, detail:	Thortality do	illing period ci	leckeu :					14
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,		01.10	13.3				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FH	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events shee	et.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N/A
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	IN/A
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	V
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	V
If no, detail:	'
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Decords shocked between 22/4/47, 47/4/49	

ecords checked between: 23/1/17 - 17/1/18

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/201
Case Number:	2018-0013		Site No:	FS0681		Insp:	AJW
Date of Visit	17/01/2018		No of movements/supp./dest.				Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	_	_	4.0		
species		ncluding third country	0			26	
	Number of supp	Dilers	0			14	<u> </u>
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
	Number of dest		0			10	<u> </u>
Exposure via water	I= · · ·	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V 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		(
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				(
and raide of the another	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status						
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		-
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		-
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			,
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				(
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes]			
	No		2				
					Total		3,
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2018-0013		Site No:	FS0681	
Sea Lice Inspection (1. Has the site experie	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years?			
·	•	ivalent) fallowed synchro	onously on a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period c cumented farm managen	ced in-feed and bath sea ell as access to suitable b f time? nent agreement or statem	iological and/or mec	hanical control measure	es, and
•		ction? (Legal SSI, CoGP	Annex 6)		
	•	andard specified in the S	·	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	: 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		v the suggested criteria fo	or treatment in the Co	oGP during the period t	hat
8. Have average adult records are inspected?		onis) numbers per fish be	en at a level of 3 or a	above during the period	I that
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no, F	HI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause sign	nificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50)
		ered or other actions take ngatus is considered to h			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	olicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions	aken had a significant im	pact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried o	ut in cooperation betweer	n participating farms?	•	
sea lice?		nere fewer populations or			
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice inf	ent procedure with waypo estation?	oints describing set a	actions to deal with reco	ognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in	relation to sea lice level	and sea lice count d	lata? If no please detail	
Containment Inspect	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the c	urrent or previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced of	n site? (Detail below	r)	Υ
inside					
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que	ents or events been exper estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Ministe	•	y of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fort	nwith (where they exist)?	(CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
		ocal fisheries trusts forth		·	l.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	y) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail			
		ed with local wild fish into	erests and was perm	ission given by Scottisl	n
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	·				
		se the risk of further esca	apes? (Not covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measure				
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with reg	ards to containment? If n	o, please detail reas	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0013			Date of visit:	17/01/2018			
Site No:	FS0681	1		Inspector:	AJW	l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
,		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
D 4 O								
Report Summary	_		nd					
Case Type ECI, CNI	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	19/01/2018	AJW	ASM					
	 							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0061Date of Visit 17/01/2018Site NoFS0681Site NameOrmsary HatcheryInspectorAmanda WalkerCase No20180013

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 19/01/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Issue	d by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0018			Date of visit: 14/02/2018
Time spent on site: 1.5 h	nours	Main Inspecto	or: JET
333311	lite Name:	John Muir Building	
Business No: SB0544 B	Business Name:	Heriot Watt University	
Case Types: 1 REG 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	hermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations: R	Region: LO	Water type: S	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish	h present?		mation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed?			mation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		ii yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet.
g		_	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out	t intended visit detail reas	on below:	

Pre-authorisation inspection of new oyster recirculation site. Site is part of native oyster restocking project at Dornoch Firth. Oysters are brought on site from Loch Ryan for cleaning to ensure there are no hitchhiker species attached to shells, before being transferred to Dornoch Firth.

Advised site manager to install disinfection mat, bunding around entrance to recirculation room, and site specific PPE to ensure separation between new site and existing aquarium facility. The oyster site water supply is separate to that of the aquarium.

Photographs of site were later provided showing recommendations put in place.

Case No:	2018-0018			Date of visit:	14/02/2018			
Site No:	SS0917	1		Inspector:	JET	1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
						1		
D 0								
Report Summary	_		nd					
Case Type REG	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	06/03/2018	JE I	DJT					
	1							

FHI 059, Version 11	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017				
Case No: 2018-0022			Date of visit: 01/02/2018				
Time spent on site:	3.5 hours	Main Inspe	ector: ALW				
Site No: FS0575 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Smolt Unit Landcatch Natural Selectio	nn I fd				
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 VMD 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Inspected tank E18 for export of 3,400 salmon to Fish Farm LLC in Dubai (MD18/004). Also checked the Hatchery as transfers of fry into Smolt Unit on-going. Currently stocked with 2.5 million alevins and 4.3 million ova. Mortalities in alevins wk 17/1 - 4.43% (unhatched), 22/1 - 3.01% (hatching) and 29/1 - 0.93%.

Formalin treatments for fungus in parr. Fry checked twice per week for parasites.

All fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0022]	Site No:	FS0575	5			
Date of Visit:		01/02/2018	3		- Inspector(s)	: ALW		7
Registration/Authoral Business/site det 2. Changes made to	tails summary		site representa	ative?			N N	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		108	Facilities sto	ocked	61	No faciliti	es inspected	16
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group	2018 parr	2018 fry						
No Fish	1,215,795	1,502,729						
Mean Fish Wt	55g	0.25g						
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Mid/late F	eb	
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	t visit)?	N
Movement Record								
 Movement record Date of last inspect Are records complete. Are movement respondence. Are records complete. Are health certifice. Transport Records	ection: plete and correcords availab plete and correcates for intro-	rectly entered ble for dead fis rectly entered	? sh and waste? ?				17/01/2018	Y N/A N/A N/A
1. Are any moveme If yes, is there a sys		• •		· ·	~ .			
Mortality Records								
 Mortality records How are mortaliti other detail: Mortality records 	ies disposed d	of?	torod?		Incinerated -	- on site		Y
4. Recent mortality		J Correctly em	Averaging ~2	250/day in pari	r and ~2,500/	day in fry. 5	morts this we	•
5. Evidence of rece	•	atunical morts	export to Du	Dai (E 16)				N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				
11 900, 140, 1102	J Hioricani, p. 2.	Taomy,	701. por	11000011.				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	uring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:				=				
7. Have increased (If yes, detail action:	• • •	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
II ves. detail action.								

N/A

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Med	icines Records		
1. Recent treatments ((last 4 wks)?		Y
If yes, detail:	Formalin		

1. Recent treatments	3 (last + WKs):		
If yes, detail:	Formalin		
If other, detail:	-		
	s available for inspection?		Y
· ·	plete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withd	•		N
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	ored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Record	ak e		
Biosecurity record	ds available for inspection?		
	·	ording and safe disposal been considered?	
		Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ined) mortality at the site been included	· ·	
4. Has the action that	at will be taken in the event that the pre-	sence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been inc	cluded and how and when that will be n	otified to Scottish Ministers?	
	,	ted on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certific	cation if required)?		
	•	nted between each epidemiological unit to minimise	
	•	visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	,	ace to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals		nonted on eite	
If no, detail:	rity procedures been adequately impler	nented on site?	
ii iio, detaii.			
Results of Surveilla	ance		
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out by,	or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results	available for inspection?		
3. Any significant res	sults?		
If yes, detail (if not d	detailed under recent disease problems)).	

Records checked between: 17/01/2018 - 1/2/18

٠.	ai 059, version i i							155	sueu by.	ГП			
	Case no:	2018-00)22	Site No:		FS0575			Date of Samplin		01/	02/2018	01/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG		lg. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:0	0:00	16:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:	ALW		VMD No	o.	29
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	37-42	43-48	49-54	55-60	61-66	67-72
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL		SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL
	Average weight	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW
Stock Details	Stock Origin	Landcatch	Landcatch	Landcatch	Landcatch	Landcatch	Fanad	Fanad	Fanad	Fanad	Fanad	Fanad	Fanad
S	Facility No	E10	E12	E11	X07	E14	Y02	Y04	Y05	X10	X05	E22	X03

	<u> </u>														
02/2018	O2/2018 Additional Sample Information:														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														
				J											
73-78	79-86	87-90													
13-10	1 9-00	01-90													
SAL	SAL	SAL													
0.0550															
		N/A													
		FW													
ad	ad	ad													
Fanad	Fanad	Fanad													
	E08	E27													

Site No: FS0575

Case No: 2018-0022

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0022]		Date of vis	it: 01/02/201	8					
Site No:	FS0575	Inspector: ALW									
Results Summary	Freq.				Date of Notific						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
			_								
				+							
				+							
				+							
			-								
			-								
Report Summary				7							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
				-							
MOV VMD	06/02/2018 06/02/2018		AJW AJW	-							
VIVID	00/02/2010	ALVV	AJVV	-							
				-							
				-							
				-							
				-							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 01/02/2018

SITE NO FS0575 SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit

INSPECTOR Andrea Warwick CASE No 20180022

Inspection for export to a third country

The above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon parr for export to Dubai was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 06/02/2018





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 01/02/2018

SITE NO FS0575 SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit

INSPECTOR Andrea Warwick Case No 20180022

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) Regulations 1997

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) Regulations 1997. Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 06/02/2018

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

R20

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0025			Date of visit: 08/02/2018
Time spent on site:	2h	Main I	nspector: DJT
Site No: FS0575	Site Name:	Ormsary Smolt Unit	
Business No: FB0061	Business Name:	Landcatch Natural Sele	ection Ltd
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): N/A	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir	ng fish present?	n If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ved?		nal information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		n If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		n	
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detai	il reason below:	

Inspection of stocks held in tanks E7,18 and 19 as these are being exported to Dubai. No issues observed, mortalities are low in both the hatchery and smolt unit so certificate referenced MD18/005 issued. Last inspection occurred 7 days ago (1/2/18) therefore only one week of records inspected.

E7 morts 14, E18-5, E19-4, (for the week) single figures per day.

In the hatchery mortalities were 0.95% (24227) for the week. An export inspection was conducted on a consignment of ova imported from Ireland, the ova were observed being disinfected and laid down in the hatchery, see case 2018-0045 for further detail.

Case No:	2018-0025			Date of visit:	08/02/2018			
Site No:	FS0575	1		Inspector:	DJT	l		
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	ļ							
	 							
	-							
	 							
	1							
	Ì							
	ļ							
Report Summary	1			1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MOV								
IVIOV	16/02/2018	D3 1	WJM					
	 							
	 							
	1							
	Ī							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 08/02/2018

SITE NO FS0575 SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit

INSPECTOR David Tomlinson CASE No 20180025

Inspection for export to a third country

The above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon parr for export to Dubai was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Signed: Date: 16/02/2018

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

FHI 059, Version 11	!	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0026]		Date of visit: 08/03/2018
Time spent on site:	2 hours	Main Insp	pector: DCB
Site No: FS0575	Site Name:	Ormsary Smolt Unit	
Business No: FB0061	Business Name:	Landcatch Natural Selecti	on Ltd
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavior	ng fish present?	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease obser	ved?		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 car	rry out intended visit detail	reason below:	

2 year classes on site, fish to Dubai 17S1

fish moved out to the recirc unit from Ormsary to Dubai in December @40 g now 110g

Fish are being transported from tank e19, parr $63g \sim -$ Mortaility in tank - WK 9 - 4 morts (no obvious cause), WK 8 0 morts, 7 4 WK 6 - 2 - (no obvious cause).

Fish in tank inspected looked healthy.

Exporting 4140 salmon parr (MD18/014) on the 12/03/18

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0026		Site No:	FS0575	,			
Date of Visit:		08/03/2018	3		Inspector(s):	DCB		1
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		104	Facilities sto	cked	83	No facilitie	es inspected	1
	SAL	SAL						
Age group	17S1	17S0						
No Fish	1,175,743	2,728,322						
Mean Fish Wt	63g	0.6g						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	Never fallow		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	1st week o	of April	
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease prob	lome?		Y	Any escapes	cince last	vicit)2	N
	Slight touch				Ally Escapes	(Silice last	VISIL):	IN
		Orlungae						
Movement Records								V
1. Movement records		r inspection?					20/00/00/0	Y
2. Date of last inspec		-the entered					23/02/2018	V
 Are records comp Are movement rec 		•		,				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of		•						Y
4. Recent mortality (`			00 - 1750 per w	veek across tr	ne site		NI
5. Evidence of recen		• •		les acons				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ск регласину/	reason.				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:		5						
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and c	enter on morta	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?	
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.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between:

23/02/2018-08/03/2018

Case No:	2018-0026			Date of visit: 08/03/2018							
Site No:	FS0575	1		Inspector:	DCB	1					
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
Case Type MOV	14/03/2018	DCB	AJW								
IVIOV	14/03/2010	БСВ	A3 V V								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 08/03/2018

SITE NO FS0575 SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit

INSPECTOR David Bradley CASE No 20180026

Inspection for export to a third country

The above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon parr for export to Dubai was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Date: 14/03/18

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0027			Date of visit: 13/02/2018
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Main In	spector: ALW
Site No: FS0562 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Geocrab Hatchery The Scottish Salmon Co	ompany
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 1.8	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additiona	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail ı	reason below:	

Water temp in fry unit heated to 8C.

Due to receive ova from Salmobreed in a couple of weeks. This stock will be 2019 S1 and Hebridean stock will be 2018 S0 stock. Parr on site transferred from Russell Burn a month ago to allow Russell Burn to have a whole site fallow period. Use comphatch system in separate container for ova and hatching. Fish transferred to small tanks for first feeding and across road to larger tanks at 1.5g.

Nephrocalcinosis seen at low level and HSS just prior to transfer in 2017 S0 smolts.

Parr from Russell Burn will be transferred to Petersport at end of March and split into Greanamul after grading in the autumn. Fish in good condition and fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0027		Site No:	FS0562	2			
Date of Visit:		13/02/2018			Inspector(s)	: ALW]
Registration/Author								
1. Business/site det		y checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	o details?						N	J
Site Details								
		47 +	1		17 +	_		47 +
Total No facilities		hatchery	Facilities sto	cked	hatchery	No facilitie	s inspected	hatchery
Species	Sal	SAL				TVO TGOIRGO	1	
Age group	2018 parr	2018						
No Fish	97,742	1,181,860						
Mean Fish Wt	57.5g	0.15-0.2g						
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	N/A - whole	site never	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	26 Feb 20	18 (Ova)	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	olems?			Any escapes	s (since last)	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	Fungus in p				Arry Cocapce	3 (Sirice last	violi):	IX
Movement Record								
Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		or mapection:					28/02/2017	
3. Are records comp		rectly entered?	>					Y
4. Are movement re		•		,				Y
5. Are records comp	olete and cor	rectly entered?	>					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for intro	ductions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records	.							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried o	ut by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys					-			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for	ineportion?						V
2. How are mortaliti		•			Ensiled - on	site		<u> </u>
If other detail:	oc aloposca	<u> </u>			21101104 011	0.10		
3. Mortality records	complete an	d correctly ente	ered?					Y
				y = w/e 14/1 -				
4. Recent mortality	(lact 1 wkc):			rst feeding ale		t = 1,236, w/6	9 11/2 - 1,726	S. Alevins =
 Kecent mortality Evidence of receive 	`	atypical mortal		210, w/e 11/2 -	1,052			Y
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason·				<u> </u>
w/e 17/12/17 - sligh		•			(857 mortality	from 395,89	5 fish - 0.2%). Fish
transferred to sea					`	,		
6. Any other peaks	n mortality d	uring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (uneynlained)	mortalities he	en reported to	Net or FHI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	anoxpiaineu)	mortaines be	on reported to	o vot of 1 fil:				TV//\
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been r	eported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and	enter on mort	ality events s	heet	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

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

28/02/2017 - 13/2/18 Records checked between:

ni 059, version i i							155	sueu by.	ГПІ			
Case no:	2018-00)27	Site No:		FS0562					13/0	02/2018	13/(
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	11:0	0:00	11:1	5:00		Inspecto	or:	ALW		VMD No	o.	5
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1-15											
Pool Group												
Species	SAL											
Average weight	0.0570											
Sex	N/A											
Water Type	FW											
	المالية											
	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1-15 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 0.0570 Sex N/A Water Type FW	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling 11:00:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors Summary samples HIST Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1-15 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 0.0570 Sex Water Type FW Case no: VI Indoors Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Fish	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 11:00:00 11:1 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1-15 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 0.0570 Sex N/A Water Type FW	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 11:00:00 11:15:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST BA Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No I-15 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 0.0570 Sex N/A Water Type FW VI BA Indoors All Indoors VI BA Indoors Add Fish/Pools - 1-15 Pool Group Species SAL Average weight 0.0570 Sex N/A Water Type FW	Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562 Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling starts/ends: 11:00:00 11:15:00 11:15:00 Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG Add Fish/Pools - click BA MG Pool/Fish No Indoors I	Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562	Description Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562	Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562 Date of Samplin	Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562 Date of visit/ Sampling: Date of visit/ Date of visit/ Sampling: Date of visit/ Sampling: Date of visit/ Date	Case no: 2018-0027 Site No: FS0562 Date of visit/ Sampling: Sampling: Sampling: HI

1111 000, 10	111 000, Volcion 11												
02/2018 Add	ditional Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
0	Total T	ests ass	igned	0	l								
		T										1	

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0027		Site No:	FS0562		Insp:	ALW
Date of Visit	13/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	40	200	
Species	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
Exposure via water	Number of dest	Site contacts			6-10	10	
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	. <u> </u>	1-5	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	porehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the raise of the another	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				0
		from Category III farm	8	•			0
		from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				-			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2]			0
					Total		28
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2018-0027		Site No:	FS0562	
Sea Lice Inspection (S 1. Has the site experien	• •	s in the previous 4 years	?		
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synd	chronously on a single	year class basis?	
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	ccess to a range of lic imectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period cumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medications (in le biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin, chanical control measure	es, and
5. Are sea lice count re-	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the	e SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	a for treatment in the (CoGP during the period t	hat
8. Have average adult f records are inspected?	emale sea lice (L. sal	monis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or	above during the period	that
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)
				s levels have exceeded tations? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3	
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tre	eatments or the action	s taken had a significan	t impact upon the lice I	evels recorded?	
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	g strategy for the site,		s or part populations ar	re held without treatment	
scenarios during the es			aypoints describing set	actions to deal with reco	gnisea
16. Does the stock on s reasons.	site appear satisfactory	y in relation to sea lice le	evel and sea lice count	data? If no please detail	
•	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the	·	•	Y Y
Tanks inside	Nets over tanks				
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	estions 4 – 9. If No skip orted to Scottish Minis	•		·	N
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	rthwith (where they exi	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detai	l		
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoGI		greed with local wild fish	interests and was peri	mission given by Scottish	
	·	imise the risk of further e	scapes? (Not covered	in code but could	
be considered under	·			ocac Jar coard	
	•	egards to containment?	If no, please detail rea	son(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Site No: FS0562

Case No: 2018-0027

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0027			Date of vis	it: 13/02/20	18		
Site No:	FS0562]		Inspecto	r: ALW			
Results Summary	Freq.			D	ate of Notifi	ication		
ŕ		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
								_
				+	+		_	
	-					+		_
						+		+
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case Type ECI/CNI/VMD	01/03/2018	3 ALW	2 nd Insp DCB					





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 13/02/2018
Site No FS0562 Site Name Geocrab Hatchery

INSPECTOR Andrea Warwick Case No 20180027

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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 2013

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 01/03/2018

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0028			Date of visit: 13/02/2018
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Main Inspec	etor: ALW
Site No: FS0149	Site Name:	Loch Langavat	
Business No: FB0169	Business Name:	The Scottish Salmon Compa	any
Case Types: 1 VMD	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~ .	N If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detai	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site stocked with Hebridean origin stock from Barvas and Amhuinnsuidhe Hatcheries. Growth has been slow over winter (water temp currently 2.6C), but Hebridean stock appears to perform better at sea.

Fish were vaccinated with Alpha ject 2-2 and treated with pyceze post vaccination.

Some stock has transferred to Kenmore. Remaining fish will be transferred to Petersport and then split to Greanamul post grade in autumn 2018.

Fish appeared in good condition and fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0028		Site No:	FS0149	3			
Date of Visit:		13/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	ALW		1
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	6
Species	SAL							
Age group	2018 parr							
No Fish	549,605							
Mean Fish Wt	55g	- 1 1			(3):>	1 1 1		
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	End April 20	18	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	End Augus	st 18	
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease probl	lems?		N	N Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec	ection:	·					23/02/2016	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement red								Y
5. Are records comp6. Are health certification		•		oblo?				Y N/A
		Juctions (out.	/IIII GD) avano	ible :				13,7
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemer	nts carried ou	ut by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Ensiled - on s	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	•	•						Y
4. Recent mortality (`			, w/b 22/1 - 0, v	w/b 29/1 - 59, y	w/b 11/2 - 5	1 plus 8676 c	
5. Evidence of recen		• •		/				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per racility	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	•	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		· 'ta FIII	O LL CONTRACTOR					NI/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add iv	RT case and r	enter on morte	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017

Treetments and Medicines Decords	
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	14
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?	
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.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between:

23/2/16 - 13/2/18

F	HI 059, Version 11							ISS	suea by:	ГПІ			
	Case no:	2018-00)28	Site No:		FS0149			Date of Samplin		13/0	02/2018	13/(
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:	ALW		VMD No	o. [12
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	ımples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-12	13-24	25-36									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	0.0550	0.0550	0.0550									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW									
		≥	2	≥									
		j.	he	he									
v.		atc	atc	atc									
<u></u>		I	H	H									
Details		vas	vas	vas									
		Barvas Hatchery	Barvas Hatchery	Barvas Hatchery									
Stock	Facility No	3	6	Ш									
J ,	,			-									

	-										,		
02/2018 Additional Sample Information:													
0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0								

Site No: FS0149

Case No: 2018-0028

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0028			Date of visit: 13/02/2018							
Site No:	FS0149	l		Inspector: ALW							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
	1				-						
Report Summary											
Case Type VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
VMD	01/03/2018	ALW	DCB								
	.										





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0169Date of Visit13/02/2018Site NoFS0149Site NameLoch LangavatInspectorAndrea WarwickCase No20180028

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013. Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 01/03/2018

R20

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

FHI 059, Version 11	I:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0029			Date of visit: 14/02/2018
Time spent on site:	5 hours	Main Insp	pector: ALW
Site No: FS0148	Site Name:	Amhuinnsuidhe Hatchery	
Business No: FB0169	Business Name:	The Scottish Salmon Com	npany
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	d?		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:	

Additional Case Information:

Water in indoor tanks heated to 7-8c at this time of year. Hebridean stock hatched a couple of weeks ago and AS Bolaks ova just starting to hatch. Ova held in troughs and drop into combi tanks at hatch. Use enka flex as substrate for alevins in tanks. Parr in outside tanks are due to transfer to sea in April. Will be input onto Uiskevagh initially and split to new site Maaey in the autumn after grading. Evidence of fin nipping in some tanks, but no sign of fungus.

Other than fin nipping fish appeared in good condition and fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0029]	Site No:	FS0148	3			
Date of Visit:		14/02/2018	3		Inspector(s)	: ALW]
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
		93 +	1		69 +	٦ .		93 +
Total No facilities	0.41	hatchery	Facilities sto	cked	hatchery	No facilities	s inspected	hatchery
Species	SAL 2018 parr	SAL Alevins	SAL Ova	_				
Age group No Fish	348,000	1,375,000	400,000	_				
	50g	0.2g	N/A					
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S		N/A - whole		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	December	2018	
					1			
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	olems?		N	Any escape	s (since last v	visit)?	N
Movement Record	<u> </u>							
Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							01/03/2017	
3. Are records comp	olete and cor	rectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re				•				Y
5. Are records comp		•		-1.1-0				Y
6. Are health certific		ductions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records	5							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried o	ut by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place	for maintenan	ice of transpo	rtation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed	of?			Ensiled - on	site		
If other detail:	complete on	d correctly and	torod?					V
3. Mortality records	complete and	a correctly ent		6 parr + 5,269	ova w/e 28/1	- 30 parr ± 1	2 5/13 ova w	1/0 1/2 - 21
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		parr + 31,51	5 blank/unhatc ched + 5,096 a	ched ova, w/e	•		
5. Evidence of recei		* *						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	r facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				-
6 Any other peaks	in martality d	uring paried of	hookod?					N
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	III mortality u	uning penod ci	leckeu?					IN
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			·					
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	eported to FH	I? If no. add M	IRT case and e	enter on mort	ality events s	heet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

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

Records checked between:

1/3/17 - 14/2/18

	11 059, Version 11							153	ueu by.				
	Case no:	2018-00)29	Site No:		FS0148			Date of Samplin		14/0	02/2018	14/(
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		lg. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	10:3	0:00	11:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:	ALW		VMD No	о.	12
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-8	9-16	17-24	25-33	34-41	42-53						
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL		SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL						
	Average weight	0.0500		0.0500		0.0500							
	Sex	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW						
Stock Details		Geocrab (Stofnfiskur)	Geocrab (Stofnfiskur)	Geocrab (Stofnfiskur)	Geocrab (Stofnfiskur)	Geocrab (Stofnfiskur)	Geocrab (Stofnfiskur)						
S	raciiity NO	36	33	38	Ί	8	12						

	-							,		
02/2018	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infoi	mation:						
0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0					

Live fish movements Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS O Frequency of movements on from equivalent Zone or compartment including third country Number of suppliers O Frequency of movements off Number of suppliers O Frequency of movements off Number of destinations O Frequency of movements off Number of destinations O Frequency of movements off Number of destinations O Farm is protected (secure water supply through diseases) Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion None Secure Unsecure	FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Live fish movements Live fish movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 0 5 10 14 0 0	Case Number:	2018-0029		Site No:	FS0148		Insp:	ALW
Movements on (from out with GB) of succeptible species of movements on from equivalent MS	Date of Visit	14/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 9 18 26 9	Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Separation Sep	Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
Number of suppliers	•			0		40	00	
Movements off	эресіез							5
Number of destinations								
Site contacts with other arms is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	Movements off							6
Water contacts with other farms (holding species ususceptible to same disindexion or borehole) Susceptible to same diseases) Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 1 2 4 4	Exposure via water	Number of desi		_			10	3
dismate (holding species ususceptible to same diseases) Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I tarms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 2 4 4 8 1 1 1 2 4 4 8 9 1 1 1 2 1 3 3 6 9 1 1 3 3 6 9 1 1 3 3 6 9 1 1 3 3 6 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Farm is protect		, <u> </u>	I -3	0-10		
farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 2 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	farms (holding species			0				0
Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion Management practices None Water contacts with processing plant discharging into adjacent waters O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 1 2 O 0 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 2 O 1 3 2 O 2 0 O 1 3 2 O 3 3 2 Processing gish from MS of equivalent status Processing gish from MS of equivalent status Processing gish from AS of equivalent status Processing gish from Category III farm B 2 0 0 Disposal of fish and fish by-Collection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites own waste only processed Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase O 1 2 0 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc O 2 0 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc O 3 2 0 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc O 3 2 0 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc O 3 2 0 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc O 3 2 0 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc O 4 0 O 5 0 O 6 0 O 7 0 O 7 0 O 7 0 O 8 0 O 8 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O 9 0 O	susceptible to same			1	0	4		1
farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	uiseases)			1	2	4		1
Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V 1			•	1	3	6		0
Management practices Water contacts with processors Water contacts with processors On farm processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) Processing fish from MS of equivalent status Processing fish from Sole equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm OD Disposal of fish and fish by-products Common processes with other farms OC Common processes with other farms OS Biosecurity Number of sites Sites operating from single shorebase Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc COGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Ves No Platform access to cages Yes No O Total O Total O Total O Total O Total		Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category V					
No on farm processing within the rules of the directive		farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive No on farm processing O Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) 1 0 O O O O O O O O O	Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) 1 Processing fish from MS of equivalent status 2 Processing fish from Category III farm 8 Processing fish from Category V farm 10 Disposal of fish and fish byproducts Site's own waste only processed. 0 Common processes with other farms 3 Collection point for waste from other farms 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 between sites, use of footbaths etc	Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters					
the rules of the directive	processors			0	1	2		0
Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)		No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
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 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 5 Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 24 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 2 Platform access to cages Yes 0 No 2 Total 24	the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
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 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 5 Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 24 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 2 Platform access to cages Yes 0 No 2 Total 24		Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
equivalent status			•					
Processing fish from Category V farm 10 0 0				4				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-products Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites of unpasteurised feed Peeding unpasteurised feed Sites operating from single shorebase Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc No CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No Total O Total		Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				0
Common processes with other farms 3 0		Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				0
Common processes with other farms 3 0	Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			0
Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 0	products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1			0
Feeding unpasteurised feed 5 0		Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Feeding unpasteurised feed 5 0	Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase O Sites sharing staff and equipment O Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc No Total O Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc Ves No O O O Total O Total O Total	,		•	5	1			0
Contacts with other sites	Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	ı 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Sites sharing staff and equipment 0	_	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
between sites, use of footbaths etc		Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	Disinfection of equipment	Yes			<u> </u> 			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance Yes 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	between sites, use of	No		0				
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Platform access to cages Yes No O No Total O Total				1	J			0
with regulator or industry code of practice No No Service S		Ivaa		ı	1			
No 3 0				0				0
No 2 Total 24	,	No		3				0
No 2 Total 24	Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0
Total 24	auomi access to cages			2				0
					ı			
Rank MEDIUM						Total		24
						Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0029		Site No:	FS0148	
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems i	n the previous 4 years?			
•	lanagement Area (or equ		ronously on a single	year class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licer amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm manager	ell as access to suitable of time?	biological and/or me	echanical control measur	res, and
•	ecords available for inspe	ection? (Legal SSI, CoG	P Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required st			(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteria	for treatment in the	CoGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> o	onis) numbers per fish b	peen at a level of 3 o	r above during the period	d that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no,	FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause si	gnificant welfare pro	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	.3.50)
	reatments been administ reatment or where <i>C. elc</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	plicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions	taken had a significant i	mpact upon the lice	levels recorded?	
	ere conducted, carried on g strategy for the site, w	·			t for
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice inf		points describing se	t actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory i	n relation to sea lice lev	el and sea lice coun	t data? If no please detai	1
·	nced equipment damage	·		•	N
	ce to mitigate against the	e predation expenenced	on site? (Detail beit	JW)	Ť
Site inside	Tank lids				
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que	ents or events been expendential extensions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Minister	o question 10	nity of the site since	the last FHI inspection?	N
5. Have these been rep	oorted to local DSFB fort	hwith (where they exist)	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and	ocal fisheries trusts fort	hwith (where they ex	cist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	pees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deple	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish in	nterests and was per	rmission given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG					
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minim	ise the risk of further es	capes? (Not covered	d in code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measure	s of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with reg	ards to containment? If	no, please detail rea	ason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Site No: FS0148

Case No: 2018-0029

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0029			Date of visit:	14/02/2018			
Site No:	FS0148]		Inspector:	ALW]		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	↓							
	 							
	+							
	+							
	† 							
	†							
	1							
	<u> </u>							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case Type ECI/CNI/VMD	01/03/2018	ALW	DCB					
	1							
	1							
	1							
								
			I					





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 14/02/2018

SITE No FS0148 SITE NAME Amhuinnsuidhe Hatchery

INSPECTOR Andrea Warwick Case No 20180029

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained

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

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 2013

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 01/03/2018

Signed:

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI		Date of is	ssue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0031			Г	Date of visit: 1	2/02/2018
Time spent on site:	4 hours	Ma	ain Inspector:	AS	SM
Site No: FS1290 Business No: FB0134	Site Name: Business Name:	Shuna SW (Rubh'a Kames Fish Farmir)	
Case Types: 1 VMD	2 3	4 5		6	
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:	T172] F	FHI 045 complet	ed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA:	M-40
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease obsertions pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see add	ditional informa	ation/clinical sco ation/clinical sco ation/clinical sco	re sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detai	I reason below:			

Additional Case Information:

Some wrasse and lumpfish all hatchery bred. Separate feeders used for the lumpfish.

Fish are ensiled off site at Kames Pier. The fish are taken directly from the site to the pier via boat.

Thermolicer on site 29/11/17 - 16/12/17 and 29/12/18 - 09/01/18

Freshwater treatment from 25/01/18 - 30/01/18

Area to be fallow by Spring (April) and due to restock in late summer (July-August approx.)

Many fish are large in the area as producers are reportedly paid a premium for producing a larger fish (over 5kg).

Site currently under going a process of harvesting. Will be fallow by the end of April (approx.)

Paperwork and site inspected on 12/02/18, VMD samples taken on 14/02/18.

FHI 059, Version 11			Iss	ued by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0031]	Site No:	FS1290				
Date of Visit:		12/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	ASM		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	tative?			Y Y	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		12	Facilities st	ocked	9	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL	WRS	LUM	T		rto raomino	o mopostou	
Age group	16 Q4	mixed	mixed					
No Fish	202,000	50	50					
Mean Fish Wt	5.3lg	mixed	mixed					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Spring 2018		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Autumn 20)18	
Deport (lost 4 wks)	diaaaaa nrab	lomo?			1 Any accord	, (ainaa laat)	vioit\2	N
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease prob	nems?		IN IN	Any escapes	(Since last	visit) ?	IN
•								
Movement Records								Y
1. Movement record		or inspection?					20/44/2047	Y
2. Date of last inspends		rooth, optorod	3				29/11/2017	Y
 Are records comp Are movement re 		•		2				Y
				•				
5. Are records comp6. Are health certification		•		lahla?				N/A
		ductions (out	villi GD) avai	iabie:				14/74
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	ut by (or on be	half) of the b	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place	for maintenar	ice of transpo	ortation records	?			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)		
If other detail:	Ensiled off	site at Kames	pier.		,			
3. Mortality records of								Y
			2,225 (1.1%	6) mainly due to	a freshwater	treatment. T	reatment und	dertaken to
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		reduce lice	and AGD issue	s.			
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	r facility/no sto	ock per facility	y/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in		• .						Y
		· ·		This due to lice				
If you details			d. 9,620 over	the site the last	t inspection. N	ot over repo	rtable limit in	any 5 or 1
If yes, detail:	week period			to viet as EUIO				N1/A
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported t	to vet of FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	ronto! hoon =	ported to EU	12 If no odd M	MDT oppo and	ontor on marts	lity overte	hoot	N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	eura neen te	sported to FH	r: II IIO, aud l'	viit i case and e		anty events s	ileet.	IN/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treetments and Medicines Decords		

Treatments and Medicines Records						
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	Y					
If yes, detail: T.M.S.						
If other, detail:						
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y					
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y					
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y					
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S.						
If other, detail:						
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y					
Biosecurity Records						
Biosecurity records available for inspection?						
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?						
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any						
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?						
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease						
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?						
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher						
health status, certification if required)?						
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.)?						
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of						
aquaculture animals held on site?						
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?						
If no, detail:						
Results of Surveillance						
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?						
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?						
3. Any significant results?						
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).						
December absolved between 20/44/47, 42/02/49						

Records checked between: 29/11/17 - 12/02/18

FHI 059, Version 11						issued by: FHI							
	Case no:	2018-00)31	Site No:		FS1290			Date of Samplin		12/0	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	13:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:	ASM		VMD No	o. 	20
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3	\Box	4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	5.0000	6.0000	6.0000									
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Details		쏬	쏬	X									
		Knock	Knock	Knock									
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No												
Ċ.	Facility NO	1	2	4									

Additional Sample Information:															
0 Total Tests assigned 0															

Case No:	2018-0031			Date of visit:	12/02/2018							
						• 1						
Site No:	FS1290 Inspector: ASM											
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification										
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp				
						-						
Report Summary												
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp									
VMD	01/03/2018	ASM	DCB									





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0134 **DATE OF VISIT** 12/02/2018

SITE NO FS1290 SITE NAME Shuna SW (Rubh'an

Trilleachain)

INSPECTOR Andy Mayes CASE No 20180031

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:



Date: 01/03/2018

Fish Health Inspector

R20

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017					
Case No: 2018-0032			Date of visit: 13/02/2018					
Time spent on site:	2 hours	Main Ins	spector: ASM					
Site No: FS0269	Site Name:	Kames Hatchery						
Business No: FB0134	Business Name:	Kames Fish Farming Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 5.1	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	Y If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet.					
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet.					
Diagnostic samples taken?		N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

Larger fish to go to sea in April, North Moine.

Mortality ensiled at Kames pier.

RTFS diagnosed on site by FVG in July. Morts slightly above "normal" for the site. Tank 4 worse affected with approx. 900 morts in July. Tanks 6 and 7 also saw slightly increased morts. Fish treated with florecol in July. Florocol treatment was successful. Mortality not above reportable criteria

Not getting ova from Norway anymore, they have changed to Denmark (Aquasearch)

One mortality observed in a tank during inspection

FHI 059, Version 11		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017	
Case No:	2018-0032		Site No:	FS0269					
Date of Visit:		13/02/2018]		Inspector(s):	ASM]	
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	itive?			Y Y]	
Site Details									
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilitie	s inspected	14	
	RTR	RTR		1					
	2017	2017							
No Fish	100,000	41,827							
Mean Fish Wt	0.1g	92g							
Next Fallow Date (Si		No plans		Next Input Da	te (Site)	End of Fel	aruary		
Next I allow Bate (of	110)	140 piano		неж трасва	- (Oite)	Lila of For	or dar y		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N	
If yes, detail:						<u> </u>			
Movement Records	2								
		r inapaction?						Y	
 Movement records Date of last inspect 		i inspection:					28/02/2017	'	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	>				20/02/2017	Y	
4. Are movement red		•						Ÿ	
5. Are records comp								Ÿ	
6. Are health certification				ıble?				Ÿ	
			,						
Transport Records									
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t bv (or on be	half) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y	
If yes, is there a syst		• •		,				Y	
Mortality Records									
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y	
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)			
If other detail:	Ensiled at K	ames Bay pie	r. Ensiled was	te is then sent	to Dundas C	hemicals.			
3. Mortality records of								Y	
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		150 approx.	in the last mon	ith, classed as	s 'backgrour	nd' mortality.		
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:					
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?									
•	If yes, detail: See additional comments								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?									
If yes, detail action:	(.))			rt of June. RT			1	N1/A	
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	KI case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	sneet.	N/A	

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	N
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?	Υ
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	Υ
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	Y
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 28/02/17 - 13/02/18	

	HI 059, Version 11							155	uea by: I	гпі			
	Case no:	2018-00)32	Site No:		FS0269			Date of Samplin		13/0	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		0:00 Indoors		0:00	3	Inspecto	or:	ASM	5	VMD No). 	2
	Summary samples	HIST	indoors	BA		MG		 VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-4	5-8										
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR	RTR										
	Average weight	100g	100g										
	Sex												
	Water Type	FW	FW										
Stock Details	Stock Origin	Aquasearch (Denmark)	Aquasearch (Denmark)										
Ċ.	Facility No	8	8										

	Additional Sample Information:												
0		Total Te	ests ass	igned	0								

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 1						: 12/09/201
Case Number:	2018-0032		Site No:	FS0269		Insp:	ASM
Date of Visit	13/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	10	26	
ороснос	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0				5
NA							
Movements off	Frequency of m		0				3
Exposure via water	Trambol of doo	Site contacts					Ľ
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or I	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	laims apstream	To within I tidal excursion	'	1 7	0		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1			3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	Ì			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0	- 			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			
between sites, use of	No		1				
footbaths etc				J			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry	No		0				⊢ —
code of practice	INO		3	J			3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				
	No		2				2
					Total		32
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2018-0032		Site No:	FS0269				
Sea Lice Inspection (\$1. Has the site experier		s in the previous 4 years?	?					
·	•	equivalent) fallowed sync		ear class basis?				
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	ccess to a range of licamectin benzoate) as in a reasonable periodumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath s well as access to suitable	sea lice medications (incle biological and/or mech	luding deltamethrin, nanical control measures,	and			
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)					
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the	SSI and the CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)				
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria	a for treatment in the Co	GP during the period that				
8. Have average adult frecords are inspected?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	lmonis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or a	bove during the period that	at			
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see comment.					
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)								
				evels have exceeded the ons? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.5	1)			
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?						
12. Have therapeutic tro	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significant	impact upon the lice lev	vels recorded?				
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	g strategy for the site,		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 scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?								
16. Does the stock on s reasons.	site appear satisfactor	y in relation to sea lice le	vel and sea lice count da	ata? If no please detail				
2. Are measures in plac	nced equipment dama ce to mitigate against	ge due to predators in the		·	N Y			
Site inside, Tank lids	/covers, Traps							
If other, detail below:								
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	estions 4 – 9. If No skip ported to Scottish Minis	sters?		·	N			
·		orthwith (where they exist						
6. Have these been rep	oorted to the SSPO an	id local fisheries trusts foi	thwith (where they exist))? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)			
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail						
		greed with local wild fish	interests and was permi	ssion given by Scottish				
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	·							
		imise the risk of further e	scapes? (Not covered in	code but could				
be considered under	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			N			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	regards to containment? I	t no, please detail reaso	on(s)	Y			

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Insp Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp Insp	Case No:	2018-0032]		Date of visi	t: 13/02/2018	3		
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp	Site No:	FS0269]		Inspecto	r: ASM]		
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2nd Insp	Results Summary	Freq.			D	ate of Notifica	ation		
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 20d Insp 20d Insp			Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				_		_			
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				_		_			
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				_		_			
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				4		_			
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				4	<u> </u>	4			
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp				_	_				
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp	Poport Summary			1	7				
		Doto	laan	and I	4				
ECLUNI, VIVID UT/03/2018 ASM TDCB					-				
	ECI, CNI, VMD				-				
Case completion 09/04/2018 ASM ALW	Case completion	09/04/2018	ASIVI	ALVV	-				
					-				
					-				
					-				
					-				
				+					
				+	-				





20180032

Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0134 **DATE OF VISIT 13/02/2018** SITE NO FS0269 **SITE NAME** Kames Hatchery **INSPECTOR** Andy Mayes CASE NO

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No 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 inadequately maintained.

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

In accordance with regulation 6(2)(b) of the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulation 2009, the operator of the Aquaculture Production Business will follow good biosecurity practice at each farm site at which it operates and must establish, maintain and comply with a biosecurity measures plan containing at least the information specified in paragraphs (a) to (f) of Appendix IV (below) of your conditions of authorisation. The bio-security measures plan must be made available by the operator of the APB or any staff engaged by or on behalf of that operator, upon request by an inspector.

- (a) The manner and frequency in which mortalities will be removed, recorded and safely disposed of by the APB;
- (b) The manner and period in which the APB will notify the Scottish Ministers(¹⁰) or a veterinary professional of any increased or unexplained mortalities in aquaculture animals held on each farm site;
- (c) The actions that will be taken by the APB in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of any listed disease(¹¹) is detected and how and when that will be notified to the Scottish Ministers(¹⁰);
- (d) The minimum health status of aquaculture animals to be stocked on the farm site, to ensure that stocks being placed on the farm site shall only be sourced from farms of an equal or higher health status and where required, certified as such;
- (e) The husbandry and bio-security measures to be implemented between epidemiological units on the farm to ensure the transmission of shellfish diseases by the movement of staff, visitors, equipment and live or dead shellfish is minimised:
- (f) The measures that are in place at the farm site to maintain the physical containment of the aquaculture animals held on the farm site.

Although a biosecurity measures plans was inspected, the information specified in part (b) (above) was not available for inspection.

This must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of the date this report was issued.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

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 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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed: Date: 01/03/2018
Fish Health Inspector





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0134
 Date of Visit
 13/02/2018

 Site No
 FS0269
 Site Name
 Kames Hatchery

 Inspector
 Andy Mayes
 Case No
 20180032

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 02/04/18. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed: Date: 10/04/2018
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectants Coming Charter detailin

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017					
Case No: 2018-0033			Date of visit: 13/02/2018					
Time spent on site:	1 hour	Main Ins	pector: ASM					
Site No: FS0468	Site Name:	Loch Tralaig						
Business No: FB0134	Business Name:	Kames Fish Farming Ltd						
Case Types: 1 VMD	2 3	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:					
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir	ng fish present?	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet.					
Clinical signs of disease observ	ved?		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:								

Additional Case Information:

Fish to be sent to management area 3A, unsure of exact site at the moment. Fish feeding deep at time of inspection reportedly due to low air temperature Slower growth than expected in this cycle

FHI 059, Version 11		Issue	d by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017	
Case No: 2018	3-0033	Site No:	FS0468					
Date of Visit:	13/02/2018	1		Inspector(s):	ASM			
Registration/Authorisati 1. Business/site details su 2. Changes made to deta	ummary checked by s	ite representat	ive?			Y N		
Site Details								
Total No facilities	7	Facilities stoo	ked	4	No facilities	s inspected	7	
Species SAL								
Age group 2018								
No Fish 163,	000							
Mean Fish Wt 80g								
Next Fallow Date (Site)	March 2018		Next Input Dat	te (Site)	August 201	18		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? N Any escapes (since last visit)? If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
Movement records ava	ilable for inspection?						Y	
2. Date of last inspection:	·					28/02/2017	•	
3. Are records complete a						_0,0_,_0	Y	
4. Are movement records	·						Y	
5. Are records complete a	and correctly entered?						Y	
6. Are health certificates f	or introductions (outw	ith GB) availal	ole?				N/A	
Transport Records								
1. Are any movements ca If yes, is there a system in	• `		•					
Mortality Records	T place for maintenant	oc or transport	allori recordo:					
	ble for increation?						Y	
 Mortality records availa How are mortalities dis 	·			Other (detail)			1	
	led at the Kames Bay	nier Ensiled v		,				
3. Mortality records comp			vaste is then s	ient to Danaa	3 Onomioaio		Y	
4. Recent mortality (last 4	•		ibuted to bird o	damage cause	ed by cormo	rants.		
5. Evidence of recent incr	<i>'</i>						N	
If yes, facility nos/no mort	• •		eason:					
6. Any other peaks in mor	rtality during period ch	ecked?					N	
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? N/A								
If yes, detail action:	nameu) mortailles be	en reported to	ver or curr				N/A	
8. Have 'mortality events'	been reported to FHI	? If no, add Mi	RT case and e	nter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2011

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	V
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	
rieditii Status, Certification ii Tequireu):	
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.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	
ii iio, detaii.	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Pacards chacked between: 28/02/17 - 13/02/18	

ы	FHI 059, Version 11					issued by: FHI							
	Case no:	2018-00)33	Site No:		FS0468			Date of Samplin		13/0	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	•	0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:	ASM	_1	VMD No	o. 	6
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-4	5-8	9-12									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	90g	90g	90g									
	Sex												
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW									
<u>S</u>		ŗ	ی	r									
Details		Allt Mhor	Allt Mhor	Allt Mhor									
		=	<u></u>	<u> </u>									
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	< AF1		3									
S.	III acility NO	AFI	AFZ	J									

	Additional Sample Information:												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

Case No:	2018-0033			Date of visit:	13/02/2018				
Site No:	FS0468	1		Inspector:	ASM]			
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification					
results Gaillinary	1 104.	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
								2 1100	
					-	-			
								1	
D	•								
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
VMD	01/03/2018	ASM	DCB						





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0134Date of Visit13/02/2018Site NoFS0468Site NameLoch TralaigInspectorAndy MayesCase No20180033

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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



FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017			
Case No: 2018-0034			Date of visit: 13/02/2018			
Time spent on site:	4 hours	Main Insp	pector: ASM			
Site No: FS1067 Business No: FB0456	Site Name: Business Name:	Inverawe (East) Etive 2 Dawnfresh Farming Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 4.3	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-36			
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~ .	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detail	reason below:				

Additional Case Information:

Fish processed at Billy Bowie site in Kilmarnock. Fish being turned into compost in Kilmarnock

Some corrections made to escape protocol regarding contact details for FHI

FMS (not FMAg) for site operations in Loch Etive (not an FMAg) and a risk assessment into why a FMAg is not employed with other sites in CoGP management area.

Could not catch fish for VMD as they were feeding too deep.

In relation to SLI section Q15: In sea lice control procedure it details the treatment trigger level for Dawnfresh which is an average of 0.1 female lice per fish. The procedure does not detail any other waypoints or exactly what will happen when the trigger level is hit.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0034		Site No:	FS1067				
Date of Visit:		13/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	ASM		1
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	itive?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	RTR	RTR					·	
Age group	2015	2017						
No Fish	85,939	102,411						
Mean Fish Wt	156g	266g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Nov 2018		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Dec 2018		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	<u> </u>							
Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		n mopoditorr.					21/09/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp	olete and corr	ectly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for intro	ductions (outv	vith GB) availa	ıble?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a system is there a system.		• •	•	•	•			Y
Mortality Records	iom in place	ioi mamonai		idiion rocordo				
Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail))		
If other detail:		nal comments						Y
 Mortality records (Recent mortality (a correctly em		unknown caus	200			'
5. Evidence of recer	,	atunical morta		unknown caus	565.			N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				14
yee, raeyee,e	····ortanty po		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	rontol bases	Ported to ELII	10 If no odd 14	DT aggs aggl	ontor on monto	lity overter -	hoot	NI/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	rents been re	eported to FHI	rrii no, add M	Ki case and e	enter on morta	anty events s	neet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		<u> </u>

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

Records checked between: 21/09/17 - 13/02/18

FHI 059, Version 11			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017		
Case Number:	2018-0034		Site No:	FS1067		Insp:	ASM
Date of Visit	13/02/2018		No of movements/supp./dest.				Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	10
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0				5
Marranata							10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0				10
Exposure via water	Trambol of door	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III					-
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		\mathbf{L}
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	Tarris apstream	Tor Willin F tidal execusion	'		ı		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				-
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
		from zone or compartment of					-
	equivalent statu		4				-
		from Category III farm	8				-
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	•	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
			'	J			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry	No		0				
code of practice	10		3	l			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				H
					Total		37
					Rank		HIGH

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2
Case No: 2018-0034	Site No:	FS1067
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Onl 1. Has the site experienced sea lice proble	••	N
	r equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	vear class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) a can these be deployed in a reasonable per	licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (is as well as access to suitable biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin, echanical control measures, and
Management Area (or equivalent)?		
5. Are sea lice count records available for i		(1 - mal COL Ca OD Amazou C)
6. Do records adequately reflect the require	ed standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels l records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	below the suggested criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that
records are inspected?	calmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 o	
	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is <i>C. elongatu</i> s infestation at a level whi	ch is considered to cause significant welfare pro	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N
	inistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonic</i> . <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications.	
11. Has any other action been taken (where	e applicable)?	N/A
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the acti	ons taken had a significant impact upon the lice	levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carri	ed out in cooperation between participating farm	s? N/A
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the sit sea lice?	e, where fewer populations or part populations a	re held without treatment for N
 Is there a site specific written lice mana scenarios during the escalation of a sea lic 	gement procedure with waypoints describing se e infestation?	t actions to deal with recognised N
16. Does the stock on site appear satisfact reasons.	ory in relation to sea lice level and sea lice count	t data? If no please detail
Containment Inspection		nundustion such so
	nage due to predators in the current or previous	
Z. Are measures in place to miligate agains	st the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	Y Y
If other, detail below:		
ii outot, dotaii bolowi		
 Have escape incidents or events been entered in the second second		the last FHI inspection?
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they ex	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover e	scapees? If yes give detail	
	agreed with local wild fish interests and was per	mission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	inimise the risk of further assence? (Not asserted	Lin code but could
	inimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	Till code but could
be considered under satisfactory meas 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	ason(s) Y

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0034	Site No: FS1067	
Date of Visit: 13/02/201	8 Inspector: ASM	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located If N, no further questions require comp	•	Y
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa	Int farm management area? Irm site(s) to which it applies? If commencement of the agreement or statemer	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana	gement	
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccir 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxi individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual f Arrangements for The Management		r farm? Y r farm? Y the area or the Y ad fish from any
of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual factorized that the circulated on farms in the area or individual factorized.	mstances under which biological controls and cl	eatments for sea Y leaner fish are to be
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify accepta	able harvest practices on farms in the area or individua	al farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the date date when a farm or area may be rest	es by which the area or individual farm will be fallow attocked?	nd the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether agreement or statement?	r one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites	s covered by the Y
	r broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on ent?	any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Mana	agement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agree parties to the agreement?	ement include arrangements for persons to become, o	or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed an	nd operated in accordance with the agreement or state	ement?
26. What is the version no/date of issu	ue of the FMAg/S? Version 6, 13/02/18	

Site No: FS1067 Case No: 2018-0034

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0034			Date of visit	: 13/02/2018	3				
Site No:	FS1067	Inspector: ASM								
Results Summary	Freq.			Da						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
			1							
				-						
							_			
			+							
			+	+				_		
			+							
			+				+			
			1							
			+	1				+		
			1							
								1		
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI	06/03/2018		DJT							
Case completion	11/04/2018	ASM	ALW							
			 							





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0456 **DATE OF VISIT** 13/02/2018

SITE NO FS1067 SITE NAME Inverawe (East) Etive 2

INSPECTOR Andy Mayes Case No 20180034

Case completion report

Issues were raised in relation to the above case, with a requirement for records unavailable for inspection to be submitted by 06/04/18. The required records have now been provided to Marine Scotland.

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

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

Signed: Date: 11/04/2018

Fish Health Inspector





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0456 **Date of Visit** 13/02/2018

SITE NO FS1067 SITE NAME Inversive (East) Etive 2

INSPECTOR Andy Mayes Case No 20180034

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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.

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

On this occasion the following recommendations were issued in relation to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice):

- There was no harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice.
- There was no site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation.

Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of this report. The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above points not be taken within the time period stipulated.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 05/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0035			Date of visit: 13/02/2018
Time spent on site:	30 mins	Main Insp	ector: ASM
Site No: FS0197	Site Name:	Ardchattan Bay	
Business No: FB0456	Business Name:	Dawnfresh Farming Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-36
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		nformation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?			
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Site inspected as it has been made inactive

No equipment left on site

Fish processed at Billy Bowie site in Kilmarnock. Fish being turned into compost on site. Billy Bowie receipt quoted the disposal facility as: Scottish Water, Westfeild Indutrial Estate, Deerdykes.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0035		Site No:	FS0197				
Date of Visit:		13/02/201	8		Inspector(s)	: ASM]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	itive?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		0	Facilities sto	cked	0	No facilitie	es inspected	0
Species	Fallow							
Age group No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	N/A		
Recent (last 4 wks)	diagona probl	ome?		NI/A	Any escapes	o (oinee leet	vicit\0	N
If yes, detail:	disease probi	ems:		IN/ <i>F</i>	Any escapes	s (Since last	visit) !	IN
Movement Records	•							
Movement record		r inepaction?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					24/04/2017	·
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				24/04/2017	Y
4. Are movement re		•						Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a sys		• •	•	•				
Mortality Records	terri iri piace i	or mannenar	ice of transpor	tation records	:			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detai	l)		
If other detail:	See addition							
3. Mortality records		correctly en						N/A
4. Recent mortality (`		N/A					N.
5. Evidence of recer If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/*******				N
ii yes, racility nos/no	mortality per	racility/no st	ock per racility.	reason.				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	een reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			10.16	D.T.				N1/4
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FH	r? If no, add M	KI case and	enter on mort	ality events s	sneet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?	
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.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
24/04/47 42/02/49	

ecords checked between:

24/04/17 - 13/02/18

	Case No:	2018-0035			Date of visit	13/02/2018			
Database Insp	Site No:	FS0197]	Inspector: ASM					
Database Insp	Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica			
			Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp	Poport Summary		1		1				
	Case Type	Data	laas	ond .	-				
REG 01/03/2018 ASM DCB					_				
	REG	01/03/2018	ASIVI	DCR	-				
					-				
					-				
					-				
					-				
					-				
					-				
		-							





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0456Date of Visit13/02/2018Site NoFS0197Site NameArdchattan BayInspectorAndy MayesCase No20180035

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow. No plans to use site in foreseeable future. All equipment has been removed from the water.

Records

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 01/03/2018

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
R10

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by:	FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0036			Date of visit: 12/02/2018
Time spent on site: 2 hrs		Main Inspector	: SAE
Site No: FS0831 Site		Burn (Old Mill)	
Business No: FB0108 Bus	siness Name: Kinta	il Hatchery	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CN	II 3 4	5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9 The	ermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations: Reg	gion: HI \	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish p	present? N I	f yes, see additional inform	nation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed?		f yes, see additional inform	
Gross pathology observed?	N I	f yes, see additional inform	nation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?	N		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out in	ntended visit detail reason be	low:	

Temperature not measured as reference thermometer not available, snow on the ground, however water temperature being artificially held at between 9C and 9.1C by automated system. Site temperature recorded.

FHI 059, Version 11			lssu/	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0036		Site No:	FS0831]			
Date of Visit:		12/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	SAE]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta			eito represents	ative?			V	7
2. Changes made to	•	Checked by 5	ille representa	llive:			Y	-
Site Details								
Olle Details								
Total No facilities		26 tanks	Facilities sto	icked	22 trays in tanks	No facilitie	es inspected	26 tanks
Species	SAL	Zo tariko	I acintico oto.	CREU	tarino	INO Idonicio	з пороска	Zo tame
Age group	Alvins							
No Fish	2,000,000							
Mean Fish Wt	0.25g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	July 2018		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	January 2	019	
				<u> </u>	7			
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease probl	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		er inenaction?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		і іпоресцоп:					23/02/2016	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				20/02/2010	N
4. Are movement re-		•						N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered	?					N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	ductions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen								Y
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place i	or maintenan	ce of transpor	tation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed c	of?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent		' l l' a . al a f	······································	1 - 1	·	Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		14,051 morts	s including defo	ormities and d	lead eggs s	ince input wn	
5. Evidence of recer		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility/	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					l N
If yes, detail:	Tillortailty Go	illing period ci	ieckeu:					
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		
1 Recent treatments (last / wks)?		N

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

Records checked between: 23/02/2016 - 12/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0036		Site No:	FS0831		Insp:	SAE
Date of Visit	12/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	10	26	0
Species .	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
Exposure via water	Number of dest	Site contacts			6-10	10	3
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	, <u> </u>	I-3	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	oorehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		0
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing owr	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			0
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				0
	Processing fish	8				0	
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0]			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3	ĺ			0
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0]			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	. 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				0
					Total		23
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0036		Site No:	FS0831	
Sea Lice Inspection (1. Has the site experie	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems ir	the previous 4 years?			
	⁄lanagement Area (or equ		nously on a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and emcan these be deployed	access to a range of licen amectin benzoate) as we lin a reasonable period o cumented farm managemequivalent)?	II as access to suitable b f time?	iological and/or mec	hanical control measur	es, and
•	ecords available for inspe	ction? (Legal SSI, CoGP	Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required sta		·	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
7. Are sea lice (L. saln records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criteria fo	or treatment in the Co	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	nis) numbers per fish be	en at a level of 3 or a	above during the period	d that
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Hea	alth Inspectorate? If no, F	HI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause sign	ificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50)
	reatments been administere reatment or where <i>C. elon</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	olicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the actions t	aken had a significant im	pact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
	ere conducted, carried oung strategy for the site, wh	•	• •		t for
	rific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice infe		oints describing set a	actions to deal with reco	ognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory ir	relation to sea lice level	and sea lice count d	lata? If no please detai	
Containment Inspect	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the c	urrent or previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced o	n site? (Detail below)	Υ
If other, detail below	:				
site inside					
If Yes proceed with qu	ents or events been exper estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Ministe	question 10	y of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forth	with (where they exist)?	(CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	J.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and le	ocal fisheries trusts forth	vith (where they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail			
	oyed was this action agre	ed with local wild fish into	erests and was perm	ission given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, Co		on the right of further a	upoo2 (Not occurs 1)	n aada but aasild	
	cen to prevent and minimi	_	ipes? (Not covered ii	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures d as satisfactory with reg	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	o, please detail reas	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0036	Date of visit: 12/02/2018						
Site No:	FS0831	Inspector: SAE						
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
				-	-	-		
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
Case Type ECI, CNI	21/02/2018	SAE	PMM	1				
- , -				1				
				1				
				1				
				1				





Kintail Hatchery Ruarach Inverinate, Kyle of Lochalsh Ross-shire IV40 8HG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0108
 DATE OF VISIT 12/02/2018

 SITE NO
 FS0831
 SITE NAME
 Mill Burn (Old Mill)

 INSPECTOR
 Svenja Elwenn
 CASE NO
 20180036

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were / were not available for inspection.

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

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

• FS numbers must be recorded in the source/destination section of the movement record book, to allow for better traceability of stocks. It was discussed with the site manager that his would be recorded in future. No further action is required.

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

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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed: Date: 21/02/2018
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

FHI 059, Version 11	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0037			Date of visit: 13/02/2018
Time spent on site:	4.5hrs	Main Insp	ector: SAE
Site No: FS0375 Business No: FB0224	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Damph Torridon Smolts Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	Y If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detail rea	son below:	

Fish sampled for VMD appeared to be in very good condition. Across the site 1-2 fish in a few pens observed with fungal infections. Fish were actively swimming and were deep in the pen. No moribund or lethargic fish observed. Water very peaty, so visibility limited.

Site thermometer 3.4C, own thermometer 3.3C however reference thermometer not available as broken. Snowy conditions.

FHI 059, Version 11	ı		Issı	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0037		Site No:	FS0375	5			
Date of Visit:		13/02/2018	8		Inspector(s):	: SAE		1
Registration/Authornament 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	tails summary		site represent	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		20	Facilities sto	ocked	6	No facilitie	es inspected	20
Species	SAL							
Age group	2018 S1							
No Fish	272,463 79.4a							
Mean Fish Wt	79.4g	1 2010		Mary Lange C	(0:40)	1 2011		
Next Fallow Date (S	lite)	April 2018		Next Input D	ate (Site)	June 2018	3	
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?		1	N Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	Is							
1. Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe	ection:	·					31/10/2017	
3. Are records comp	•	•						Y
4. Are movement re				?				N/A
5. Are records comp6. Are health certific	•	•		Jahlo?				N/A N/A
		ductions (out	VIIII GD) avaii	able :				147.
Transport Records	5							
1. Are any movemen	ents carried or	ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the b	usiness (not u	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys								Y
Mortality Records	·							
Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	- on site		
If other detail:	·							
3. Mortality records	•	d correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 0-36 morts per cage per day								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								N
If yes, facility nos/no) mortality per	r racility/no sit	ock per racinty	//reason.				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality d	uring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								N/A
If yes, detail action:		arted to EU	IO If the lead of N	ADT case and	arter an mort	-lite avente	-1	N/A
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								

FHI 059, Version 11	Issu	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medi	cines Records		
1. Recent treatments (I	ast 4 wks)?		N
If yes, detail:			
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records a	vailable for inspection?		Y
3. Are records complet	e and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdraw	wal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatmer	nt(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines store	d appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records			

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

31/10/2017 - 13/02/2018 Records checked between:

Priority samples:		ni 059, version i i							133	ueu by.				
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling starts/ends: 11:00:00 11:20:00 Inspector: SAE VMD No. 8 Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Pool Group		Case no:	2018-00)37	Site No:		FS0375					13/0	02/2018	
Summary samples		Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	-				
Summary samples		starts/ends:				0:00		Inspecto	or:	SAE).	8
Pool/Fish No		Environmental conditions:	7	indoors	2		3		4		5			
Pool/Fish No		Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Pool/Fish No														
Fish nos	A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL Average weight Sex N/A Water Type FW		Pool/Fish No												
Species SAL		Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Average weight Sex N/A Water Type FW		Pool Group												
Sex N/A		Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL				
Sex N/A		Average weight	75g	75g	75g	75g	75g	75g	75g	75g				
Details lochmoidart chery lochmoidart chery lochmoidart chery lochmoidart chery lochmoidart chery lochmoidart chery chery chery lochmoidart chery chery chery chery lochmoidart chery chery			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Stock Details Since Details Winlochmoidart Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery Hatchery Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery Hatchery Hatchery Kinlochmoidart Hatchery Hatchery		Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW				

	Additional Sample Information:												
	2 fish per sample												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0037		Site No:	FS0375		Insp:	SAE
Date of Visit	13/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
.,	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	10
Movements on	Number of dest		0		6	10	6
Exposure via water		Site contacts	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro-		0				0
	Processing owr	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	1				0
		from Category III farm	8				
		from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	5 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Ιο				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages Yes]			0
	No		2	1			0
					Total Rank		18 MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0037		Site N	No:	FS0375	
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years?	•			
•	Ianagement Area (or equi			ngle ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licence amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period of cumented farm managem	I as access to suitable time?	e biological and/or	r mech	nanical control meas	ures, and
	ecords available for inspec	tion? (Legal SSI, Co	SP Annex 6)			
	ely reflect the required sta		•	P? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Anno	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criteria	a for treatment in t	the Co	GP during the period	d that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	nis) numbers per fish	been at a level of	3 or a	bove during the perio	od that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Hea	Ith Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see commer	nt.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause s	ignificant welfare p	proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)
	reatments been administer reatment or where <i>C. elor</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	licable)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions to	aken had a significant	impact upon the li	ice lev	vels recorded?	
	ere conducted, carried ou ng strategy for the site, wh	•	• • •			ent for
	ific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infe		ypoints describing	set a	ctions to deal with re	cognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in	relation to sea lice lev	vel and sea lice co	ount da	ata? If no please det	ail
Containment Inspecti	ion					
•	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	e current or previo	us pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced	d on site? (Detail b	below)		Y
If other, detail below:						
top nets, tensioned net						
•	nts or events been experi	enced on or in the vici	inity of the site sin	ce the	last FHI inspection?	? N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to	question 10				
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Minister	s?				
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forth	with (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.3	7, 5.4.	.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and lo	cal fisheries trusts for	thwith (where they	y exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give detail				
	oyed was this action agre	ed with local wild fish i	interests and was	permi	ssion given by Scott	ish
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		on the risk of further as	poppos 2 (Not sour	orod in	ando but sould	
	en to prevent and minimis	_	scapes? (NOT COVE	erea in	code but could	
	r satisfactory measures d as satisfactory with rega		f no, please detail	reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0037	Date of visit: 13/02/2018						
Site No:	FS0375]		Inspector:	SAE]		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	+	-						
								Į
Report Summary	1		Т	1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	-				
	21/02/2018		PMM					
ECI, CNI, VMD	21/02/2010	SAL	L IAIIAI					
	1							
	1	1		1				
	1							
	1							





Torridon Smolts Ltd Shieldaig Strathcarron Ross-shire IV54 8XN

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NOFB0224DATE OF VISIT 13/02/2018SITE NOFS0375SITE NAMELoch DamphINSPECTORSvenja ElwennCASE NO20180037

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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 and the Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 21/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0038			Date of visit: 14/02/2018
Time spent on site:	3 hrs	Main I	nspector: SAE
Site No: FS0301	Site Name:	Couldoran Hatchery	
Business No: FB0125	Business Name:	Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	d
Case Types: 1 VMD	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	· ·	Y If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Compromised dorsal fins (fin rot/fin nipping) in the majority of tanks, some fish with fungus observed however these are mostly actively swimming. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0038]	Site No:	FS0301]			
Date of Visit:		14/02/2018]		Inspector(s)	: SAE		
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		58	Facilities sto	cked	41	No facilitie	es inspected	58
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group	2018 S0	2018 S1						
No Fish	707,228	1,015,390						
Mean Fish Wt	0.2g	39g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	none		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	15/2/2018		
Decemb (least 4 volce)	طاعده محمدالم	lama?		V		a (ainaa laat	. vicit\O	N
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:		iems? sing some mor	tality	1	Any escape	s (since last	VISIT) ?	IN
ii yes, detaii.	rungus caus	ing some mor	tanty					
Movement Records	S							
1. Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							13/02/2017	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement re								Y
5. Are records comp		•		shla?				ľ
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	ductions (outw	ntn GB) avalla	adie?				
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a sys								
Mortality Records								
Mortality records:	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Biogas - En	ergen, Cuml	pernauld	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (lact 4 wks):		per tank per	whole site sind week for Janu y in February 1	ary; Februar			
 Evidence of recer 	•			y III i ebidaiy i	.2 /0.			Υ
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				<u>'</u>
increased mortality i	n the recircul	ation system in	n January : w	k2 1,606 morts	s in CR01, C	R08 wk1 1,2	17 morts, CR0	09 wk5 1,898
morts, CR10 wk3 1, vaccination increase			•				•	
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					Y
	February 2017: batch of dead eggs received 81,915 dead eggs; 51,841 morts in 2017 S1 due to fungus; March 2017: batch of poor eggs received with some increased mortalities in eggs, this continues through							
If yes, detail:		•		ed with some in th slightly high		_	•	
7. Have increased (Inexplained)	mortalities her	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			oportou te					,7
8 Have 'mortality ev	ents' haan ro	ported to EUI	2 If no add M	IPT case and a	enter on mort	ality events	shoot	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	Y
If yes, detail:	
Formalin,	
Pyceze,	
Chloramine	
If other, detail:	V
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	1 V
Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	1
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail: Formalin	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	1
Biosecurity Records	
4.5:	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	·
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottisl	Ministers or veterinary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	
A lieuth a attend that will be talked in the account that the account	an acceptation of the management of a list and allocated
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on health status, certification if required)?	the farm site been covered (equal of higher
riedili status, certification il requileu)!	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented be	atwoon each anidomiological unit to minimica
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors	•
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to	
aquaculture animals held on site?	maintain the physical containment of
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented	d on site?
If no, detail:	. on exe.
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on b	pehalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 13/0	02/2017 - 14/02/2018

FITI 059, VEISIOIT II						issueu by. Ffii							
	Case no:	2018-00)38	Site No:		FS0301			Date of Samplin		14/0	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Jampiin	g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:	SAE		VMD No	· [8
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL				
	Average weight	50g	50g	50g	50g	50g	50g		50g				
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A				
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW				
Stock Details		Marine Harvest Ireland	LA Marine Harvest Ireland	Marine Harvest Ireland	Marine Harvest Ireland	യ Marine Harvest Ireland	യ Marine Harvest Ireland	ک Marine Harvest Ireland	ک Marine Harvest Ireland				
0)	1. 20, 1.10	7.1	/ \ I	וש	וט	1 3	1 3	1 . 1	1 1				

Additional Sample Information:															
	multiple fish per sample														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														

Site No: FS0301

Case No: 2018-0038

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0038			Date of visit:	14/02/2018						
Site No:	FS0301 Inspector: SAE										
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification									
,	•	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
						ļ					
						.					
	1	-		1	-	├──		+			
						 					
	1			1	1	 		1			
D 0				1							
Report Summary	D :		nd .								
Case Type VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp PMM								
VMD	21/02/2018	SAE	PMM	4							
				4							
				4							
				1							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0125 DATE OF VISIT 14/02/2018

SITE NO FS0301 SITE NAME Couldoran Hatchery

INSPECTOR Svenja Elwenn CASE NO 20180038

Inspection under The Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits)(England and Scotland) Regulations 2015 and the Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits)(England and Scotland) Regulations 2015 and the Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:



Date: 21/02/2018

Fish Health Inspector

R20

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

FHI 059, Version 11	I:	ssued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0039			Date of	of visit: 14/02/2018
Time spent on site:	3 hrs	Mair	n Inspector:	SAE
Site No: FS0300 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Damph Scottish Sea Farms	Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6	_
Water Temp (°C): 3.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 04	45 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	- Co	GP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		Y If yes, see additi	ional information/	clinical score sheet. clinical score sheet. clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:		

Additional Case Information:

Site received stock from Couldoran hatchery 7 days ago. Water peaty so visibility limited. Some fish with fungus observed on site, these were deeper in the cage and appeared to be actively swimming. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Site and T205 3.4C

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0039		Site No:	FS0300				
Date of Visit:		14/02/2018]		Inspector(s):	SAE		1
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	es inspected	14
Species	SAL							
Age group	2018 S1							
No Fish	159,000							
Mean Fish Wt	50g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	April 2018		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Septembe	r 2018	
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement record		r inconction?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					24/02/2016	<u>'</u>
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	>				24/02/2010	N
4. Are movement re-		•						Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered?	>					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	ductions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a systematical syste		• •		•				Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Biogas - Ene	raen. Cumb	pernauld	
If other detail:					29.00	<u> </u>		
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		Fish on site:	since 7/2/18: 2	2-183 per day	per site		
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period of	nockod?					N/A
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	i illortality du	ning penoa cr	ieckeu?					IN/A
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	[
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: Formiin, Pyceze	Treatments and Medicines Records	
If yes, detail: Formlin, Pyceze 2. Medicines records available for inspection? Y Y A. Are fish in a withdrawal period? Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y		Y
Formlin, Pyceze P		
If other, detail: Pyceze 2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 8. Have any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 4. 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? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. The secults of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	· ·	
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? If other, detail: 7. All since stored appropriately? If other, detail: 8. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 8. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines appropriately. If other, detail: 9. Are medicines stored appropriately? If other, detail: 9. Are medicines appropriately. If ot		$\overline{}$
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? Formalin If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	·	·
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? N/A Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Yellow the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A N/A any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	·	
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? N/A Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	'
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		NI/A
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	IN/A
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? NA 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Biosecurity Records	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	more account (arrangement) in citating at the citation account more account in citation at the citation account in citation ac	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	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)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No in the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	ricality states, certification is required;	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	6. Have the husbandry and hissocyrity massures implemented between each enidemiological unit to minimise	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		'
If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		ı
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Results of Surveillance	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by or on behalf of the business?	N
3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		N/A
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Records checked between: 24/02/2016 - 14/02/2018	ii yes, detaii (ii not detailed diidei recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 24/02/2016 - 14/02/2018		
	Records checked between: 24/02/2016 - 14/02/2018	

	ii 059, versiori i i								ueu by.				
	Case no:	2018-0	039	Site No:		FS0300			Date of Samplin		14/	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		ig. HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	30:00	15:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:	SAE		VMD N	o.	14
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	50g											
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Water Type	FW											
Details		Couldoran Hatchery											
상	Stock Origin	9	8	Sol	Sou	Sol	Sol	Sou	So l	Sol	8	Col	Cou
Stock	Facility No	7	7	7		8	_		8		9		9

	Additional Sample Information:												
	mutiple	fish ma	de up ea	ach sam	ple								
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												
				٠									
SAL	SAL												
50g	50g												
N/A	N/A												
FW	FW												
<u>></u>	Z.												
She	che												
latí	late												
n T	n F												
ora	ora												
ng	nlď												
Couldoran Hatchery	Couldoran Hatchery												
	q												

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0039		Site No:	FS0300		Insp:	SAE
Date of Visit	14/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or				40	00	
species	compartment including third country Number of suppliers			9	18 10	26 14	0
			0				
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Exposure via water	Number of desi	Site contacts	_			10	3
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	, <u> </u>	I -3	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I	4	0	4		
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	1	2	4		
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters					
processors			0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	_				
	equivalent statu	ıs	4				0
		from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0]			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3	1			0
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	•	5	1			0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	ı 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	<u> </u> 			
between sites, use of	No		0				0
footbaths etc	110		1	J			0
CoGP/Regulator	IVaa		T .	1			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes]			0
and the second second	No		2				0
	I			J			
					Total		16
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0039		Site No:	FS0300	
	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the	e previous 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm I	Management Area (or equival	ent) fallowed synchronously c	on a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and emcan these be deployed	namectin benzoate) as well as d in a reasonable period of tin ocumented farm management	in-feed and bath sea lice med s access to suitable biological ne? agreement or statement relev	and/or med	hanical control measur	res, and
•		n? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	;)		
	·	ard specified in the SSI and th		egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. sali</i> records are inspected		e suggested criteria for treatme	ent in the C	oGP during the period	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected) numbers per fish been at a le	evel of 3 or a	above during the period	d that
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish Health	Inspectorate? If no, FHI see c	comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is cor	sidered to cause significant w	elfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	.3.50)
		or other actions taken when the state of the			
11. Has any other acti	on been taken (where applica	ble)?			
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the actions take	n had a significant impact upo	on the lice le	vels recorded?	
		cooperation between particip fewer populations or part populations	~		t for
	cific written lice management escalation of a sea lice infesta	procedure with waypoints des tion?	cribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in rel	ation to sea lice level and sea	lice count o	data? If no please detai	1
Containment Inspec	tion				
•		to predators in the current or	previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against the pre	edation experienced on site? (I	Detail below	<i>ı</i>)	Υ
If other datail balan					
If other, detail below Top nets, tensioned n					
•		ced on or in the vicinity of the	site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with qu	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to qu	estion 10		·	
•	eported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwit	n (where they exist)? (CoGP –	- 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local	fisheries trusts forthwith (whe	ere they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)
7. Were methods (if a	ny) used to recover escapees	? If yes give detail			
		with local wild fish interests an	nd was perm	nission given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, Coo	·	ha rick of further accessed (N	ot ocupred :	n codo but sould	
		he risk of further escapes? (N	ot covered i	TI COde but could	
	er satisfactory measures of		a detail rece	on(s)	Υ
To. Is the site inspecte	tu as salisiaciony with regards	s to containment? If no, please	c detail feas	011(5)	· ·

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0039			Date of visit	: 14/02/2018			
Site No:	FS0300	1		Inspector	: SAE]		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notifica	tion		
	'	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	_			-				
Report Summary				4				
Case Type ECI, CNI, VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	_				
ECI, CNI, VMD	21/02/2018	SAE	PMM					





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0125Date of Visit 14/02/2018Site NoFS0300Site NameLoch DamphInspectorSvenja ElwennCase No20180039

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

 FS numbers must be recorded in the source/destination section of the movement record book, to allow for better traceability of stocks. The bus-stop delivery and water exchange must also be recorded in the movement record book. It was discussed with the site manager that his would be recorded in future. No further action is required.

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

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits)(England and Scotland) Regulations 2015 and the Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013

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 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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 21/02/2018

R04

FHI 059, Version 11	ls	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0040			Date of visit: 14/02/2018
Time spent on site:	3 hours	Main Ins	pector: ASM
Site No: FS0805 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Bagh Dail Nan Cean Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.3	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-40
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

BDNC, PNG and Shuna stocked at the moment. All to be fallow at the end of March/beginning of April. BDNC will be empty next followed by PNG and Shuna.

Salmosan treated in December. Had impact on lice numbers

Freshwater treatment from 05/12/17 - 12/12/17 using a wellboat. Reportedly very effective at removing lice.

In relation to SLI section Q15: Specific sea lice level detailed when the manager would discuss with area manager if a treatment is required. A threshold of 3 adult females per fish was detailed. No other information on the action that is required when sea lice reach certain levels/waypoints.

Only two cages of fish left as the site is harvesting. Divers on site on the day of the inspection prior to harvest later in the day.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017	
Case No:	2018-0040		Site No:	FS0805					
Date of Visit:		14/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	ASM]	
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ils summary		ite representa	itive?			Y Y]	
Site Details									
Total No facilities Species	SAL	10	Facilities sto	cked	2	No facilities	s inspected	10	
	2016 Q4 49,766								
Mean Fish Wt	7.2kg								
Next Fallow Date (Si	te)	19/02/18		Next Input Da	te (Site)	August 201	18		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last v	visit)?	N	
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									
Mortality records a How are mortalities If other detail:		•			Whole fish - I	Dundas Che	emicals	Y	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y	
4. Recent mortality (•	·		mainly attribu	ted to backgro	und mortali	ty		
5. Evidence of recen		•						N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility/	/reason:					
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					Y	
•		• .		treatments (sa	almosan) in O	ctober (1.4%	6). Reported	to FHI.	
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?									
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev				ring the treatm		lity events s	heet.	Y	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		
4. December 100 and 10		

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

12/10/17 - 14/02/18 Records checked between:

FHI 009, VEISIOII I I						issued by. Fili							
	Case no:	2018-00)40	Site No:		FS0805			Date of Samplin		14/0	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:	ASM		VMD No	o.	29
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	6kg	7kg										
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Loch Garry	Loch Garry										
Ċ.	Tacility NO	8	4										

	Additional Sample Information:														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 11 Issued by: FHI				Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017	
Case Number:	2018-0040		Site No:	FS0805		Insp:	ASM
Date of Visit	14/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Mayamanta aff			0			10	10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3
Exposure via water	1.14.11.50.01.450	Site contacts	0				
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through	0				
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or l	or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)	farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion			2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III 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 pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes						0
100000 10 00000	No		2				
					Total Popk		MEDIUM
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0040		Si	te No:	FS0805		
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)						
•	nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years	s?				Υ
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or equ	ivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a	single y	ear class basis?		Υ
azamethiphos and emac can these be deployed	access to a range of licen amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm managem	ell as access to suitab f time?	ole biological and	d/or mecl	hanical control me	asures, and	Y
Management Area (or							
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspe	ction? (Legal SSI, Co	oGP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required sta	andard specified in th	e SSI and the C	oGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP A	nnex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	v the suggested criter	ria for treatment	in the Co	oGP during the per	riod that	N
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	onis) numbers per fish	h been at a level	l of 3 or a	above during the p	eriod that	Υ
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Hea	alth Inspectorate? If n	no, FHI see comi	ment.			Υ
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause	significant welfa	are proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.8	31, 5.3.50)	N
	reatments been administer reatment or where <i>C. eloc</i>						Y
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	olicable)?					Υ
•	reatments or the actions t		nt impact upon th	ne lice le	vels recorded?		Υ
•	ere conducted, carried or	-					Υ
	ng strategy for the site, wh	·	•	~		ment for	Y
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice infe		aypoints describ	oing set a	actions to deal with	recognised	N
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in	n relation to sea lice le	evel and sea lice	e count d	lata? If no please o	detail	Υ
Containment Inspect	ion						
•	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	he current or pre	evious pro	oduction cycles?		N
•	ce to mitigate against the	•	•	-	-		Υ
Tensioned nets, ADI			,		,		
If other, detail below:							
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been exper	ienced on or in the vi	icinity of the site	since the	e last FHI inspection	on?	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to	o question 10					
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Ministe	rs?					
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forth	nwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.	4.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and le	ocal fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where t	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37	7, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give deta	il				
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish	n interests and w	as perm	ission given by Sc	ottish	
	en to prevent and minimi	se the risk of further	escanes? (Not o	overed in	n code but could		
	r satisfactory measures		cocapes: (Not c	JVGIGU II	T Sout but could		
	d as satisfactory with reg	· ·	If no please de	tail reas	on(s)		Υ
. c. le the ene mopeote	a as successfully with rog	a. ab to contaminant:	110, p.0000 00		(0)		

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0040	Site No: FS0805	
Date of Visit: 14/02/201	8 Inspector: ASM	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	d within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	pletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farn	n Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish factorial	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or stateme	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana	ngement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	num health standards for the stocks to be introd	duced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the special. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxindividual farm?	nation requirements for stocks held in the area cies of fish which may be stocked into the area timum stocking density of any pen on any farm ngements for the storage and disposal of any d	or farm? in the area or the
fish farm in the area or the individual		lead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	t of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the avai of statement?	lability and the use of medicines on farms cove	red by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual f	uirements for the sensitivity testing of available farms?	treatments for sea Y
	umstances under which biological controls and	cleaner fish are to be
	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	umstances when live fish may be introduced or	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the array or individual farms?	ngements for the movement of live fish on and	off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	le harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restored.	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow cked?	and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether cagreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	res covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept t?	on any site N
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	I operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 1st March 2017	

Feq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp	Case No:	2018-0040			Date of visit:	14/02/2018			
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Insp Phone Ins	Site No:	FS0805]		Inspector	ASM]		
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2nd Insp	Results Summary	Freq	_				tion		
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT	resource Summary		Database	Insp				Insp	2 nd Insp
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT							, ,		2 11100
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT		<u> </u>							
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT		+					-		
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT		+							
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT		1							
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT									
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT		_	_	-					
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT Case completion 11/04/2018 ASM ALW	Report Summary				_				
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD 05/03/2018 ASM DJT Case completion 11/04/2018 ASM ALW	Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case completion 11/04/2018 ASM ALW	ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	05/03/2018	ASM	DJT	_				
	Case completion	11/04/2018	ASM	ALW	_				
		<u> </u>			_				
					-				
					-				
					-				
		+							
		+							
		+		+					





Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0119 **DATE OF VISIT** 14/02/2018

SITE No FS0805 SITE NAME Bagh Dail Nan Cean

INSPECTOR Andy Mayes Case No 20180040

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 09/04/18. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed: Date: 11/04/2018

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





Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0119 **Date of Visit** 14/02/2018

SITE No FS0805 SITE NAME Bagh Dail Nan Cean

INSPECTOR Andy Mayes Case No 20180040

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had 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) Regulations 1997

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

On this occasion the following recommendation was issued in relation to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice):

 There was no site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation.

The following recommendation was also made in relation to section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements:

• The farm management agreement does not identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement (see annex below).

Records or documentation demonstrating that this point has been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of this report. The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above point not be taken within the time period stipulated.

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

Signed: Date: 07/03/2018
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

R25

Annex - The Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

Section 4A of the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, introduces the requirement for a person carrying out the business of fish farming within a farm management area⁽¹⁾ to;

- (a) be party to a farm management agreement, or prepare and maintain a farm management statement, in relation to the fish farm, and
- (b) ensure that the fish farm is managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement.

A copy of this annex has been sent to Kames Fish Farming as signatories to the farm management agreement for area M40.

⁽¹⁾ Farm management area means an area specified as such in the Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture

FHI 059, Version 11	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017					
Case No: 2018-0041			Date of visit: 14/02/2018					
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Main Ins	spector: JET					
Site No: FS1292 Business No: FB0561	Site Name: Business Name:	EPPE Centre EPP Ltd						
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 17.5	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: LO	Water type: B	CoGP MA:					
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:						
	Water temperatu	re above 14 degrees Celcius						

Additional Case Information:

Movement book for Shellfish business required.

Rainbow trout came on site 30th January

REG case carried out as water temperature currently above 14 degrees Celsius. When fish brought on site water kept at ambient temperature (9 degrees Celsius) and then gradually increased 1 degree Celsius per day and then maintained between 17-18 degrees Celsius.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0041		Site No:	FS1292	2			
Date of Visit:		14/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	JET		1
Registration/Author 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		47	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilitie	es inspected	47
	RTR 2018							
3-3-1	2018 97							
	97 1.8g							
Widaii i idii vvt		April 2018		Next Input Da	oto (Sito)	Summer 2	204.0	
Next Fallow Date (Si	(e)	April 2016		Next Input Da	ate (Sile)	Summer	2018	
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	lisease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		л порсси					09/11/2015	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement red	cords availab	ole for dead fis	sh and waste?					Y
5. Are records comp		•						Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	ductions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst								Y
Mortality Records	Sill ill place .	IOI IIIdii iio.i.d.	ice of transpe.	tation 1000.us				
1. Mortality records a		•			Tau (1.4.7)			Y
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail))		
If other detail: 3. Mortality records of			• ,	ed by Labwast	.e			Y
4. Recent mortality (I	•	1 COITectly em	3 across site					,
5. Evidence of recen	•	etypical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				
		·						
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	- ambinad)	talitian ha	reported to	t on EUI2				N/A
7. Have increased (ull fixed), detail action:	nexplairieu)	mortalities be	en reported to) Vet of Finis				TV//
8. Have 'mortality eve	ents' been re	eported to FH	l? If no, add N	IRT case and	enter on morta	ality events :	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

Treatments and Medicines Records		
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		N1/A
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		N/A
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		IN/A
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		N/A
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		V
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, record	ding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Score.	•	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the prese		Y
is detected been included and how and when that will be not		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked	d on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?		
Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	nd hatwaan aach anidamialagiaal unit ta minimiaa	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, vis		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place	·	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately impleme	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or	on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		

Records checked between: 09/11/2015 - 14/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:				
Case Number:	2018-0041		Site No:	FS1292		Insp:	JET
Date of Visit	14/02/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS			5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or			9	18	26	
op 00.00	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0			14	0
NA			0				
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	0
Exposure via water	Trainibor or door	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III		_			_
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iairiis upstreair	TOT WILLIIT T LIGAT EXCUISION	<u>'</u>	4	o o		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0	1			0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				_
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
		from Category III farm	8	1			
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	•			
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				_
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			
ooo or unpaotoanooa roodo	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites] 2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0		2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			
between sites, use of	No		0	-			
footbaths etc	110		1				
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry			0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
. Idilomi doocoo to dages	No		2				
	1.10			J			
					Total		0
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2018-0041		Site N	No:	FS1292		
Sea Lice Inspection (3	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	n the previous 4 years?	•			Г	
•	lanagement Area (or equ			gle ye	ear class basis?	- 1	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licent amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period of cumented farm managen	ell as access to suitable of time?	e biological and/or	mech	nanical control measu	ires, and	
•	cords available for inspe	ection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)			Г	
	ely reflect the required st		·	P? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteri	a for treatment in th	he Co	GP during the period	that	
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (L. salmo	onis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3	3 or al	bove during the perio	od that	
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see commen	nt.		Г	
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause s	ignificant welfare p	oroble	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)	
	eatments been administreatment or where <i>C. elo</i>						
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	plicable)?				Г	
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions	taken had a significant	impact upon the lic	ce lev	els recorded?		
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried o	ut in cooperation betwe	een participating fa	ırms?			
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, when					L	
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice info		ypoints describing	set ac	ctions to deal with red	cognised	
16. Does the stock on streasons.	site appear satisfactory in	n relation to sea lice le	vel and sea lice co	unt da	ata? If no please deta	ail [
Containment Inspecti		des to mandators in the			dustis such s 0	5	,
•	nced equipment damage	•	•	•	•	Y	,
Site inside	ce to mitigate against the	e predation expenence	d on site? (Detail b	elow)		T	
If other, detail below:							
il other, detail below.							
If Yes proceed with que	nts or events been expensestions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Minister	o question 10	inity of the site sinc	ce the	last FHI inspection?	N	l
5. Have these been rep	oorted to local DSFB fort	hwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37	7, 5.4.	.17)	г	
6. Have these been rep	oorted to the SSPO and I	ocal fisheries trusts for	thwith (where they	exist))? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	pees? If yes give detail					
	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish	interests and was p	permi	ssion given by Scotti	sh	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		·				
	en to prevent and minim	_	scapes? (Not cover	red in	code but could		
	r satisfactory measure	· L	,				
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with reg	ards to containment?	r no, please detail i	reaso	on(s)	Υ	

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0041	Date of visit: 14/02/2018									
Site No:	FS1292	Inspector: JET									
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification									
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
		_									
							_				
	+	+				+		_			
	+		+			+	+				
						+					
		1									
Report Summary	_	_		7							
Case Type	Date	lnon	ond L	4							
		Insp	2 nd Insp	4							
REG	16/02/201	O JE I	WJM	-							
			+	4							
				-							
				-							
				1							
				4							
		1									
		1	1								
	1	1									





EPP Ltd
EPP Environmental Centre
Bush Estate
Penicuik
EH26 0PH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0561Date of Visit 14/02/2018Site NoFS1292Site NameEPPE CentreInspectorJoe TriscottCase No20180041

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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 Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 16/02/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue:	12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0045			Date of visit: 08/02	/2018
Time spent on site:	1h	Main	Inspector: DJT	
Site No: FS0681 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Hatchery Landcatch Natural Se	lection I td	
Case Types: 1 IMP	2 3	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed	
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		n If yes, see addition	onal information/clinical score shonal information/clinical score shonal information/clinical score sh	neet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail r	reason below:		

An import inspection was conducted on a consignment of 1,500,000 Atlantic salmon ova imported from the Kindrum Freshwater Unit operated by Marine Harvest (Ireland) Ltd. Ova was disinfected prior to being laid down for hatching, the health certificate (INTRA.IE.2018.0001697/EXP-2381) was present and completed correctly. No issues raised.

Case No:	2018-0045	Date of visit: 08/02/2018								
Site No:	FS0681	1		Inspector:	DJT]				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
Papart Summan										
Report Summary	Data	laaa	ond .							
Case Type	Date 16/02/2018	Insp	2 nd Insp							
imp	10/02/2016	ונטו	WJM							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 08/02/2018

SITE NO FS0681 SITE NAME Ormsary Hatchery

INSPECTOR David Tomlinson CASE No 20180045

Inspection of a consignment introduced into Scotland

An inspection was conducted at Ormsary Hatchery on a consignment of 1,500,000 Atlantic salmon ova introduced into Scotland from Kindrum Freshwater Unit, operated by Marine Harvest (Ireland) Ltd.

The accompanying health certificate met the requirements of the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 and the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012.

The consignee must retain the original health certificate for at least 3 years.

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

Signed: -

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/02/2018

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

FHI 059, Version 11	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/201								
Case No: 2018-0048			Date of visit: 26/02/2018								
Time spent on site:	hour	Main	Inspector: JET								
Site No: SS0917	Site Name:	John Muir Building									
Business No: SB0544	Business Name:	Heriot Watt University									
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 3	4 5	6								
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed								
Observations:	Region: LO	Water type: S	CoGP MA:								
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.									
Clinical signs of disease observed	1 ?		nal information/clinical score sheet.								
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet.								
Diagnostic samples taken?		N									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:										

Oysters to be moved to Dornoch Firth site in March 2018

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017		
Case No:	2018-0048		Site No:	SS0917	7					
Date of Visit:		26/02/2018	,		Inspector(s):	JET		1		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			N N	}		
Site Details										
Total No facilities		2	Facilities sto	cked	2	No facilitie	es inspected	2		
	OED Mix									
3 - 3 1	WIIX 420									
	420 Mix									
Wearr isir vvt		March 2018		Next Input Da	oto (Sito)	Summer 2	2010			
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	IVIAICH 2016		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Sulline 2	.018			
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? N Any escapes (since last visit)? N yes, detail:										
Movement Records	s									
1. Movement record		or inspection?						Y		
2. Date of last inspec	ection:	·					First inspect			
3. Are records comp		•						Y		
4. Are movement red								N/A		
5. Are records comp6. Are health certification		•		chlo?				N/A N/A		
		Juctions (outw	Illi GD) avano	ible :				14/7		
Transport Records										
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst					-					
Mortality Records	CITI RI P.C.	Of main.	30 01 (13)	tation 100						
Mortality records a	available for	inepaction?						Y		
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail))				
			eld and remov	ved in line with	, ,	,	disposal			
3. Mortality records of				00	110.11	II II CO.	Cicp	Y		
4. Recent mortality (•	5 across site)						
5. Evidence of recen		* *						N		
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:						
6. Any other peaks in	in mortality du	uring period ch	necked?					l N		
If yes, detail:	1110	illig police	CORO .							
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A		
If yes, detail action:										
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	sheet.	N/A		

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal helalth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Treatments and Medicines Records	
If yes, detail: If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results?	1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: 7. It yes, are results available for inspection? 8. Any significant results?		
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 8. Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	If other, detail:	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	Biosecurity Records	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Any significant results?		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No. 1 In the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included? Ye have the procedure of a listed disease in place to subject to maintain the procedure of the procedure of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of a listed disease in place to suspicion of the presence of the presence of the presence of the pres		
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		Υ
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	4. Here the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or avanision of the presence of a listed disease.	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		·
health status, certification if required)? 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.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No. 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	6. Have the husbandry and higsecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	· · ·	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		
Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?	·	Y
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results?		
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? ———————————————————————————————————	Results of Surveillance	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? ———————————————————————————————————	Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
3. Any significant results?		

Records checked between: First inspection

FHI 059, Version 11 Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 12/09/2017 Case Number: 2018-0048 SS0917 Site No: Date of Visit JET 26/02/2018 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen No Yes Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 25 25 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 0 3 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion 0 2 10 0 0 1-2 >3 Live shellfish movements 0 5 10 O Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 0 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 0 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 0 1 2 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 3 6 3 Areas 0 Number of destinations 3 6 **Secure Unsecure** Management (effluent (no effluent practices None treatment) treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area 0 2 6 n Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 4 8 0 area **Number of sites** 1 2 or 3 > 4 Biosecurity Sites operating from single shorebase 0 Contacts with other sites Sites sharing staff and equipment Yes No Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0

Total Risk

Case No:	2018-0048]		Date of visit:	26/02/2018]				
Site No:	SS0917]		Inspector: JET						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
			L							
Report Summary				1						
	Dete	1	and .	4						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI	06/03/2018	JE I	DJT	4						
	+	<u> </u>	1	-						
				-						
			 							





Heriot Watt University John Muir Building Heriot Watt University Riccarton Campus, Edinburgh EH14 4AS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No SB0544 DATE OF VISIT 26/02/2018

SITE NAME CASE NO SITE No SS0917 John Muir Building

INSPECTOR Joe Triscott 20180048

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 06/03/2018

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

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI		Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017				
Case No: 2018-0049				Date of visit: 27/0)2/2018				
Time spent on site:	.5 hours	M	ain Inspector	: JET					
Site No: FS0339	Site Name:	Furnace (FW)							
Business No: FB0235	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture	e (Freshwater	r) Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 10	Thermometer No:	T147]	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•		N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Clinical signs of disease observe	:d?			nation/clinical score					
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see add	ditional inform	nation/clinical score	sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	l reason below:							

Next input of fry due in from Cairndow, site may no longer hatch own eggs due to historic issues with salmon gill pox on site. Fish vaccinated with PD7 vaccine January 2018 Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy

FHI 059, Version 11			Issı	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0049		Site No:	FS0339	ગ			
Date of Visit:		27/02/20	018		Inspector(s	s): JET]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		by site represent	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		18	Facilities sto	ocked	7	No facilitie	es inspected	18
	SAL 2018 S1							
Age group No Fish	2018 S1							
	507,871 140g							
Mean Fish Wt		N/A		Next Input Da	rata (Sita)	May 2018		
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	IN/A		Next Input Do		May 2018		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	olems?		Y	Y Any escap	oes (since last v	visit)?	N
,			fungus (post vac			•		
 Movement records Date of last inspect Are records comp Are movement records Are records comp Are health certificat Transport Records Are any movement If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records Mortality records at 	ection: plete and corrected available eates for intro eates fo	rrectly entered ble for dead rectly entered boductions (or one for mainter	red? d fish and waste? red? butwith GB) availa n behalf) of the bunance of transpo	lable? ousiness (not us		?	22/08/2017	Y Y Y N/A
2. How are mortalities of other detail:	es disposed (of?			Biogas - E	nergen, Cumb	ernauld	
3. Mortality records of	complete an	d correctly	entered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (·	Tooneen	19376 (3.6%	%) across site a 2018 7218, has		•	•	
5. Evidence of recen	`	/atypical mo	artalities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		v/reason:				
	The tan y	10.0	0.00	71.02.32				
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality d	uring period	d checked?					N
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities	been reported t	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been r	eported to	FHI? If no, add N	MRT case and	enter on mo	ortality events s	sheet.	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?
If yes, detail: Formalin, T.M.S.
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)? Formalin, T.M.S.
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?
moroacca (anoxidamea) menang at the electronal actions and the electronal actions are also also actions and actions are also actions and actions are also actions and actions are also actions at all actions are also actions are
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?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?
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.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?
If no, detail:
Results of Surveillance
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
3. Any significant results?
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).
Records checked between: 22/08/2017 - 27/02/2018

П	ai 059, version i i					ISSUEU DY. FITI							
	Case no:	2018-00)49	Site No:		FS0339			Date of v		27/0	02/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		,. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:	JET		VMD No).	18
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	_	5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	F	PA		Total Sa	mples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-8	9-16	17-20	21-24	25-28	29-32	33-36					
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	0.1400	0.1400	0.1400	0.1400	0.1400	0.1400	0.1400					
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
			_	,	,		,						
		ler)	iery	iery	ier)	iery	iery	iery					
		달	tch	tch	ıtch	tch	tch	itch					
		岩	Ha	На	На	На	Ha	На					
ails		<u>></u>	ΜC	ΜC	ΜC	ΝĆ	ΜC	ΜC					
Details		ndc											
X	Stock Origin	Cairndow Hatchery											
Stock	Facility No	B3	A4		A2	A1		B1					
U)	1 40	D0	/\ 1	AU	/\Z	Al	DZ	וט					

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0049		Site No:	FS0339		Insp:	JET
Date of Visit	27/02/2018		No of me	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or			4.0		
species	compartment in Number of supp	cluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
Exposure via water	Number of dest	Site contacts	0		6-10	10	3
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	. <u>U</u>	I-5	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	oorehole)	0				ш
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		or in a coastal zone with category III 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 pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	1				
	equivalent statu	from Category III farm	4	1			-
		from Category V farm	10				\vdash
			10]			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products			0				0
products		sses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised 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 st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0]			0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				H
					Total		14
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2018-0049		Site No:	FS0339	
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or equi	valent) fallowed synch	nronously on a single	year class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licent amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period of cumented farm managem	II as access to suitable time?	biological and/or me	chanical control measur	es, and
•	ecords available for inspec	ction? (Legal SSL CoG	P Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required sta		·	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criteria	for treatment in the 0	CoGP during the period t	that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	nis) numbers per fish b	peen at a level of 3 or	r above during the period	d that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Hea	Ith Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause si	gnificant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50)
	reatments been administer reatment or where <i>C. elor</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	licable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions to	aken had a significant i	impact upon the lice I	levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried ou	it in cooperation betwe	en participating farms	s?	
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, wh				
	ific written lice manageme scalation of a sea lice infe		points describing set	actions to deal with reco	ognised
16. Does the stock on streasons.	site appear satisfactory in	relation to sea lice lev	rel and sea lice count	data? If no please detai	1
Containment Inspecti	ion				
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	current or previous p	production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced	I on site? (Detail belo	w)	Y
Site inside					
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que	nts or events been experiestions 4 – 9. If No skip to	question 10	nity of the site since t	he last FHI inspection?	N
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forth	with (where they exist)	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)	
	ported to the SSPO and lo		•		4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deple	oyed was this action agre	ed with local wild fish in	nterests and was per	mission given by Scottis	h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG					
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimis	se the risk of further es	capes? (Not covered	in code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures	of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with rega	ards to containment? If	no, please detail rea	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0049	Date of visit: 27/02/2018							
Site No:	FS0339	Inspector: JET							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification					
,	,	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
						-			
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
Case Type ECI,CNI,VMD	06/03/2018	JET	DJT						





Cooke Aquaculture (Freshwater) Ltd Crowness Road Hatston Kirkwall Orkney KW15 1RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0235
SITE NO FS0339
INSPECTOR Joe Triscott

DATE OF VISIT 27/02/2018
SITE NAME Furnace (FW)
CASE NO 20180049

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

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

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

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 06/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	ls	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0050			Date of visit: 27/02/2018
Time spent on site:	3 hours	Main Ins	spector: JET
Site No: FS0260 Business No: FB0456	Site Name: Business Name:	Braevallich Farm Dawnfresh Farming Ltd	
Case Types: 1 REP	2 ESC 3 CNA	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additiona	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:	

ESC (MSe010218RTR) - FHI notified of possible escape event on 01/02/2018 when a hole was discovered on the net of cage G1 during a routine net inspection. The last full inspection of the net took place on 04/01/2018. The local fisheries trust and DSFB were also notified. The net was repaired the same day, fish from cage G1 were then transferred to a different cage and counted the following week, where it was discovered that 5400 fish had escaped, the cage had been holding 9762 fish (average weight 950g, triploid stock), no fish had been observed outside the cages prior to the hole being discovered. The FHI were notified of the confirmed escape on 13/02/2017. All other nets on site have since been inspected. There was no attempt made to recapture the escaped fish, as it was not known when exactly they would have escaped, there was no response from the fisheries trust or DSFB to the notification of the escape. The damaged net, which was originally installed on the site in November 2017, was sent to the manufacturer (Boris Nets), to investigate the cause of the hole and to be repaired. Boris nets reported that the net had not been properly stitched at the point where the hole was found and have accepted liability for the escape. They have also changed their manufacturing method so that nets are now hand stitched as opposed to mechanically.

FHI 059, Version 11		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0050		Site No:	FS0260				
Date of Visit:		27/02/201	8		Inspector(s):	JET]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		28	Facilities sto	cked	21	No facilitie	s inspected	28
Species	RTR	RTR		I		110 100	1	
Age group	2017	2016						
No Fish	376,989	140,676						
Mean Fish Wt	300g	962g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ŭ	N/A		Next Input Da	te (Site)	April 2018		
Troxer anow Bato (C		1 4/7 (Noxt input bu	•	7 (pm 2010		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	Υ
If yes, detail:	See addition	al comments	3			,		
Marrament Danaud								
Movement Records								
1. Movement record		r inspection?					22/02/2017	Y
 Date of last inspects Are records comp 		oothy optorod	2				22/02/2017	Y
4. Are movement re		•						N/A
5. Are records comp								N/A
6. Are health certific		•		able?				Y
		(, , ,					
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t hy (or on he	shalf) of the hi	isiness (not lisi	ing a STR)?			
If yes, is there a syst		• ,		· ·				
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:	·							
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly en	tered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		1204 (0.2%)	across site po	or doers			
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	itypical morta	alities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no st	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:		. 15.5		, =::::0				N1/A
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	een reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	rantal baan ==	ported to EU	IO If no odd M	DT aggs and a	ntor on morts	ality ayanta a	phoot	N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FH	re ii no, add M	Kir case and e	enter on morta	anty events s	sneet.	IN/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?	
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.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Pacards chacked between: 22/10/2017 - 27/02/2018	

Case No:	2018-0050	Site No:	FS0260	
Date of visit:	27/02/2018	Inspector(s):	JET	
Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (FRESHWATER)		•		
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency pro	cedures			
1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		Y		
If yes answer 1.2-1.8: 1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	Y	CoGP 2.4.31, 3.4.39	DSFB and Fisheries trust notified
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail		N	-	
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	Dawnfresh notified DSFB and FT of escape. No further communication regarding whether to attempt to recapture escapees or not.
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed of appropriate mesh size with regard the size of the escaped fish?	Low	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		Net sent back to manufacturer (Boris nets), who determined the net was not properly stiched, will now hand stich all nets, previously used mechanical method. Other nets on site inspected with no holes or damage to seams found.
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.28, 3.4.36 SSI, 2,9	Recapture strategy in place, seine nets are available, however no attempt was made following this escape event, site staff unsure as to when the escape occurred, did not discuss whether to attempt to recapture escapees or not with DSFB or FT.
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and t	he site			
General records				
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-		Facilities	SSI 2,1 Moorings Nets	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement		Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A	N/A	N/A	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
d) The date of purchase	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Υ	Υ	Υ	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Υ	Υ	Υ	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	N/A	Υ	Υ	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Υ	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Υ	1		
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Υ	1		
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Υ			
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:			1		
i) The date of construction	Low	Υ	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Υ	1		
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Υ	1		
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	Υ			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Υ			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Υ			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,5		
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters[3]			SSI, 2,6		
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A			
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	N/A			
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A			
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7		
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)		
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)		
Pen and mooring systems					

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that pens and moorings are designed, manufactured and installed suitable for purpose at the location of the site?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.11	
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Υ	CoGP 3.4.12	
2.10 Can the site demonstrate evidence that all nets have been designed and manufactured under the control of a Quality Management System to ensure they provide containment for the whole of their working life?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.13	Boris nets ISO 9001 - Copy of certificate of compliance held by site
2.11 Are all screens inspected daily and relevant action taken? Are	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	
records maintained of inspection frequency and the outcomes? 2.12 Are screens constructed from a suitably strong and robust material, and therefore fit for purpose?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.19	
2.13 Can the site demonstrate awareness of the minimum net strengths to be used at all times?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.14	
2.14 Does the site have a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.15	
2.15 Does the site use nylon nets older than 5 years?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.16	All nets are dyneema
2.16 Can site managers demonstrate awareness of the minimum fish size supplied where new stock is introduced?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.18	
2.17 Have nets been treated with UV inhibitor?	Low	Υ	CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low	Υ	CoGP 3.4.20, 3.4.21	
2.19 Can the site demonstrate evidence of nets being inspected and strength tested after each cycle by a competent person?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.22	Strength testing carried out annualy Highland Aqua Team
2.20 Is in accordance with a detailed procedure based on manufacturer's advise and using a documented quality control system?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.22	Highland Aqua team have calibration certificate for net strength tester
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23	
a) net base	High	Y		
b) side wall	High	Υ		
c) above the waterline	High	Υ		
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High	Υ	CoGP 3.4.24	
2.23 Are additional inspections undertaken following adverse weather where required?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.25	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Υ	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High	Υ	CoGP 7.4.7	
3.3 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working in the site in relation to any helicopter operations?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.27, 3.4.33	
3.4 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.35 SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37	
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk asset 4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	ssments	Y	CoGP 2.4.6, 3.4.8, 2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 2.4.23, 3.4.27 SSI 2,7, b SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments b) standard operating procedures	High High	Y Y		
c) contingency plan 4.3 Is the integrity of all handling equipment checked, including pipelines, pumps, transport tanks, graders, counters and vaccination stations, before fish are handled?	High High	Y	CoGP 2.4.24, 3.4.28	
4.4 Do these checks include the suitability of the above equipment for use during adverse weather conditions where appropriate?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.25, 3.4.29	
4.5 Are mitigation measures such as safety nets, security devices, or bunding used at potential risk points, such as pipe connections?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.26, 3.4.30	
4.6 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Υ	SSI 2,6,b	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N	1	
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?	Medium	Υ	2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.10 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including			SSI, 2,8,a	
-The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Υ	1	
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.11 Where predator nets are deployed is this done in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of access by predators? For example, see requirements of Annex 7.	Low	N/A	3.5.34-37 2.5.34-37	
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the site is not located within an area likely to be affected by flood, or suitable flood defences in place?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.4.11	
5.3 Does the site have effective measures in place to prevent fish from jumping out of holding facilities into surface waters or natural water courses?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.12	
5.4 Is the site inflow system designed to prevent any upstream escape of farm stock?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.14	
5.5 Are the screen sizes capable of containing the entire range of fish sizes within the unit in every instance?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.15	
5.6 In the case of a land-based aquaculture system, are there two screens incorporated into the outflow system of a suitable size to prevent the passage of fish in all potential water conditions?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.20	
5.7 Does the net mesh size contain the entire range of fish sizes in every instance of the species involved?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.17	
5.8 Are boat operations conducted in a manner which avoids damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.34	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	l High	Y	CoGP 3.4.24	Upper area of nets inspected daily, full net inspection where nets are fully pulled up out of water occur every 4-6 weeks.

,			- ,	_ = ===================================		
Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary		
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-a) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.31			
b) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.32			

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

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

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

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

Feq. Date of Notification Database Insp	Case No:	2018-0050	Date of visit: 27/02/2018							
Database Insp	Site No:	FS0260	Inspector: JET							
Database Insp	Results Summary	Frea.	Date of Notification							
Report Summary	,		Database	Insp				Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary Report Summary Case Type Date Insp Insp										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp Date Insp DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp Date Insp ESC, REP O6/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 27d Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 20d Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp Date Insp SC, REP 06/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2nd Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary										
Report Summary										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS										
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS	Report Summary									
ESC, REP 06/03/2018 JET DJT C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS	Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
C.N.A. 30/04/2018 JET RJS	ESC, REP	06/03/2018	JET	DJT						
	C.N.A.	30/04/2018	JET	RJS						
		.								





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0456Date of Visit27/02/2018Site NoFS0260Site NameBraevallich FarmInspectorJoe TriscottCase No20180050

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

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

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

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

Although a contingency plan is in place it is recommended that a documented review of the site-specific contingency plans that describe actions to be taken in the event of any escapes is carried out in consultation with the local Fisheries Trust and District Salmon Fishery Board. Specifically the protocols for discussing, implementing and resourcing recapture of escaped fish, whilst managing fisheries interactions.

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

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

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

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

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

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

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

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

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

Please do not hesitate to contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

Date: 30/04/2018

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

Scotland's Marine Atlas, an assessment of the condition of Scotland's seas, is available at www.scotland.gov.uk/marineatlas





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0456Date of Visit27/02/2018Site NoFS0260Site NameBraevallich FarmInspectorJoe TriscottCase No20180050

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of 5400 rainbow trout on 01 February 2018. (Marine Scotland escape incident number MSe010218RTR)

An enhanced containment inspection was conducted and a report will be issued separately.

All epidemiological units were inspected.

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 06/03/2018

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

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017								
Case No: 2018-0051			Date of visit: 20/03/2018								
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Main !	Inspector: JET								
Site No: FS0106 Business No: FB0071	Site Name: Business Name:	Allt Mhor JS Salmon Ltd									
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6								
Water Temp (°C): 7	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed								
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:								
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:											

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0051		Site No:	FS0106	j			
Date of Visit:		20/03/2018	3		Inspector(s):	JET		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities	_	44	Facilities sto	ocked	22	No facilitie	es inspected	44
	SAL S0.2018							
Age group No Fish	S0 2018 1,007,520							
	1,007,520 1g							
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Si		October 201	I Q	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	November	r 2018	
Next Fallow Date (5	il o)	000001 20	0	NOX! IIIpat = 1		November	2010	
Recent (last 4 wks) of lf yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement records	ls available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							16/03/2016	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement red								Y
5. Are records comp6. Are health certification		•		able?				Y
Transport Records		idolio	nai 32,					
		(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		OTD)0			
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst								Y
Mortality Records	letti ili piaco .	Of Inalitional.	Ce of transpe.	lation records				
Wortanty Noociac								
1. Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Domestic wa	ste - <25kg		
If other detail: 3. Mortality records of	complete and	Learnactly ant	12 mg d2					I Y
 Mortality records of Recent mortality (•	Correctly end		%) across site -	post hatch mo	ortality		·
5. Evidence of recen	`	atvoical morta) doross c.i.	poor nate.	Titality		N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
2 A surether packs i	in a set a littly du	· - revied o	1 1 12					N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period ci	necked?					N
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			·					
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and c	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

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

Records checked between:

16/03/2016 - 20/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 12/09/2					
Case Number:	2018-0051		Site No:	FS0106		Insp:	JET
Date of Visit	20/03/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		0	40	00	
species	compartment in Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
	Number of dest		0			10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Torm is protect	Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				ш
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
allocation)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III	1				ш
		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V	1	3	6		$\vdash \vdash$
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
		rfrom Category III farm	8				-
		from Category V farm	10				Н
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				-
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				-			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
•	No		2				$\vdash \vdash \vdash$
				J			
					Total		26
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2018-0051		Site N	lo: FS0106	
Sea Lice Inspection (1. Has the site experie	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in	n the previous 4 years?	?		
·	Ianagement Area (or equ			gle year class basis?	?
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licer amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm managen	ell as access to suitable of time?	e biological and/or	mechanical control r	measures, and
•	ecords available for inspe	ction? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required st		·	?? (Legal SSI, CoGF	P Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteri	a for treatment in th	ne CoGP during the	period that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	onis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3	3 or above during the	e period that
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If no	o, FHI see commen	t.	
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause s	significant welfare p	roblems? (CoGP 4.3	3.81, 5.3.50)
	reatments been administoreatment or where <i>C. elo</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	olicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions	taken had a significant	impact upon the lic	ce levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried o	ut in cooperation betwe	een participating fa	rms?	
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, w				
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice info		ypoints describing	set actions to deal w	ith recognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in	n relation to sea lice le	vel and sea lice cou	unt data? If no pleas	se detail
Containment Inspect	ion				
•	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	e current or previou	s production cycles	? N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	e predation experience	d on site? (Detail be	elow)	Y
Electric Fence, Tank	lids/covers				
If other, detail below:					
If Yes proceed with que	ents or events been expensestions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Minister	o question 10	inity of the site sind	e the last FHI inspe	ection?
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB fort	nwith (where they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37	. 5.4.17)	
	ported to the SSPO and I			·	1.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were depl	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish	interests and was p	permission given by	Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		·		
	en to prevent and minim	_	scapes? (Not cover	red in code but could	d
	r satisfactory measure	· L			B
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with reg	ards to containment?	If no, please detail i	reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0051			Date of visit:	20/03/2018			
Site No:	FS0106	1		Inspector:	JET]		
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notifica			
Results Guillinary	1 104.	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
								2 1100
				-	-			
	1							1
D + 0	•			1				
Report Summary	_							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	28/03/2018	JET	AJW					
				1				





JS Salmon Ltd Allt Mhor Hatchery Clachan Tarbert PA29 6XL

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0071
 Date of Visit 20/03/2018

 Site No
 FS0106
 Site Name
 Allt Mhor

 Inspector
 Joe Triscott
 Case No
 20180051

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No 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 Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 28/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0052			Date of visit: 20/03/2018
Time spent on site:	3 hours	Main Ins	spector: JET
Site No: FS0892	Site Name:	Clachbreac	
Business No: FB0061	Business Name:	Landcatch Natural Selec	tion Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3.1	Thermometer No:	T147	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	N If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		I information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit detail r	reason below:	

Dead fish waste sent to Ormsary for incineration. Waste movement records held in site diary.

FHI 059, Version 11		Issu	ed by: FHI		Ī	Date of issue	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0052	Site No:	FS0892				
Date of Visit:	20/03/2	2018		Inspector(s):	JET		
Registration/Authorn 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary checked	by site representa	ative?		-	Y N	
Site Details							
Total No facilities	24	Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilities	inspected	24
Species	SAL						
Age group	2018 S1						
No Fish	478,591						
Mean Fish Wt	50g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite) May 201	8	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	June 2018		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disassa nrohlams?		Y	Any escapes	(eince last vi	icit\2	N
If yes, detail:	Some fungus observe	ed on fish, not res			•	ioit):	11
		,		·	,		
Movement Records							V
	s available for inspecti	on'?				04/00/0047	Y
2. Date of last inspe		IO			L	21/03/2017	Y
•	elete and correctly ente						Y
	cords available for dea						Ī
•	plete and correctly ente ates for introductions (ahla?				N/A
		outwith Obj availe	abie:				14// (
Transport Records							
1. Are any movemen	nts carried out by (or o	n behalf) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
•	tem in place for mainte		•	•			
Mortality Records							
Mortality records a	available for inspection	?					Y
2. How are mortalities	•			Other (detail))		
If other detail:	Sent to Ormsary for in	ncineration.					
3. Mortality records	complete and correctly						Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	1018 (0.2%)	across site - n	najority attribu	ted to fungus		
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/atypical m	ortalities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per facility/no	stock per facility	/reason:			_	
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality during perio						Y
If you alote:	Week 39 2017 - 3902			0.7%), Week	41 2017 - 266	66 (0.6%) - a	Il attributed
If yes, detail:	to fungal infection. For						V
7. Have increased (t	unexplained) mortalitie	Group attended s		7 for pro transf	for check (Le	ch Duart), co	nfirmed that
		e able to be transf		•	,		
If yes, detail action:	non wer	abio to be trailed	5.100 to 300. I	.sir dansione	. to 1 00 1 07 1		00.000.
	ents' been reported to	FHI? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	ality events sh	neet.	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records												
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	Υ											
If yes, detail: Formalin TMS												
If other, detail:												
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y											
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y											
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y											
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? Formalin TMS												
If other, detail:												
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Υ											
	Biosecurity Records											
biosecurity records												
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Υ											
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ÿ											
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any												
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y											
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y											
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?												
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y											
health status, certification if required)?												
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y											
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?												
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y											
aquaculture animals held on site?												
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y											
If no, detail:												
Results of Surveillance												
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Υ											
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y											
3. Any significant results?	Υ											
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).												
Records checked between: 21/03/2017 - 20/03/2018												

ГГ	HI 059, Version 11		issued by: FHI										
	Case no:	2018-00)52	Site No:		FS0892			Date of v		20/0	03/2018	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	0:00	14:3	0:00	 	Inspecto	or:	JET	E	VMD No	D.	15
	Environmental conditions:	'1		<u> </u>		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-9	10-15	16-21	22-27	28-33	34-40	41-46					
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL					
	Average weight	0.0500		0.0500		0.0500							
	Sex	N/A	N/A			N/A		N/A					
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW					
		Init	Init	Smolt Unit	Init	Init	Smolt Unit	Init					
		# +	از ر	it L	ılt L	it L	it L	it L					
		Ormsary Smolt Unit	Ormsary Smolt Unit	mo	Smolt Unit	Ormsary Smolt Unit	mo	Ormsary Smolt Unit					
<u>S</u>		\overline{S}	رة ا			S /	Ŋ.	Ŋ.					
Details		ary	ary	Ormsary	Ormsary	ary	Ormsary	ary					
		ms	ms	sm	ms	ms	ms	ms					
Stock	Stock Origin	_	_										
St	Facility No	B6	B2	B7	B3	B8	B4	B5					

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0052		Site No:	FS0892		Insp:	JET
Date of Visit	20/03/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0	3	6	10	10
INOVERNEETIS ON	Number of desi		0			10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent statu		4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes						0
	No		2				
				•	Tatal		
					Total Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0052		Site	No:	FS0892	
Sea Lice Inspection (and 1. Has the site experies	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems ir	n the previous 4 years	?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or equ	ivalent) fallowed sync	chronously on a si	ingle ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licen amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm managen	ell as access to suitable f time?	e biological and/c	or mech	nanical control meas	
	ecords available for inspe	ction? (Legal SSL Co	GP Annex 6)			
	ely reflect the required sta		·	GP? (Lo	egal SSI, CoGP Ann	nex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	v the suggested criteri	a for treatment in	the Co	oGP during the perio	d that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	onis) numbers per fish	been at a level o	of 3 or a	above during the peri	iod that
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Hea	alth Inspectorate? If no	o, FHI see comme	ent.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is	considered to cause s	significant welfare	e proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)
	reatments been administer reatment or where <i>C. elo</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	olicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions t	aken had a significant	t impact upon the	lice lev	vels recorded?	
	ere conducted, carried or g strategy for the site, wh	•	• • •			ent for
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice infe		ypoints describin	g set a	ctions to deal with re	ecognised
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory in	n relation to sea lice le	vel and sea lice o	count d	ata? If no please det	tail
Containment Inspecti	ion					
· ·	nced equipment damage	due to predators in th	e current or previ	ious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experience	d on site? (Detail	l below))	Y
Electric Fence, Tank	lids/covers					
If other, detail below:						
If Yes proceed with que	ents or events been expensestions 4 – 9. If No skip to ported to Scottish Ministe	o question 10	cinity of the site si	ince the	e last FHI inspection	? N
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forth	nwith (where they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.:	37, 5.4	.17)	
·	ported to the SSPO and I	•				5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail				
8 If all nets were deal	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish	interests and was	s nermi	ission given by Scott	tish
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		Will lood wild light	torosto and was	о роппп	locion given by ocott	
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimi	se the risk of further e	scapes? (Not cov	vered ir	n code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures	s of the Act)				
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with reg	ards to containment?	If no, please deta	il reaso	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Case No:	2018-0052			Date of visit:	20/03/2018			
Site No:	FS0892]		Inspector:	JET]		
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
		L				L		
Report Summary				1				
	Dete	leas	ond .	4				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD	28/03/2018	JE I	AJW					
	-							
	-							
	1							
	1			1				





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0061Date of Visit 20/03/2018Site NoFS0892Site NameClachbreacInspectorJoe TriscottCase No20180052

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

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

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

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

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 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: Date: 28/03/2018
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

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/09/201
Case No: 2018-0053			Date	e of visit: 23/02/2018
Time spent on site:	30 minutes	Ma	in Inspector:	ALW
Site No: FS0681	Site Name:	Ormsary Hatchery		
Business No: FB0061	Business Name:	Landcatch Natural S	election Ltd	
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI	045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F C	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir	ng fish present?	N If yes, see addi	tional information	n/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	ved?	N If yes, see addi	tional information	n/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see addi	tional information	n/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N		
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detai	il reason below:		

Inspected stock for exports of ova to Taiwan (MD18/006), Netherlands (MD18/010) and Spain (MD18/011) on 26 February. Site currently stocked with 1.6 million Landcatch, 200,000 Loch Duart, 1.5 million Fanad and 612,000 Stofnfiskur ova. Stock will be 2019 S1s.

Main cause of mortalities in alevins has been pinched yolksacs and deformities. It is thought that lighting has caused the issues (fish are more active instead of sitting in substrate) and additional blinds will be installed to reduce the light levels further. No disease issues on site.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0053		Site No:	FS0681]			
Date of Visit:		23/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	ALW		1
Registration/Authoral Business/site det 2. Changes made to	tails summary		site representa	ative?			N N/A]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		Hatchery	Facilities sto	cked	Hatchery	No facilitie	es inspected	Hatchery
Species	Sal Ova							
Age group No Fish	3,900,000							
Mean Fish Wt	N/a							
Next Fallow Date (S		End April/ M	av 2018	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Autumn 2	018	
110/11/2000 (3	Jilo,	L110 7 (p.1)	ay Zo.o	110/10 mp 3.1 2 3	1	, total	010	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	ls							
1. Movement record	ds available fo	or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							17/01/2018	
3. Are records com	•	•						Y N/A
4. Are movement re								N/A N/A
5. Are records com6. Are health certific	•	•		able?				Y
Transport Records			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
·								
1. Are any moveme		• '		•				
If yes, is there a sys	sterri iri piace i	Of Illalitellan	ice or transpor	Italion records	ſ			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti					Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent		11.224		/: aa/)		Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 1 wks).			2,933 (4.83%), ties in alevins	16/2/18 - 43,	667 (1.9%)	- due to pinch	ed yolksacs
 Kecent mortality Evidence of rece 	,	at mical morta		lles in alevins				N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
11 you, radincy 1100/11.	Jillortanty por	Tability/110 Cts	Jok por raomey	ricason.				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	iring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (If yes, detail action:	•	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
ii ves. detail action.								/

N/A

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		

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

8/2/18 - 23/2/18 Records checked between:

Case No:	2018-0053			Date of visit:	23/02/2018			
Site No:	FS0681	l		Inspector:	ALW	1		
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
		-						
Report Summary Case Type MOV								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MOV	01/03/2018	ALW	DCB					
		-						





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 23/02/2018

SITE NO FS0681 SITE NAME Ormsary Hatchery

INSPECTOR Andrea Warwick CASE No 20180053

Inspection for export to a third country

The above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon ova for export to Taiwan was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 01/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	I	ssued by: FHI	Date	of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0054			Date of visit:	23/02/2018
Time spent on site:	30 minutes	Mair	n Inspector:	ALW
Site No: FS0575	Site Name:	Ormsary Smolt Unit		
Business No: FB0061	Business Name:	Landcatch Natural So	election Ltd	
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6	3
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 con	pleted
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA	A :
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir	ng fish present?	N If yes, see additi	onal information/clinical	score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	ved?	N If yes, see additi	onal information/clinical	score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additi	onal information/clinical	score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N		
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail	reason below:		

Inspection for export to Dubai on 26 February of 6,150 salmon parr (MD18/012).

Stock for export to Dubai held in tanks E7 (34g) and E19 (52g). E7 will be emptied for the export on Monday and consignment topped up with fish from E19. A few fish seen in E19 with fin nipping, but mortality levels low.

Also checked stock in the Hatchery as part of the inspection, see case 20180053.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0054		Site No:	FS0575	5			
Date of Visit:		23/02/2018	3		Inspector(s):	: ALW]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			N N/A	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		108	Facilities sto	cked	79	No facilitie	es inspected	2
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL					
Age group	2018 parr	Fry	First feeders					
No Fish	1,184,935	1,429,742	1,300,000					
Mean Fish Wt	60g	0.62g	0.2g					
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2018	3	
					7			
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement records		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							08/02/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement red								N/A
5. Are records comp		•						N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	ductions (out	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement of yes, is there a syst					-			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (·		E7 - 15 and I	E19 - 4				
5. Evidence of recen		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility/	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring pariod o	hookod2					N
If yes, detail:	Tilloriality uc	illing period of	leckeu :					'`
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FH	I? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		

Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and s	•	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Mini	sters or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?		
A line the nation that will be talied in the great that the great and		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or su is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to So		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the fa		
health status, certification if required)?	ini site been covered (equal of higher	
Troutin status, sortinoation ir roquirou).		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented betwee	n each epidemiological unit to minimise	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equ		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to main	·	
aquaculture animals held on site?	, ,	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on s	ite?	
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
4. He can enimal health compalliance hear coming out he can be held	of the husiness?	N
 Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf If yes, are results available for inspection? 	or, the business?	IN
·		
3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
ii yes, detaii (ii not detailed under recent disease problems).		

Records checked between: 8/2/18 - 23/2/18

Case No:	2018-0054			Date of visit	: 23/02/2018	В		
Site No:	FS0575]		Inspector	: ALW]		
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification					
,	,	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	_	<u> </u>		+	+			
					1			
	+	 		†	1			
				<u> </u>				
				<u> </u>	-			
Report Summary		_	_	7				
Case Type	Date	Insp	ond Inon	+				
Case Type MOV	01/03/2018	R AT W	2 nd Insp DCB	-				
IVIOV	01/03/2010	ALW	БСБ	-				
				4				
		1		-				
				4				





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061 **DATE OF VISIT** 23/02/2018

SITE NO FS0575 SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit

INSPECTOR Andrea Warwick Case No 20180054

Inspection for export to a third country

The above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon parr for export to Dubai was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 01/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017				
Case No: 2018-0057]		Date of visit: 05/03/2018				
Time spent on site:	4.5hrs	Main Inspe	ector: WJM				
Site No: FS0504 Business No: FB0557	Site Name: Business Name:	Girlsta Hatchery Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd	d (Hatchery)				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): see addition	nal ir Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: F	CoGP MA:				
Dead/weak/abnormally behavior Clinical signs of disease obser Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

Parr unit currently shut down. Has had a deep clean. Smolt unit to also be deep cleaned once fish moved out. Units fallowed every 4 months but site never completely fallow

Recent vet report only observing damage in muscle due to vaccine treatments

Eggs @ 7oC, Fry @ 12.7oC, Smolts @ 11.7oC, Parr unit empty.

Slight increase of mortality level on site in June 2017 due to IPN but mortality percentage remained below reporting level and decreased in July.

FHI 059, Version 11	1		lss	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0057		Site No:	FS0504	Į į			
Date of Visit:		05/03/2018	8		Inspector(s): WJM		7
Registration/Authornament 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	tails summary		site represen	tative?			Y N	<u>-</u> -
Site Details								
Total No facilities		39	Facilities st	cocked	29	No faciliti	ies inspected	39
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL					
Age group	2019 Q1	2018 Q3	2018 Q2					
No Fish	1,531,697	1,363,119	787,853					
Mean Fish Wt	0.2g	7.1g	80.1g					
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	never fallow		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	JUNE 20	18	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prof	olome?		N	Any escape	es (since las	t vicit\2	N
If yes, detail:	uisease proc	JICHIO!			Ally Escape	35 (SILICE IASI	Visit):	IN
Movement Record								
 Movement record Date of last inspect Are records completed. Are movement respectively. Are records completed. Are health certified. Transport Records	ection: plete and cor ecords availat plete and cor cates for intro	rrectly entered ble for dead fis rrectly entered	? sh and waste ?				15/03/2017	Y Y Y Y Y Y
1. Are any moveme If yes, is there a sys		• •		,	•			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records How are mortaliti If other detail:	ies disposed (Larger num	of? nbers get skipp		to total waste m			Waste to Ener	
3. Mortality records	complete an	d correctly ent	_				(= 1.00()	Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):			7 (0.1%), wk 6 - k 9 - 10,064 (0.2	•	6), wk 7 - 61	43 (0.16%), w	ık 8 - 9085
5. Evidence of rece		atypical morta			,			N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		y/reason:				
6. Any other peaks								Y
If yes, detail:		- 195,788 (3.9						_
7. Have increased (• • •							Y
If yes, detail action:		Reported to	company ve	t. No action take	en.			

N/A

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		N

Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Υ
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	•	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottisl increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	n Ministers or veterinary professional of any	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence		Y
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on health status, certification if required)?	the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented be	·	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors	· · ·	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to aquaculture animals held on site?	maintain the physical containment of	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented	d on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on b	pehalf of, the business?	Υ
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		

Records checked between: 15/03/2017 - 5/03/2018

Case no: 2018-0057 Site No: FS0504 Date of visit/ Sampling: 05/03/2018 Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling starts/ends: 16:30:00 18:15:00 Inspector: WJM VMD No. Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Sampling:	05/0 25
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 16:30:00 18:15:00 Inspector: WJM VMD No. starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5	
starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5	
	nples
Add Fish/Pools - click	
Pool/Fish No	
Fish nos 1-9 10-15 16-21 22-27 28-30 31-34 35-38 39-46 47-50 51-56	
Pool Group	
Species SAL	
Average weight 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800 0.0800	
Sex	
Water Type FW FW FW FW FW FW FW FW FW	
Stock Details Stock Details Salmobreed (Girlsta Hatchery) Hatchery)	
Facility No	

1111 000,								.00	aca by.		
03/2018	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0		Total Te	ests ass	igned	0	l					

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0057		Site No:	FS0504		Insp:	WJM
Date of Visit	05/03/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5
Mayamanta off			0				10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Exposure via water	1.10.1.00.01.000	Site contacts	0	ļ			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or I	ed (secure water supply through	0				0
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)	farms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		-
		or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				-
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised 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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes]			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		HIGH
					Nailk		ПОП

Case No:	2018-0057]	Site No:	FS0504					
Sea Lice Inspection (\$1. Has the site experier		s in the previous 4 years	s?						
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	anagement Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a single	year class basis?					
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and emacan these be deployed	ccess to a range of licamectin benzoate) as in a reasonable periodumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath well as access to suitab	sea lice medications (in the biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin, echanical control measures	s, and				
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)						
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	3)				
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested crite	ria for treatment in the (CoGP during the period that	at				
8. Have average adult records are inspected?		lmonis) numbers per fis	h been at a level of 3 or	r above during the period t	hat				
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If r	no, FHI see comment.						
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.	50)				
				s levels have exceeded thations? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.					
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?							
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon the lice I	evels recorded?					
 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice? 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised 									
scenarios during the es			aypoints describing set	actions to deal with recog	nisea				
16. Does the stock on s reasons.	site appear satisfactor	y in relation to sea lice I	evel and sea lice count	data? If no please detail					
•	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in t	•	•	N Y				
Site inside, Traps									
If other, detail below:									
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	estions 4 – 9. If No skip ported to Scottish Minis		·		N				
·		•		ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.	17)				
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il		一				
8. If gill nets were deplo	oyed was this action a	greed with local wild fish	n interests and was per	mission given by Scottish					
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		·						
9. What action was take	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not covered	in code but could					
be considered under	•	•							
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	regards to containment?	If no, please detail rea	son(s)	Υ				

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

Site No: FS0504

Case No: 2018-0057

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0057			Date of visit:	05/03/2018			
Site No:	FS0504]		Inspector:	:WJM]		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
Í	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-	-		1	1	1		
	+	1		†	†			
		1						
	1	1		i	1			1
			-					
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case Type ECI/CNI/VMD	16/03/2018	WJM	AJW					





Grieg Seafood Shetland Ltd (Hatchery) Gremista Lerwick Shetland ZE1 0PX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0557
SITE NO FS0504
INSPECTOR Warren Murray

DATE OF VISIT 05/03/2018
SITE NAME Girlsta Hatchery
CASE NO 20180057

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

No 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 2013

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 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: Date: 16/03/2018
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

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI		Date of	issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0058				Date of visit:	06/03/2018
Time spent on site:	4 hours	N	/lain Inspector	r: [WJM
Site No: FS0451 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Turness Cooke Aquacultur	re Scotland Lt	td	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD	5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 6.6	Thermometer No:	Site	.	FHI 045 compl	eted
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type:	S	CoGP MA:	S-2
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	· .	N If yes, see ad	dditional inforn	mation/clinical so mation/clinical so mation/clinical so	core sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	ry out intended visit deta	il reason below:			

Additional Case Information:

Site currently stocked with 10,000 fish which are to be used as potential broodstock.

Fish in good condition. Fish sampled for VMD showed no signs of disease.

Fish to be moved late August early September 2018 but destination unknown at the moment. Time of restocking of site also currently undecided.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issı	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0058		Site No:	FS0451	1			
Date of Visit:		06/03/2018	3		Inspector(s):	: WJM		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	4	No facilitie	es inspected	10
	SAL S1 2016							
Age group No Fish	10,000							
Mean Fish Wt	8.4kg							
Next Fallow Date (Si	_	AUG/SEP. 2	2018	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	UNKNOW	/N	
THOM:	10)	, 10 0,	0.10	THOM:		<u></u>		
Recent (last 4 wks) of lf yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	N Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records	9							
1. Movement records		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec	ction:	·					03/10/2017	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement red								Y
5. Are records comp6. Are health certification		•		able?				Y N/A
		Juctions (out	/IIII GD) avail	ADIC!				107
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	ut by (or on be	half) of the b	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst					-			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Whole fish -	TWMA (Sh	etland)	
If other detail:								
 Mortality records of Recent mortality (•	correctly ente		107				Y
5. Evidence of recen	•	tunical morta	1st-28th feb	- 18/				N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		//reason:				
	,	•	<u> </u>					
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	iring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (u	(harilained)	martalities he	an reported t	a vot or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	лехранеа)	IIIUI taiities 50	en reported a) vet of finite				147.
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add N	IRT case and	enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
	N
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail:	14
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Υ
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	V
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	ĭ
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
	V
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.)?	'
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Gill disease indicative of previous toxic waterborne insult such as stinging nematocysts	
Records checked between: 03/10/2017 - 06/03/2018	

П	al 059, version i i							155	sueu by.				
	Case no:	2018-00)58	Site No:		FS0451			Date of Samplin		06/0	03/2018	07/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:3	0:00	16:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:	WJM		VMD No	D.	7
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	8.4000											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	SW											
		တ											
Sign		les											
Details		Z Z											
		Basta Ness											.
Stock	Stock Origin												
S	Facility No	3											

1111 000,								.00	aca by.		
03/2018	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0		Total Te	ests ass	igned	0	l					

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0058		Site No:	FS0451		Insp:	WJM
Date of Visit	06/03/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
op 00.00	Number of supp	cluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m Number of dest		0			10	3
Exposure via water	Transor or door	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					$\overline{}$
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,		or in a coastal zone with category III		_			⊢
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iaiiis upstreaii	TOT WITHIN T LIGAT EXCUISION	'	4	o o		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0	1			0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	•			-
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				_
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			
	Feeding unpast	<u>'</u>	5				<u> </u>
Biosecurity		Number of sites		J 2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0		2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			
between sites, use of	No		0	-			
footbaths etc			1	J			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry			0				0
code of practice	No						
Platform access to cages	lYes			1			0
. Idilomi doocoo to dages	No		2				H
				J			
					Total		17
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2018-0058		Site I	No: FS0)451	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)					
1. Has the site experie	nced sea lice problems i	n the previous 4 years	?			Υ
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	Management Area (or equ	uivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a sir	ngle year cl	ass basis?	N
azamethiphos and emacan these be deployed 4. Is there a signed do	access to a range of licer amectin benzoate) as we I in a reasonable period o cumented farm manager	ell as access to suitab of time?	le biological and/or	mechanic	al control measure	es, and
Management Area (or						
	ecords available for inspe		·			Y
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required st	andard specified in th	e SSI and the CoG	P? (Legal S	SSI, CoGP Annex	(6) Y
7. Are sea lice (L. saln records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criter	ia for treatment in t	he CoGP o	during the period t	that N
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	onis) numbers per fish	n been at a level of	3 or above	during the period	that Y
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish He	alth Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comme	nt.		Y
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause	significant welfare	problems?	(CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50) N
	reatments been administ reatment or where <i>C. elo</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	plicable)?				N/A
•	reatments or the actions		it impact upon the l	ice levels r	ecorded?	Y
•	ere conducted, carried o	•				Y
	ng strategy for the site, w	·			without treatment	t for Y
	ific written lice managem scalation of a sea lice inf		aypoints describing	set actions	s to deal with reco	ognised Y
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory i	n relation to sea lice le	evel and sea lice co	ount data?	If no please detail	Υ
Containment Inspect	ion					
•	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	ne current or previo	us product	ion cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	e predation experience	ed on site? (Detail b	pelow)		Υ
M.M.L., Tensioned N			·	•		
If other, detail below	·					
,						
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been expe	rienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site sin	ce the last	FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip t	o question 10				
4. Have these been re	ported to Scottish Ministe	ers?				
5 Have these been re	ported to local DSFB fort	hwith (where they exis	et)2 (CoGP = 4.4.3	7 5 4 17)		
	ported to the SSPO and I				GOGP = 4 4 37 5 4	1.17)
o. Have these been re	ported to the GOI G and I	ocal hancines trusts to	oranwar (where are)	y CAIST): (O	- 4.4.07, 0.4	, .17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escap	pees? If yes give detail	il			
	oyed was this action agre	eed with local wild fish	interests and was	permission	given by Scottish	h
Ministers? (Legal, Coo	·	ice the rick of further	ascanas? (Not sour	ared in and	e but could	
	en to prevent and minim		escapes? (NOLCOVE	ered in Cod	e but could	
	r satisfactory measure d as satisfactory with reg	, and the second	If no please detail	reason(s)		Υ
To. 13 the site inspecte	a as satisfactory with reg	jarus to containment?	ii iio, piease uetali	1603011(3)		l'

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0058	Site No: FS0451	
Date of Visit: 06/03/2018	Inspector: WJM	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located v	-	Υ
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farr	It farm management area? In site(s) to which it applies? It commencement of the agreement or statement	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	ement	
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang fish farm in the area or the individual fa		or farm? Y or farm? Y n the area or the
Arrangements for The Management of	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangem	ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availar of statement?	bility and the use of medicines on farms cover	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requir lice on farms in the area or individual far	rements for the sensitivity testing of available to rms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual for	nstances under which biological controls and c	cleaner fish are to be
	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	nstances when live fish may be introduced or r	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	le harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be fallo cked?	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether cagreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto s	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept?	ot on any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to becon	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAq/S? 16/02/2016	

Site No: FS0451

Case No: 2018-0058

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0058]		Date of visit	: 06/03/2018	В		
Site No:	FS0451]		Inspector	: WJM]		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notifica	ition		
	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
				-				
Report Summary				_				
Case Type ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	16/03/2018	WJM	AJW					
				_				
	_[
	_[
	_[





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0095
 Date of Visit
 06/03/2018

 Site No
 FS0451
 Site Name
 Turness

 Inspector
 Warren Murray
 Case No
 20180058

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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 2013

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 16/03/2018

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0059			Date of visit: 06/03/2018
Time spent on site:	4 hours	Main Ins	spector: WJM
Site No: FS0717 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Balta Isle Cooke Aquaculture Scot	and I td
Dusiness No.	Dusiness Name.	Cooke Aquaculture Scot	ianiu Liu
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 6.9	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA: S-1
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail r	eason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site testing out alternative top net support system on 10 of the 20 pens to the conventional hamster wheel system. Hoping to see a reduction in physical damage to the fish.

Increased mortality levels over a 3 week period in January. Attributed to IPN in a one batch of fish originating from Furnace. Mortality levels quickly reduced.

The odd weak or abnormally behaving fish present but no clinical signs of disease. Fish sampled for VMD looked in good condition.

FHI 059, Version 11		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0059		Site No:	FS0717				
Date of Visit:		06/03/2018]		Inspector(s):	WJM]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	itive?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		20	Facilities sto	cked	20	No facilities	s inspected	20
Species	SAL							
Age group	S0 2017							
No Fish	1,055,147							
Mean Fish Wt	340g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	AUG 2018		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	SEP/OCT	2018	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease nrobl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last)	/isit\?	N
If yes, detail:	•		of fish from F	urnace. Has g		(Sirice last	vioit):	IN
Movement Records				·				
		r inanaction?						Y
 Movement record Date of last inspec 		i inspection?					01/03/2016	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	•				01/03/2010	Y
4. Are movement red								Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		ıble?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any movement	nts carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst		• '		•				
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (•			10378 (1%) for	whole site			
5. Evidence of recen				,				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					Y
o. Any other peaks in		• •		1 - 20511 (1.89	%) 27/01 - 16	165 (1.5%) :	suspect IPN i	n batch of
If yes, detail:	_		, ,	eased to 1% for	•	, ,		
7. Have increased (u								Y
If yes, detail action:				taken as leve				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
C. Have the higher drivered his account resource implemented het were excellent devices with the minimizer	
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.)?	'
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Ÿ
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
you, actual (i dottallod under rooms diodeco productio).	
04/02/2016 05/02/2019	

Records checked between: 01/03/2016 - 06/03/2018

П	al 059, version i i							155	ueu by. F	I II			
	Case no:	2018-00)59	Site No:		FS0717			Date of vi		06/0	03/2018	07/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:0	0:00	13:4	5:00		Inspecto	or:	WJM		VMD No). [10
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	F	PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-2	3-4	5-7									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	0.3400	0.3400	0.3400									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
k Defails		Haweswater	Haweswater	Cairndow									
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No		8 8	14									
S.	T domity 140	5	O	14									

1111 000,								.00	aca by.		
03/2018	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0		Total Te	ests ass	igned	0	l					

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0059		Site No:	FS0717		Insp:	WJM
Date of Visit	06/03/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Mayara anto aff			0				2
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0				
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	4		1
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III					H
		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V	'	3	6		-
		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 pro	cessing	0				0
and raide of the another	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		12
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued	l by: FHI	Date of iss	sue: 12/09/2	
Case No:	2018-0059		Site No:	FS0717		
Sea Lice Inspection (So	• •	in the previous 4 years	:?		N	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	•			vear class basis?	Y	
3. Does the site have ac azamethiphos and eman can these be deployed in 4. Is there a signed docu	cess to a range of lice nectin benzoate) as w n a reasonable period umented farm manage	nced in-feed and bath rell as access to suitab of time?	sea lice medications (ir le biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin, chanical control measures, and	Y	
Management Area (or ed	•		00.4		V	
5. Are sea lice count rec	·		·	Larral CCL CaCD Array C)	Y	
b. Do records adequater	y renect the required s	tandard specified in th	e SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Ť	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?		w the suggested criter	ria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that	Υ	
records are inspected?	·	, .		above during the period that	N	
If yes, have these been i	•	·			N/A	
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infesta	ation at a level which is	s considered to cause	significant welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N	
				s levels have exceeded the tions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	N/A	
11. Has any other action	been taken (where ap	oplicable)?			N/A	
12. Have therapeutic treation	·		nt impact upon the lice le	evels recorded?	N/A	
13. Are treatments, when		-			Υ	
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	strategy for the site, w	where fewer population	s or part populations ar	e held without treatment for	Υ	
15. Is there a site specifi scenarios during the esc			aypoints describing set	actions to deal with recognised	Υ	
16. Does the stock on sireasons.	te appear satisfactory	in relation to sea lice l	evel and sea lice count	data? If no please detail	Υ	
Containment Inspectio 1. Has the site experience		e due to predators in t	ne current or previous p	roduction cycles?	N	
2. Are measures in place	• • •	•	·	•	Y	
M.M.L., Tensioned Ne	0 0	.,	(,		
If other, detail below:						
2. Have account in side w	to an aventa haan aven	winnerd on on in the wi	civity of the city circus t	as lest EUU inspection?	N	
 Have escape incident If Yes proceed with quest 	•		cirily of the site since the	ne last FHI inspection?		
4. Have these been repo	•	•				
		o.o.				
5. Have these been repo	orted to local DSFB for	thwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)		
6. Have these been repo	orted to the SSPO and	local fisheries trusts for	orthwith (where they exi	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)		
7. Were methods (if any)) used to recover esca	pees? If yes give deta	il			
8. If gill nets were deploy	ed was this action agi	reed with local wild fish	n interests and was perr	mission given by Scottish		
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP	2 – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		·			
9. What action was take			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) Y						
To. Is the site inspected	as satisfactory with re	gards to containment?	ii no, piease detail rea	son(s)	Υ	

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0059	Site No: FS0717	
Date of Visit: 06/03/201	8 Inspector: WJM	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located If N, no further questions require comp	•	Y
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statemer	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana	gement	
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccir 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxi individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual f Arrangements for The Management		or farm? Y r farm? Y n the area or the Pad fish from any Y
of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual factorized the farms in the area or individual factorized on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and cl	reatments for sea Y leaner fish are to be
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	imstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptabl	e harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow cked?	and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	tes covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ?	on any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	of the FMAg/S? 07/02/2018	

Site No: FS0717

Case No: 2018-0059

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No: 2018-0059 Site No: FS0717 Date of visit: 06/03/2018

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
07/01/18	13/01/2018	<750g	340g	SAL	S0 2017	Weekly	1.70	Explained	IPN
14/01/18	20/01/2018	<750g	340g	SAL	S0 2017	Weekly	1.86	Explained	IPN
21/01/18	27/01/2018	<750g	340g	SAL	S0 2017	Weekly	1.50	Explained	IPN
							+		

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	19025	No action taken by company. Bulk of mortalities came from 1 batch of fish from Furnace. Suspected to be IPN.	Company reminded that mortalities equal to or above a certain percentage have to be reported to the FHI.
	20511	No action taken by company. Bulk of mortalities came from 1 batch of fish from Furnace. Suspected to be IPN.	Company reminded that mortalities equal to or above a certain percentage have to be reported to the FHI.
	16165	No action taken by company. Bulk of mortalities came from 1 batch of fish from Furnace. Suspected to be IPN. Mortality levells dropped below reporting threshold after this event	Company reminded that mortalities equal to or above a certain percentage have to be reported to the FHI.

Case No:	2018-0059			Date of visit: 06/03/2018							
Site No:	FS0717	1		Inspector	: WJM]					
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion					
	1.54	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
						, ,		2 11100			
				Ì		1					
	_										
	+										
	+										
	+			 							
	+			1							
Report Summary				7							
	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1							
Case Type ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	16/03/2018	WJM	PMM	1							
				1							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0095Date of Visit06/03/2018Site NoFS0717Site NameBalta IsleInspectorWarren MurrayCase No20180059

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

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.



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

FHI 059, Version 11	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017						
Case No: 2018-0060	l.		Date of visit: 06/03/2018						
Time spent on site:	3.5hrs	Main	Inspector: WJM						
Site No: FS0710 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Sandwick Cooke Aquaculture Sc	otland Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 6.9	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA: S-3						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.									
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

Site operated from shorebase on Unst.

Cooke took over site from Thomson brothers round about time of last inspection. No fish held on site at time of take over. No fish been on site until 26/11/17

VHP states cleanerfish not likely to be used on site because of high energy and strong tidal conditions.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy. One or two runts per cage spotted close to surface.

All fish to be on site until harvest by dead haul and taken to Mid Yell packing station.

FHI 059, Version 11			Issı	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 12/09/2017
Case No:	2018-0060		Site No:	FS0710	J			
Date of Visit:		06/03/2018	3		Inspector(s):	: WJM		
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site represent	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	ocked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12
	SAL S1 2017							
Age group No Fish	S1 2017 306,279							
Mean Fish Wt	3.5kg							
Next Fallow Date (Si		OCT/NOV 2	2018	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	JAN 2019		
Troxe i a	(0)	33.,	0.0	THOM:		0,		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	N Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
1. Movement records		r inspection?					10/05/0045	Y
2. Date of last inspect3. Are records comp		costly entered	2				13/05/2015	Y
4. Are movement red		•		7				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst					-			N
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:		(1						
 Mortality records of Recent mortality (•	correctly end		1526 (0.5%) fo	er whole cite			Y
5. Evidence of recen	`	etypical morta		1520 (0.570) 10) WHOLE SILE			N
If yes, facility nos/no		•		//reason:				
								N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period cr	necked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								
If yes, detail action:	,		Si. 15 ₁					N/A
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017		
Treetments and Medicines Decords				

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	Y
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Ť
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	Y
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
in you, dottain (in not dottained drider rooding disease problemie).	
Decords shocked between 12/05/2015 06/02/2019	

Records checked between: 13/05/2015 - 06/03/2018

Г	mi 059, version i i							155	sueu by. I				
	Case no:	2018-00	060	Site No:		FS0710			Date of Samplin		06/0	03/2018	06/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	16:0	0:00	16:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:	WJM		VMD No).	9
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	3.5000											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	SW											
Details		Su											
Ď.		shi											
		Flaeshins											
Stock	Stock Origin												
Ċ,	Facility No	11											

000,	The ood, voicin Th													
03/2018 Additional Sample Information:														
0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 11		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/09/2017
Case Number:	2018-0060		Site No:	FS0710		Insp:	WJM
Date of Visit	06/03/2018		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	10	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10		0
h							
Movements off	Frequency of m		0				0
Exposure via water	Transor or door	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	iainis upstream	TOT WILLIIT T LIGAT EXCUISION	<u>'</u>	1 4	0		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	1				
	equivalent statu	i from Category III farm	0	1			
		from Category V farm	10				
			10]			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products			0				
producto		esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0]			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
odd of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		Q
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2018-0060		Site	e No:	FS0710	_	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)						
•	nced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years	s?				Ν
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or equ	ivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a s	single y	ear class basis?		N
azamethiphos and emac can these be deployed	access to a range of licen amectin benzoate) as we in a reasonable period o cumented farm managem	ell as access to suitab f time?	le biological and/	or mecl	hanical control me	easures, and	Y
Management Area (or	equivalent)?						
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspe	ction? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)				Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required sta	andard specified in th	e SSI and the Co	GP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP A	nnex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below (CoGP Annex 6)	v the suggested criter	ia for treatment ir	n the Co	oGP during the pe	riod that	Υ
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i>	onis) numbers per fish	n been at a level o	of 3 or a	above during the p	eriod that	N
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Hea	alth Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comm	ent.			N/A
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infe	station at a level which is	considered to cause	significant welfare	e proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.8	31, 5.3.50)	N
	reatments been administere treatment or where <i>C. elon</i>						N/A
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where app	olicable)?					N/A
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions t	aken had a significan	nt impact upon the	e lice lev	vels recorded?		N/A
•	ere conducted, carried ou	-					Υ
	ng strategy for the site, wh	•				tment for	Υ
	ific written lice managemescalation of a sea lice infe		aypoints describir	ng set a	actions to deal with	n recognised	Υ
16. Does the stock on reasons.	site appear satisfactory ir	n relation to sea lice lo	evel and sea lice	count d	lata? If no please	detail	Υ
Containment Inspect	ion						
•	nced equipment damage	due to predators in the	ne current or prev	ious pro	oduction cycles?		N
•	ce to mitigate against the	•	·	•	•		Υ
M.M.L., Tensioned N			,		,		
If other, detail below:	·						
ii daidi, dataii balaii							
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been exper	ienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site s	ince the	e last FHI inspecti	on?	N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to	question 10					
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Ministe	rs?					
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forth	nwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP - 4.4.	.37, 5.4	.17)		
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and lo	ocal fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where th	ey exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.3	7, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if ar	y) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give deta	il				
O If will water warm at 1	avad was this setient	od with least wild C. I	intoracta	0.00	ingion sives by 0	ottiol-	
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agre SP – 4.4.38. 5.4.18)	eed with local wild fish	i interests and wa	is perm	ission given by So	COTTISh	
	en to prevent and minimi	se the risk of further	escapes? (Not co	vered in	n code but could		
	r satisfactory measures						
	d as satisfactory with reg	· ·	If no, please deta	ail reaso	on(s)		Υ
io ino dito inoposto			, piodoo dott		(-)		

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/09/2017

FHI 059, Version 11

FHI 059, Version 11	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/09/2017
Case No: 2018-0060	Site No: FS0710	
Date of Visit: 06/03/2018	Inspector: WJM	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located v		Y
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farr	It farm management area? In site(s) to which it applies? It commencement of the agreement or stateme	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	ement	
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang fish farm in the area or the individual fa Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangem 14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availation statement?	of Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe bility and the use of medicines on farms cover	or farm? Y Y n the area or the ead fish from any ers and treatments? Y red by the agreement Y
lice on farms in the area or individual far 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual f	nstances under which biological controls and c	cleaner fish are to be Y
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	nstances when live fish may be introduced or regements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 11	on 11 Issued by: FHI	
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	ole harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be resto	s by which the area or individual farm will be fallow ocked?	and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	res covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether covered by the agreement or statemen	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept of the transfer of the trans	on any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreer parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become	e, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	d operated in accordance with the agreement or st	tatement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 16/02/2016	

Site No: FS0710

Case No: 2018-0060

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2018-0060			Date of visit:	06/03/2018			
Site No:	FS0710	1		Inspector:	WJM]		
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	ļ					ļ		
						.		
	-							
	-					 		
	 				1	 		
	Ì					Ì		
	<u> </u>					<u> </u>		<u> </u>
D				1				
Report Summary	D /		nd .					
Case Type ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI/CNI/SLI/VMD	27/03/2018	WJM	AJW					
	 			4				
	-			4				
	 							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0095Date of Visit06/03/2018Site NoFS0710Site NameSandwickInspectorWarren MurrayCase No20180060

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

R25

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 2013

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.



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