

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2019-0265"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="28/05/2019"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text" value="4h"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text" value=""/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS0506"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Loch Ritheanan (Loch Nan Ritheanan)"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0449"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Meavag Fish Farming"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNA"/>	3 <input type="text" value="ECS"/>	4 <input type="text" value=""/>	5 <input type="text" value=""/>	6 <input type="text" value=""/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="11.5"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="T173"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value=""/>	
Observations:	Region:	WI	Water type:	F	CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="n"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="n"/>					

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Stock was transferred from Meavag hatchery 11 August to 14 August

Very low mortality rates since input, no morts have been disposed of yet, planning to take to landfill.

Escape incident: Site manager was contacted on the 11/05/2019 informing him that there were number of fishermen at the loch catching rainbow trout.

Manager came out to the site and completed a full inspection of all nets and no holes were noted. A spinner was recovered from the side of pen 5. This indicted that there had been fishermen accessing the site and fishing in the pens.

Given that there were no holes and that the site had been accessed the manger suspected that fish had been released from the pens and contacted the local police.

No recount has been made yet as this will be completed as the site is harvested out.

At the time of the inspection four pens were stocked. The nets originated from Carranoch smolts and were part of the site buyout. The age of the nets is not known. The nets were inspected by Net Services Scalpay. All nets had been break tested and passed on the 2/8/18.

One net is due to be replaced in August 2019 as the jump net break test was nearing the minimum strength. The ID tag was different on the service card than the tag on the net however the manager informed me that there was an additional cylinder tag that I had missed.

The other three nets have been approved for 24 months (from 2/8/18)

Before deployment the nets were inspected and repaired by manager and an employee, no records were maintained. The nets are checked during morting and during site visits and repaired when required but no significant holes have been repaired.

The loch has no direct contact with open water, there is one loch below but there is only connected by a small trickle stream.. A high number of fishermen have been in the area but the numbers of fish being caught are declining. Due to the number of fishermen no effort has been made to recover any fish.

The fish on site were in good general condition.

Rats were reported to be an issue by accessing the site and chewing on the nets above the water line. Traps have been put in place on the pens and also on the shore and the issue has resolved

Case No:  Site No:   
 Date of Visit:  Inspector(s):

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

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

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="9"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="4"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="9"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="RTR"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="2018"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="20,187"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="680g"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="unsure should be by"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="July 2020"/>	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?  Any escapes (since last visit)?   
 If yes, detail:

**Movement Records**

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

**Transport Records**

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

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection?   
 2. How are mortalities disposed of?   
 If other detail:   
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?   
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):   
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?   
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?   
 If yes, detail:   
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?   
 If yes, detail action:   
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

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
<b>Biosecurity Records</b>		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?		N
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?		N/A
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?		N/A
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?		N/A
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?		N/A
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.)?		N/A
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?		N/A
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?		N/A
If no, detail:		
<b>Results of Surveillance</b>		
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: 23/10/2018 to 28/5/2019		

Case Number:	2019-0265	Site No:	FS0506	Insp:	
Date of Visit	28/05/2019	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0			
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4	1
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8	
<b>Management practices</b>		None	Secure	Unsecure	
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2	0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0			
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1			1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4			
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8			
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10			
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0			0
	Common processes with other farms	3			3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0			0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5			
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0			0
	No	1			
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0			0
	No	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			0
	No	2			
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>5</b> <b>LOW</b>

Case No: **2019-0265**

Site No: **FS0506**

**Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)**

1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that records are inspected?  
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

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

top nets                      rat traps                      tensioned nets

If other, detail below:

3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?   
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail

8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)

9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)

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



Case No: 2019-0265 Site No: FS0506

Date of visit: 28/05/2019 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
<b>ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (FRESHWATER)</b>					
<b>a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures</b>					
1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? If yes answer 1.2-1.8:		Y			
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	n	AAAH 31D,E	Report was delayed by 6 days	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	N	CoGP 2.4.31, 3.4.39	Reported to fisheries trust but not the SSPO	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail		N		None used as fishermen have been removing them and loch is closed	
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		
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		Site inspection conducted and Police were contacted, boat is now locked and motion cameras planned	
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		
<b>b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site</b>					
General records			SSI 2,1		
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			Facilities Moorings Nets		
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	n	N	y	No anchors site uses shore pins and equipment
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A	N/A	n/a	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	N	N/A	y	Date of purchase not known, bought with the site.
d) The date of purchase	Low	N	N/A	n	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
e) Each inspection including				
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	Y	n
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y	y	n
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Y	y	Y
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Y	y	n
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	N/A	N/A	n
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:				
i) The mesh size	Medium	y	SSI, 2,2	
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	y		
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	N		
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	y		
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:				
i) The date of construction	Low	n	SSI, 2,3	Not known but been on site since 2012 but were second hand, originated from Wisco.
ii) The material used in construction	Low	N		
iii) Its dimensions	Low	y		
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4	
i) The date of installation	Low	Y		
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	N/A		
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	y		
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	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	N	CoGP 3.4.11	Site has been in place since 2012 with no issues, moorings are constructed of shore pins bedded in rock. Pens are standard steel pens. Site manager been fish farming for 30 years Testing by net services Scalpay
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	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	
2.11 Are all screens inspected daily and relevant action taken? Are records maintained of inspection frequency and the outcomes?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	Not known as bought second hand. In a container at Loch Heather
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	Y	CoGP 3.4.16	
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	N	CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low	Y	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	
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	
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23	
a) net base	High	y		
b) side wall	High	y		
c) above the waterline	High	y		
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High	y	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>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	N/A	CoGP 7.1.8	Site manager only works on site  PGD gave training course
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High	Y	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	Y	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	N/A	SSI 2,7,a ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37	
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	N	CoGP 2.4.6, 3.4.8, 2.4.7, 3.4.9	2,6,b)  Transfers would not occur if weather was adverse  SOP etc not available
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	High	n		
b) standard operating procedures	High	n		
c) contingency plan	High	n		
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	n	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	N/A	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	n/a	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	n	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	Some issues with rats not available for inspection	
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?	Medium	N	2.4.7, 3.4.9		
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?		N			
4.10 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including	Medium		SSI, 2,8,a		
-The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed		N			
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N	SSI, 2,8,b		Rat traps
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		
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>					
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	n	CoGP 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.4.11		
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			
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	y			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
<b>d. Inspection of site specific procedures</b>					
6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.24	Visual inspection as part of routine site inspections.	

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



Meavag Fish Farming  
Seafield  
Isle of Scalpay Harris  
Western Isles  
HS4 3XZ

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0449	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	28/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0506	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Loch Rithenan (Loch Nan Ritheanan)
<b>INSPECTOR</b>		<b>CASE No</b>	20190265

#### 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 movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained. No aquaculture product movements had been conducted.

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.

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

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was **not** available for inspection.

The following point was raised with the site representative during the inspection:

- **The biosecurity measures plan was not available for inspection, a copy should be provided.**

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 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.

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

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

Signed:



Date: 03/06/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

Meavag Fish Farming  
Seafield  
Isle of Scalpay Harris  
Western Isles  
HS4 3XZ

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0449	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	28/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0506	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Loch Rithenan (Loch Nan Ritheanan)
<b>INSPECTOR</b>		<b>CASE No</b>	20190265

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

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

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

The escape incident in May 2019 was not immediately reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, nor to other relevant stakeholders.

**It is recommended that a documented review of the procedure in place for dealing with a breach in containment is undertaken to ensure that, in accordance with The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended) and A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (chapter 3, point 4.39), any escape, or suspected escape, of live fish should be reported immediately to all relevant stakeholders, including the relevant Producer Organisation or industry association, the local District Salmon Fisheries Board and Fisheries Trust.**

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

Records relating to facilities and nets were not being maintained correctly.

**It is recommended that to meet the requirements of Schedule 2 of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 (RKO) records must be kept in relation to each facility, mooring and net to include:**

- **The name of the manufacturer;**
- **Any special adaptations;**
- **The name of the supplier;**
- **The date of purchase;**
- **Each inspection including -**

R10

- The name of the person conducting the inspection;
  - The date of each inspection;
  - The place of each inspection; and
  - The outcome of each inspection; and
- The date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out.
  - the place of use, storage and disposal in relation to each net.
- the date of construction of each facility;
  - the materials used in construction of each facility.

The site was unable to provide evidence that pens and moorings are designed, manufactured, installed and are fit for purpose at the location of the site.

**It is recommended that a documented review is undertaken to demonstrate in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 3, point 4.11 that pen and mooring systems are designed, manufactured and installed to ensure that they are fit for purpose at the location of the site.**

Nylon nets, older than 5 years, were in use on the site.

**It is recommended that a plan for net replacement is developed and introduced to ensure that in accordance with the CoGP chapter 3 Point 4.16 nylon nets older than 5 years from date of manufacture should not be used.**

It was not known if the nets had been treated with a UV inhibitor, this was discussed at the time, no further action is 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**

Records in relation to procedures and risk assessments were not available for inspection.

**It is recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 3 Points 4.27 and 4.9) that when the risk of escape is increased during procedures such as fish input, grading, vaccination and transfer of fish within and between sites, such procedures should be carried out to a standard operating procedure, based on risks identified and include planning and supervision to minimise any risk. In order to meet the requirements of the RKO Schedule 2, parts 7,b and 8,c records of these assessments must be maintained.**

There was no record of the type or size of the boat used for operations on the site.

**In order to meet the requirements of the RKO Schedule 2 part 6,b a record of the type and size of each boat used for operations on the site must be maintained.**

Records in relation to predator risk assessments and predator measures were not maintained.

In order to meet the requirements of the RKO Schedule 2 part 8) a record must be made of any anti-predator measures undertaken, including–

- the type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed;
- the use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site; and
- any assessment of risk of escape of fish carried out.

**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.

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by 1<sup>st</sup> March 2020. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 19/12/2019

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

Meavag Fish Farming  
Seafield  
Isle of Scalpay  
Western Isles  
HS4 3XZ

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0449	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	28/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0506	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Loch Rithenan (Loch Nan Ritheanan)
<b>INSPECTOR</b>		<b>CASE No</b>	20190265

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of 3000 rainbow trout on 11/5/2019. 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 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: 12/11/2019

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

[REDACTED]  
Meavag Fish Farming  
Seafield  
Isle of Scalpay  
Western Isles  
HS4 3XZ  
[REDACTED]

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0449	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	28/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0506	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Loch Rithenan (Loch Nan Ritheanan)
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>CASE No</b>	20190265

#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 1st March 2020. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed:

[REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 06/05/2020

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