FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0379			Date of visit: 09/12/2020
Time spent on site:	Hrs	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0767 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Tarbert South The Scottish Salmon Company	у
Case Types: 1 VMD	2 REP 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-42
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	nil reason below:	

No dead, moribund or lethargic fish observed. Small number of fish observed deeper in the water with physical damage, attibuted to post treatment.

Treatments have been targeted to cages that have had numbers above TSSC treatment threshold, rather than treat the whole site. All recent treatments have been hydrolicer, with only SLICE being used earlier in the cycle. Site stocked with wrasse (wild caught) and along with targetting specific cages, this has reported to have helped the management of sea lice so far this cycle.

No recent issues reported on site, fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Visibility good at time of inspection and fish observed shoaling deeper in the water.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0379		Site No:	FS0767				
Date of Visit:		09/12/2020]		Inspector(s):			I
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?	·	·				N]
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	cked	11	No facilitie	es inspected	11
Species	SAL	WRA					T .	
Age group	2019 S0	Mixed						
No Fish	180,706	5,046						
Mean Fish Wt	4 kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (S		Spring 2021		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Sept / Oct	2021	
Recent (last 4 wks)				•	Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:					,	(- '/	
4. Are movement ref. Are records comp. 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any movement yes, is there a system.	olete and corr ates for introd ats carried ou	ectly entered? ductions (outw	vith GB) availa	able? usiness (not us				Y Y N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	Dundas Ch	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ente	ered?					Y
Recent mortality (60 - 0.81, WK4 ⁻	7 - 3,992 1.74	%,WK 48 -	1,447 0.64%,	WK 49
Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	iring period ch	necked?					Y
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?
If yes, detail: 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)?
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?
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)?
Tiedili Status, Certification ii 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
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: 11/03/20 to 09/12/20

٠.	11 009, VEISIOII 13					ISSUEU DY. FIII							
	Case no:	2020-03	379	Site No:		FS0767			Date of		09/	12/2020	09/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	g: HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	0:00	15:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	D.	26
	Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2	Cloudy	3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	4	2	3									
		1	2	3									
	Pool Group	0.41	0.41	0.41									
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000									
	Sex	0)4/	0)11	0)1/									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Loch Damph	Loch Damph	Loch Damph									
S	Facility No	1	3	14									

12/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													
				.9										

Case No:	2020-0379			Date of visit:	09/12/2020			
Site No:	FS0767	l		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
ŕ	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	ļ							
	 							
	 							
	-							
D 1 O								
Report Summary	D (- nd -					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
VMD	21/12/2020							
	 							
	 							
	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 SITE NO FS0767 INSPECTOR
 DATE OF VISIT
 09/12/2020

 SITE NAME
 Tarbert South

 CASE NO
 20200379

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

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.

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: 21/12/20

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0477			Date of visit: 15/12/2020
Time spent on site:		Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: SS0004 Business No: SB0004	Site Name: Business Name:	Site 1 Sunart Sea Farm Ltd	
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving for Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry of	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Following review of Bonamia restrictions in 2020 order C2006001 was withdrawn and replaced with CDN2020004.

Case No:	2020-0477			Date of visit:	15/12/2020			
Site No:	SS0004	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
ŕ	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	1							
	1							
Report Summary			<u> </u>	1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
INF - no report	18/12/2020		2 11100					
,	1							

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2020-0523			Date of visit: 01/12/2020				
Time spent on site:	hr	Main Inspecto	or:				
Site No: SS0548 Business No: SB0553	Site Name: Business Name:	Lamb Holm Orkney Shellfish Hatchery (OS	SH) Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 10	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to 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 rea	son below:					

Case paperwork completed remotely by on 25/11/2020 while being shadowed by

OED distributed between 4 tanks at different temperatures, HGA in 2 separate tanks.

Water temperatures taken with site thermometer due to biosecurity. A portion of the OED broodstock currently at 10oC for stasis while remainder are currently at 13oC and gradually being cooled down to 10oC to reach stasis. OED spat currently at 18oC. HGA broodstock being held at 11oC while juveniles are at 18oC.

109 OED morts across all site from input (28/04/20) to present (01/12/20). 2 of the 5 HGA have been lost since input due to oxygen and water quality issues.

Morts are disposed of as domestic waste at Orkney Islands Council Chinglebraes commercial waste site as is less than 25kg.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0523]	Site No:	SS0548	3			
Date of Visit:		01/12/202	0		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Author	orisation Det	ails						
1. Business/site deta			site renresent	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•	onconca by	one represent	u			Ϋ́	j
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	sh for all sec	tions)					
Total No facilities	io oroanor no	21	Facilities sto	ocked	6 tanks	No facilitie	s inspected	All units
Species	OED	OED	OED	T	HGA	HGA		
	brood	2020 spat	2020 spat		wild caught	Juv		
	brood	2020 Spat	2020 Spat		(brood)	(stages 3		
Age group					(brood)	and 4)		
3. 3	161	500	~8000 -		3	350		
No Fish	101	300	10,000		3	330		
Mean Fish Wt	120g	8-20mm	1mm	_	400g	5mm		
Next Fallow Date (S		never fallow		Next Input Da		unknown		
Recent (last 4 wks)	*				Any escapes		/icit\2	I N
	disease prob	icilis:		1	Arry escapes	(Since last)	risit):	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	_							
		r increation?	,					
1. Movement record		or inspection?					20/04/2020	
2. Date of last inspe							20/01/2020	
3. Are records comp		•		_				Y
4. Are movement re				?				Y
Are records comp		•						Y
6. Are health certific	ates for intro	ductions (out	with GB) avail	able?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movemen	nts carried oເ	ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the bi	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place	for maintenar	nce of transpo	ortation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Domestic wa	ste - <25ka		
If other detail:					2011100110 110			
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly en	tered?					T Y
4. Recent mortality (•	a correctly err		ng November, (HGA morts			
5. Evidence of recer	•	atypical morts		ig November, c	TIOATIIOIIS			l N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		y/reason:				- "
	•							
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality du	uring period c	hecked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported t	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	eported to FH	? If no. enter	details on mor	tality events sh	neet.		N/A

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	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).	

12/03/2020 - 25/11/2020

Records checked between:

Date of View	01/12/2020 Illispector.				
Number of Susceptil	ble species on site				
-	ies present = <u>LOW</u> 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	0
Sites within a tidal e	xcursion	1	2-5	>6	
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal				
	excursion	0	2	10	0
Live shellfish moven	nents	0	1-2	>3	
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0
Mayamanta aff					
Movements off	Frequency of movements off <u>within</u> MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	0
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas	0	3	6	6
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	3
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)	
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area	0	4	8	0
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	0
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5	U
			Yes	No	
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	s etc	0	2	0

		_				_		
Case No:	2020-0523			Date of visit:	01/12/2020			
Cita Na	CC0540			I				
Site No:	SS0548			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
r toodito ourimary	1 10q.	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
						J	_	2 11150
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI	09/12/2020							





Orkney Shellfish Hatchery (OSH) Ltd The Lobster Ponds Lamb Holm Orkney KW172SF

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0553 SITE NO INSPECTOR

SS0548

DATE OF VISIT SITE NAME CASE NO

01/12/2020 Lamb Holm 20200523

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.

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 https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0526				Date of visit: 01/12/2020
Time spent on site:	min]	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0274 Business No: FB0137	Site Name: Business Name:	Millburn Millburn Salmon	Hatchery	
Case Types: 1 VMD 2	3	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		⊐	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving f Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed?	· ·	N/A If yes, see a	additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry of	out intended visit detail rea	son below:		

Site not inspected. Fish for vmd sampling were collected by site contact and dropped off at Cooke shorebase at Lyness (Hoy) on 01/12/2020.

Fish have not had any treatment while on site so not in withdrawal but fish removed for vmd sampling were euthanised with TMS. Fish looked in good condition with no clinical signs observed and no gross pathology observed when examined during sampling.

Photo's of movement records emailed through and issue raised with site contact that the site number of source/ destination was to be recorded for all future movements on and off site.

FHI 059, Version 13	;		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0526		Site No:	FS0274				
Date of Visit:		01/12/2020]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site det			ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	o details?	·	·				N	
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		15	Facilities sto	cked	2	No facilitie	es inspected	0
Species	SAL							
Age group	2021 S1							
No Fish	69,534							
Mean Fish Wt	30g							
Next Fallow Date (S		March 2021	•	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2021		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record								
Movement record		r inspection?						
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					19/03/2019	·
3. Are records comp		actly entered?	,				19/03/2019	N
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys		• •		,	•			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)		
If other detail:			shorebase a	t Lyness (Hoy)	,		sal at Keenan	Recycling
3. Mortality records				it = y11000 (110y)	ror otorago p	nor to alope	our at Hoorian	Y
4. Recent mortality	•			ity for Oct acro	ss whole site	was 281 (0.	4%)	
5. Evidence of recei	` '	typical mortal		ity for Got dolo		20 . (0.	.,,,	N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				
C. Amu other medical	in manufality dy	vin a mavia al alc	a alca dO					NI
6. Any other peaks in the first of the first	in mortality du	ning period cr	iecked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sl	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	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?	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: 19/03/2019 - 24/11/2020	

	Case no:	2020-05	526	Site No:		FS0274			Date of Samplin		01/	12/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampiin	g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	09:3	0:00	09:4	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	р.	1
	Environmental conditions:	1	Cloudy	2	Dry	3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Δ	add Fish/Pools - click												
		4.7											
	Fish nos	1-7											
	Pool Group	0.11											
	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	0.0300											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
Stock Details		Rysa Incubation Unit FS1050											
Ċ	Facility No	2-1											

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infoi	mation:										
0	1	Total Te	ests ass	signed	0	l								

Site No: FS0274

Case No: 2020-0526

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

	2020-0526	J		Date of visit.	01/12/2020	<u>'</u>		
Site No:	FS0274	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	ition		
,	'	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Dan ant Come				1				
	Date	Lead	and .					
			2" Insp					
VIVID	09/12/2020							
Report Summary Case Type VMD	Date 09/12/2020	Insp	2 nd Insp					





Millburn Salmon Hatchery Bayview Hoy, Stromness Orkney KW16 3NJ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0137 SITE NO FS0274

INSPECTOR

 DATE OF VISIT
 01/12/2020

 SITE NAME
 Millburn

 CASE NO
 20200526

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

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.

On this occasion, the site visit could not be conducted as there were no site representatives available but fish were made available for sampling.

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.

No treatments had been administered on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R20

• 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 this 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.

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: 09/12/2020
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0527			Date of visit: 02/12/2020
Time spent on site:	5 Hrs	Main Ins	pector:
Site No: FS1080 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Bay of Cleat (North) Cooke Aquaculture Scotla	and Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 10.1	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA O-1
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed 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 carry	out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Inspection of site records carried out remotely on the 26th November 2020 by with shadowing. Inspection of stock on site carried out on the 2nd December 2020 by WJM.

Water clear with good visibility of the stock. Fish shoaling well and responding to feed. No issues observed while on site. Fish removed for vmd sampling appeared in very good condition externally with no lice noted. No gross pathology observed on internal examination of fish taken for vmd sampling.

FMA not fallowed synchronously but RA conducted in accordance with CoGP 4.3.101.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0527		Site No:	FS1080				
Date of Visit:		02/12/2020]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho			., ,				V	
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y N	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	ocked	15	No facilitie	s inspected	15
Species	SAL							
Age group	19 S1							
No Fish	201,599							
Mean Fish Wt	4.3 kg	Jan. 2024		Northwest Da	t- (C:t-)	Ail 2024		
Next Fallow Date (S	•	Jan. 2021		Next Input Da	Any escapes	April 2021	vioit\2	N
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	uisease probi	ems?		IN	Any escapes	(since last	visit) !	N
5. Are records comp 6. Are health certificant Transport Records 1. Are any movemer If yes, is there a syst	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	usiness (not usi				N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	f?			Other (detail)			
If other detail:				as may also be	used.			
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (•			(0%), wk 46 - 1	4 (0.01%), wk	45 - 20 (0.0	01%), wk 44 -	
5. Evidence of recen		**						N
If yes, facility nos/no	rnortality per	racility/no sto	ck per racility	reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	Thortanty du	ing period of	iconcu:					1
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained)	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, enter	details on mort	ality events sl	neet.		N/A

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Med	icines Records		
1. Recent treatments	(see comment)?		Y
If yes, detail:	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)? 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)? 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: 31/07/2019 - 26/11/2020

P	Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends:	2020-05 VI	527	Site No: BA		FS1080			Date of v Sampling		02/	12/2020	
Т	Fime sampling	VI		ВА	_	•			Sampling	g:			
		12.2				PA		MG		HI			
S	starts/ends.	13.3	0:00	14:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	15
E	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	_	5			
S	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
	d Fish/Pools - click												
	ish nos	1	2										
		1	2						_				
	Pool Group	0.41	0.41										
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight		1.4 Kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A						_				
V	Vater Type	SW	SW										
	Stock Origin Facility No	4 Willburn (FS0274)	ടിsallachy Site (FS0887)										

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	Date of issue: 12/05/20			
Case Number:	2020-0527		Site No:	FS1080		Insp:			
Date of Visit	02/12/2020		No of movements/supp./dest.				Score		
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10			
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0		
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26	0		
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	0		
N									
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	3		
Exposure via water	Indiliber of des	Site contacts							
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	red (secure water supply through							
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0						
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III		_					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6				
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8				
	lamis apstream	TOT WITHIN T HUAI EXCUISION	<u> </u>	4	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 the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0]					
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			1		
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2						
		from zone or compartment of							
	equivalent state	us n from Category III farm	4						
		n from Category ∀ farm	8						
	Processing list	Thom Category Viaim	10	<u> </u>					
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		7.	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		2		
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1						
CoGP/Regulator				•					
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0		
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3						
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			-		
a.io access to cages	No		2	-			0		
	1.10			J					
					Total		15		
					Rank		LOW		

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of iss	sue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0527		Site No:	FS1080	
Is the CoGP Farm M. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema	seawater Sites Only) aced sea lice problems in the previous anagement Area (or equivalent) fallo access to a range of licenced in-feed a amectin benzoate) as well as access access access access access	wed synchronously o and bath sea lice med to suitable biological	lications (in and/or med	cluding deltamethrin, hanical control measures, and	N N Y
Management Area (or e		sin or statement relev	uni to the s	nte una coor i um	
	cords available for inspection? (Legal ly reflect the required standard specif		•	.egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?	onis) record levels below the suggest (CoGP Annex 6)	ted criteria for treatme	ent in the C	oGP during the period that	Υ
If yes, have these been 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes 10. Have therapeutic tresuggested criteria for the 11. Has any other action 12. Have therapeutic tre 13. Are treatments, who 14. Is there a harvesting 15. Is there a site speci	emale sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers reported to the Fish Health Inspector tation at a level which is considered to eatments been administered or other eatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to the eatment or where applicable)? The eatments or the actions taken had a serie conducted, carried out in cooperating strategy for the site, where fewer positic written lice management procedurals observed on stocks reflect sea lice	rate? If no, FHI see coo cause significant wactions taken when the asidered to have welf significant impact upout too between participal pulations or part pope with waypoints des	omment. Telfare probles. The salmonis fare implication the lice leading farms are cribing set a	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) levels have exceeded the tions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) evels recorded? e held without treatment for actions to deal with recognised	N/A N N/A N/A N/A Y
2. Are measures in place	on ced equipment damage due to preda se to mitigate against the predation ex Nets, M.M.L., Seal Pro Sapphire			-	N Y
2			· i 4 i 4 l-	- l4 FIII in -n #0	IN
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep 5. Have these been rep	nts or events been experienced on or stions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 orted to Scottish Ministers? orted to local DSFB forthwith (where orted to the SSPO and local fisheries	they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	ł.17)	N
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover escapees? If yes g	ive detail			
Ministers? (Legal, CoG 9. What action was take	yed was this action agreed with local – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) en to prevent and minimise the risk of satisfactory measures of the Act)	further escapes? (N	·		
	as satisfactory with regards to conta		detail reas	on(s)	Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0527	Site No: FS1080	
Date of Visit: 02/12/202	0 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	pletion.	
2. Has a current farm management ag3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or state	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	gement num health standards for the stocks to be int	roduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the are sies of fish which may be stocked into the are imum stocking density of any pen on any far	ea or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual f	ngements for the storage and disposal of an farm?	y dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arranger	of Sea Lice ments for the sharing of data on sea lice nun	nbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the avail of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms co	overed by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual for	uirements for the sensitivity testing of availab arms?	ole treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	ımstances under which biological controls ar l farms?	nd cleaner fish are to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar	ngements for synchronous treatments on far	rms within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circularea or farm?	ımstances when live fish may be introduced	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar or individual farms?	ngements for the movement of live fish on a	nd off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest prac	tices on farms in the area or individual farms?	Y
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the a	rea or individual farm will be fallow and the ea	rliest Y
date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more yea agreement or statement?	ar classes may be stocked onto sites covered	by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or p covered by the agreement or statement?	otential broodstock are to be kept on any site	Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreen 24. Does the farm management agreement include an parties to the agreement?		to be,
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in ac 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S		Y

Site No: FS1080

Case No: 2020-0527

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

O N	0000 0507			D	00/40/000	5		
Case No:	2020-0527			Date of visi	t: 02/12/2020	4		
Site No:	FS1080	1		Inspecto	r:			
Results Summary	Freq.	D / 1	1.		ate of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
					_			
Report Summary				l				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	09/12/2020							
	1							





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 SITE NO INSPECTOR

FS1080

DATE OF VISIT 02/12/2020

SITE NAME Bay of Cleat (North) 20200527 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 low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 09/12/2020

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0528			Date of visit: 02/12/2020
Time spent on site:	.5 Hrs	Main Inspec	etor:
Site No: FS1210 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Vestness Cooke Aquaculture Scotland	Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.9	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA O-1
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe 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 carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Inspection of site records carried out remotely on the 26th November 2020 by with with shadowing. Inspection of stock on site carried out on the 2nd December 2020 by shadowing.

Water clear but fish staying low due to rougher seas. Fish shoaling closer to surface appeared well and responding to feed. No issues observed while on site. Fish removed for vmd sampling appeared in very good condition externally with no lice noted. No gross pathology observed on internal examination of fish taken for vmd sampling.

FMA not fallowed synchronously but RA conducted in accordance with CoGP 4.3.101

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0528		Site No:	FS1210				
Date of Visit:		02/12/2020]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	iils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL							
Age group	20 S1							
No Fish	500,238							
Mean Fish Wt	1.4 kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Nov/Dec. 202	21	Next Input Da	te (Site)	March/Apr	il 2022	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
 Movement records Date of last inspect Are records comp Are movement records Are records comp Are health certification Transport Records Are any movement If yes, is there a system 	ction: elete and correctords available elete and corrected attentions attentions attentions attentions attentions	ectly entered? e for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outw	h and waste? vith GB) availa half) of the bu	able? usiness (not usi	•		31/07/2019	Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail)			
If other detail:				as may also be	used.			V
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente		(0.000())	/	·		Y
4. Recent mortality (•			(0.09%), wk 46	6 - 289 (0.06%	6), wk 45 - 2	205 (0.04%), v	
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?					N
If yes, detail:		3 p = 110 a 011						
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) i	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, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medic	ines Records		
1. Recent treatments (se	ee comment)?		Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S.		
If other detail:			

Treatments and medicines records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	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 an	ny
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 di	sease
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or high	ier Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minim	nise 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: 31/07/2019 - 26/11/2020

Case no: 2020-0528 Site No: FS1210 Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling starts/ends: 13:00:00 13:30:00 Inspector:	Date of visit/ 02/12/2020 Sampling: MG HI
Time sampling 13:00:00 13:30:00 Inspector:	
	r: VMD No.
Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3	45
Summary samples HIST BA MG	VI PA Total Sample
Add Fish/Pools - click	
Pool/Fish No	
Fish nos 1 2	
Pool Group	
Species SAL SAL	
Average weight 4.5 Kg 4.5 Kg	
Sex N/A N/A	
Water Type SW SW	
Stock Details Loch Garasdale (FS0866) Loch Garasdale (FS0866) 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0528		Site No:	FS1210		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/12/2020		No of m	ovements/s	upp./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	40	20	0
species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
							0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6 6	10 10	3
Exposure via water	Number of des	Site contacts			6-10	10	
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	T T		0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III		_			_
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	0		
	iainis upstream	1 of within 1 tidal excursion	<u>'</u>	4	٥		
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]			
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		4				
		from Category III farm	8				
		r from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				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	1			
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		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		T 0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes			1			0
with regulator or industry	No		2				
code of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Pople		15
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ied by: FHI	Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2	020-0528	Site No:	FS1210							
Sea Lice Inspection (Sea	awater Sites Only)									
1. Has the site experience	ed sea lice problems in the previous 4 ye	ars?		N						
2. Is the CoGP Farm Man	agement Area (or equivalent) fallowed s	synchronously on a single	year class basis?	N						
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and										
4. Is there a signed docum Management Area (or equ	nented farm management agreement or uivalent)?	statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm	Y						
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)	Υ						
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmoni</i> records are inspected? (0	is) record levels below the suggested cr CoGP Annex 6)	iteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that	Y						
8. Have average adult fen	nale sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per	fish been at a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	N						
If yes, have these been re	ported to the Fish Health Inspectorate?	If no, FHI see comment.		N/A						
9. Is C. elongatus infestat	tion at a level which is considered to cau	se significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N						
•	tments been administered or other action tment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is conside			N/A						
11. Has any other action b	peen taken (where applicable)?			N/A						
12. Have therapeutic treat	ments or the actions taken had a signification	cant impact upon the lice l	evels recorded?	N/A						
13. Are treatments, where	conducted, carried out in cooperation b	etween participating farms	s?	Υ						
14. Is there a harvesting s	trategy for the site, where fewer populat	ions or part populations ar	re held without treatment for	Y						
· ·	written lice management procedure with	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Y						
16. Do the sea lice levels	observed on stocks reflect sea lice cour	t data? If no please detail	reasons.	Y						
Containment Inspection										
Containment Inspection	ed equipment damage due to predators i	n the current or provious n	production cycles?	N						
	to mitigate against the predation experie		-	V						
	ets, M.M.L., Seal Pro Sapphire	iliced oil site: (Detail belo	w)	•						
If other, detail below:	ets, M.M.L., Gear 1 To Gapphine									
ii otiloi, dotali bolow.										
3. Have escape incidents	or events been experienced on or in the	vicinity of the site since t	he last FHI inspection?	N						
If Yes proceed with questi	ons 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10									
4. Have these been report	ted to Scottish Ministers?									
5. Have these been report	ted to local DSFB forthwith (where they	exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.	.4.17)							
6. Have these been report	ted to the SSPO and local fisheries trust	s forthwith (where they exi	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)							
7. Were methods (if any)	used to recover escapees? If yes give d	etail								
0 If all noto were denime	d was this action agreed with least wild	fish interests and was name	mission given by Caettish							
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP -	·	·								
	to prevent and minimise the risk of furth	er escapes? (Not covered	in code but could							
	atisfactory measures of the Act)									
10. Is the site inspected a	s satisfactory with regards to containme	nt? If no, please detail rea	son(s)	Y						

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0528	Site No: FS1210	
Date of Visit: 02/12/202	0 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comp	pletion.	
2. Has a current farm management ag3. Is the current FMAg/S available for i4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far	ant farm management area? arm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or state	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	gement num health standards for the stocks to be int	roduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the ar cies of fish which may be stocked into the ar imum stocking density of any pen on any far	ea or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar fish farm in the area or the individual f	ngements for the storage and disposal of an farm?	y dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arranger	of Sea Lice ments for the sharing of data on sea lice nur	mbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the avail of statement?	lability and the use of medicines on farms co	overed by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual for	uirements for the sensitivity testing of availab arms?	ole treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	ımstances under which biological controls a l farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar	ngements for synchronous treatments on fa	rms within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circularea or farm?	ımstances when live fish may be introduced	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrar or individual farms?	ngements for the movement of live fish on a	nd off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest prac	tices on farms in the area or individual farms?	Y
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the a	rea or individual farm will be fallow and the ea	rliest Y
date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more yea agreement or statement?	ar classes may be stocked onto sites covered	by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or p covered by the agreement or statement?	otential broodstock are to be kept on any site	Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreen 24. Does the farm management agreement include an parties to the agreement?		to be,
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in ac 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S		Y

Site No: FS1210

Case No: 2020-0528

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0528			Date of visit	: 02/12/2020			
Site No:	FS1210			Inspector				
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, SLI, VMD	08/12/2020							





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 Site No FS1210 Inspector
 DATE OF VISIT
 02/12/2020

 SITE NAME
 Vestness

 CASE No
 20200528

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.

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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



Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 08/12/2020

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of is	ssue: 12/05/2020		
Case No: 2020-0532				Date of visit:	1/12/2020		
Time spent on site: 4h		\neg	Main Inspector	:			
Site No: FS0590 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Glenan Bay The Scottish Sa	lmon Company				
Case Types: 1 REP 2	VMD 3	4	5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 10.3	Thermometer No:	T173		FHI 045 complet	ed		
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	s S	CoGP MA:	M-42		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Jegonal information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

Gill issues caused by toxic algal bloom started in wk 33 with PD further compromising fish health, type of bloom could not be confirmed.

Mortalities: week 33 6840 (1.7%) week 38 4589 (1.19), week 39 4392 (1.15%), week 40 5413 (1.44%) week 41 10071 (2.71%), week 42 (20109 (5.57%) week 43 13566 (3.98%) week 44 10939 3.34%) week 45 4345 (1.37%) week 46 (458 (0.15%), week 47 496 (0.16%) week 48 524 (0.17%)

Freshwater treatment finished end of November which had a positive impact on gill health and mortalities.

Hydrolicer permanently stationed in Loch Fyne with targeted treatments administered.

Treatments with Salmosan and freshwater 26/10/2020 to 2/112020, good clearance achieved. slice and hydrolicer also been used this year.

Some fish observed lethargic in the pens but could not be removed due to startle response. Some fish with physical damage also observed, attempts were made to remove these but also could not be caught. Site manager reported that any moribund fish are removed as soon as is possible with the pen surface checked when removing mortalities.

FHI 059, Version 13	.	_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0532		Site No:	FS0590				
Date of Visit:		01/12/2020			Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site det			site representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•	·	·				N]
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	cked	14	No facilitie	s inspected	14
Species	Sal	WRS					1	
•	2019 S0	mix						
Age group	20.000	wild/famed						
No Fish	311,069	19,606						
Mean Fish Wt	3.418	n/a						
Next Fallow Date (S		May 2021		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	September	r 2021	
Recent (last 4 wks)	•	•		•	Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:	Gill health				iny occuped	(on loo laot		
Movement Record								
Movement record		r inspection?						У
Date of last inspendent							04/06/2019	
Are records comp		•						Y
Are movement re	cords availabl	e for dead fis	sh and waste?	•				Y
Are records comp	plete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
6. Are health certific	cates for introd	uctions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records	S							
1. Are any moveme		by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys		• `	,	•	,			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti					Whole fish - I	Dundas Che	emicals	•
If other detail:					TTTTOIS HOTT	Danidae One	71110410	
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•	corrosily one	see addition	al comments				<u> </u>
5. Evidence of rece	•	tynical morta		ai comments				l N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				
ir yes, racility 1105/110	o mortality per	Tacility/110 Stc	ock per racility,	rieason.				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					Y
If yes, detail:	see additiona							
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								
If yes, detail action:	• •		al information					
8. Have 'mortality e					tality events sh	neet.		Y
					,			

FHI 059, Version 1	3	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Treatments and Medicines Records									
	nts (see comment)?		1						
If yes, detail:	TMS								
If other, detail:	Freshwater								
2 Modicinos rocor	de available for increation	2	Y						

If yes, detail:	TMS	
If other, detail:	Freshwater	
2. Medicines records	ds available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records comp	plete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withd	drawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatm	tment(s)?	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines sto	tored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Record	rds	
1. Biosecurity record	rds available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner a	and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner a	and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplain	ained) mortality at the site been included?	
	nat will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been inc	cluded and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
	tatus of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certific	ication if required)?	
	ndry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	
	ease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	n available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals		
	urity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveilla		
•	health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
-	s available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant res		Y
It ves. detail (it not d	detailed under recent disease problems). Gill issues and PD see additional com	ments

Records checked between:

4/6/2019 to 26/11/2020

starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Sample Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No	THE 009, VERSION TO							133	ded by. I				
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling starts/ends: 12:30:00 14:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Sample Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Pool/Fish No Pool Group	Case no:	2020-053	32	Site No:		FS0590					01/1	2/2020	
starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Sample Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Image: Control of the control	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG					
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Sample Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No		12:30	0:00	14:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No). [26
Pool/Fish No	Environmental conditions	;: 1 <u>[</u>	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Pool/Fish No	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
Fish nos 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Pool Group Species Image: Control of the													
Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type													
Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Fish nos	1 2	2 (3	4	5	6	7					
Average weight Sex Water Type	Pool Group												
Sex Water Type													
Sex Water Type	Average weight												
	Sex												
	Water Type												
				ij			it	it					
				smolt unit			smolt unit	n					
				븅			olt.	et e					
		도	چ	ŭ.	چ	چ	Ü.	Ü.					
	<u>s</u>	崩	립	ر ح	ш	ш		~ ~					
th Damp serkerry and Damp serk	ete	Da	Da	eri	Da	Оа	eri	eri					
Loch Damph		등	동	erk	등	등	erk	erk					
Stock Origin Coch Damph Loch	്റ്റ് Stock Origin	Loc	ادّ	<u> </u>	Ľ	Loc	<u>N</u>	<u>l</u>					
중 Facility No 14 14 3 13 13 4 4	ਲੋਂ Facility No	14 1	14	3	13	13					_		

Additional Sample Information:												
0 Total Tests assigned 0												

Site No: FS0590

Case No: 2020-0532

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2020-0532			Date of visit:	01/12/2020]			
Site No:	FS0590	1	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion			
,	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
							_		
							-		
Report Summary			1	1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
REP, VMD	11/12/2020		2 IIISP						
	,,								





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
 01/12/2020

 Site No
 FS0590
 Site Name
 Glenan Bay

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200532

The above site was inspected following the report of a mortality event by the business.

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. 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.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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

Signed: Date: 11/12/2020
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2020-0533			Date of visit: 07/12/2020					
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Ins	pector:					
Site No: FS1322 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incul Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	pation 2					
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 5.9	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y					
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:								

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection carried out on the 01/12/2020 and the physical inspection was carried out on the 07/12/2020. Accompanied by for remote inspection.

Waste is ensiled onsite and transported to SSF Barkip by

The site was stocked in week 48 from Holywood. Eggs disinfected with Buffodein on arrival - 1% for 10 minutes.

Site temperature used as inspectors thermometer was faulty.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0533		Site No:	FS1322				
Date of Visit:		07/12/2020]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	site representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		5	Facilities sto	cked	5	No facilitie	s inspected	5
Species	SAL							
Age group	Ova							
No Fish	1,557,448							
Mean Fish Wt	Ova							
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	January 20	21	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		. N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:				•		•	•	
 Are records comp Are movement records comp Are records comp Are health certification Transport Records Are any movement yes, is there a syst 	cords availablete and corrected attestion for introduction to the corrected out the	e for dead fis ectly entered' luctions (outv	sh and waste? ? vith GB) availa chalf) of the bu	able? usiness (not us				Y Y Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Ensiled - on	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (•		WK49 - 0.16	6%				
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?						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?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?							N/A	
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events sl	neet.		N/A

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N
If yes, detail:		
If other detail:		

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	N			
If yes, detail:				
If other, detail:				
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y			
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?				
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	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?	Y			
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?	N			
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).				

Records checked between: 12/03/2019 - 07/12/2020

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0533		Site No:	FS1322		Insp:	
Date of Visit	07/12/2020	supp./dest.		Score			
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26	9
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	5
N							
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	3
Exposure via water	realiser of des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	T				
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III		_			
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1		8		
	iainis upstream	TOT WILLIIT T LIGHT EXCUSSION	<u> </u>	4	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 fales of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	1				
	equivalent state	us n from Category III farm	4				
	_	r from Category ∀ farm	10				
			10]			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		7.	0				
P. C. S. S. C.		esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		Ι ο	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	1			
Sub of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		27
					Rank		HIGH
					· with		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0533	Site No:	FS1322
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e 3. Does the site have access to a range of lice azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as 4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)? 5. Are sea lice count records available for ins 6. Do records adequately reflect the required 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	s in the previous 4 years? equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single yenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or medication agreement or statement relevant to the s	year class basis? cluding deltamethrin, chanical control measures, and site and CoGP Farm Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Fig. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which 10. Have therapeutic treatments been adminisuggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. et al.</i> Has any other action been taken (where a 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, 15. Is there a site specific written lice manager	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare problestered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications.	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) levels have exceeded the tions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) evels recorded? ? e held without treatment for actions to deal with recognised
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against and pest control contract If other, detail below: 3. Have escape incidents or events been explictly been explicated by the proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skill 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministry. Have these been reported to local DSFB for the period of the process of the post of the process of the period of the process of the period of the	•	ne last FHI inspection? N 4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimum be considered under satisfactory measurements.	greed with local wild fish interests and was pern imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in res of the Act) egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	in code but could

		_				_					
Case No:	2020-0533			Date of visit:	07/12/2020						
	504000	•									
Site No:	FS1322			Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification									
Nesults Summary	r req.	Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
		Databass	шор	THORIC	ШОР	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	шор	2 111 5 p			
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI	25/01/2021										





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 SITE NO FS1322 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 07/12/2020
SITE NAME Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation 2
CASE NO 20200533

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 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.

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 https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/

Date: 25/01/2020

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2020-0534			Date of visit: 07/12/2020				
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Insp	pector:				
Site No: FS1324 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incut Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	pation 4				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 5.8	Thermometer No:	Site	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? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	nil reason below:					

Remote inspection carried out on the 01/12/2020 and the physical inspection was carried out on the 07/12/2020. Accompanied by for remote inspection.

Waste is ensiled onsite and transported to SSF Barkip by

Site thermometer used as case inspectors faulty.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0534		Site No:	FS1324				
Date of Visit:		07/12/2020			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author	risation Deta	iils						
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	site representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	
Site Details (include	e cleaner fisl	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		5	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilitie	s inspected	5
	SAL							
Age group	Ova							
	1,519,716							
Mean Fish Wt	Ova							
Next Fallow Date (Si		No plans		Next Input Da		January 20		
Recent (last 4 wks) d	lisease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last v	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
 Date of last inspect Are records completed. Are movement records completed. Are records completed. Are health certificat Transport Records Are any movement If yes, is there a systematical expectations. 	ete and corre cords available ete and corre tes for introd	e for dead fisectly entered luctions (outv	sh and waste? ? with GB) availa chalf) of the bu	able? usiness (not usi			22/03/2019	Y Y Y Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed of	f?			Ensiled - on s	site		
If other detail:			10					V
3. Mortality records of		correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (I	•			23827 wk46 -	816 0.06% W	(47 825 0.0)	5% WK48 249	
5. Evidence of recent		• •		/				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	Tacility/no sto	ock per facility	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	nexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality eve	ents' been re	ported to FH	l? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Reco 1. Recent treatments (see comme		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	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	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	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.)?	1
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: 22/03/2019 - 07/12/2020

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0534		Site No:	FS1324	ı	Insp:	
Date of Visit	07/12/2020		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	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	g
-	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0			14	5
Movements off			0		6	10	2
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other		ted (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or	•	0				0
diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	Tallio apolioali						
Management practices	I A my mynnannima		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	1			0
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
		n from MS of equivalent status	1				\vdash
	_	n from zone or compartment of					
	equivalent stat		4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of ι	inpasteurised feed	0	Ī			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				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
				ı			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		27
					Rank		HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0534	Site No:	FS1324
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 e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single y	/ear class basis?
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or med	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (L	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	oGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salr	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
	is considered to cause significant welfare probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
_	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i>	
suggested criteria for treatment or where C. e	elongatus is considered to have welfare implicate	tions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	applicable)?	
	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice le	evels recorded?
•	l out in cooperation between participating farms	
	where fewer populations or part populations are	
	ement procedure with waypoints describing set	
	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail r	
Containment Inspection		
•	ge due to predators in the current or previous p	reduction eveloc2
	ge due to predators in the current of previous protection by the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
	The predation expendiced on site? (Detail below	V)
Pest control Site inside		
If other, detail below:		
2. Have occano incidente er evente hace even	porioneed on or in the visinity of the site since the	no last EHI inspection?
·	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	ie last i fil ilispection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis		4.47)
-	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	st)? (COGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
	greed with local wild fish interests and was perm	nission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered i	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measur	res of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s)

		_				_				
Case No:	2020-0534			Date of visit:	07/12/2020					
Site No:	FS1324			lmama atawi						
Sile No.	F31324			Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification								
,		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI	26/01/2020	шэр	Z IIISP							





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 SITE NO FS1324 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 07/12/2020
SITE NAME Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation 4
CASE NO 20200534

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 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 https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/

Date: 26/01/2021

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of	f issue: 12/05/2020	
Case No: 2020-0537			Date of visit:	10/12/2020	
Time spent on site:	hrs	Mai	n Inspector:		
Site No: FS0805 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Bagh Dail Nan Cean Mowi Scotland Ltd	1		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 10.5	Thermometer No:	T153	FHI 045 comp	leted	
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	S CoGP MA:	M-40	
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 carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:			

Site had experienced a drop in feed, health screening identified piscirickettsia, this was treated with Aquatet and mortalities attributed to this have dropped.

Feeding response has reportedly increased over the last few weeks and the stock displayed a good feeding response at time of inspection. 4 fish removed for VMD appeared healthy. 3 dead observed across site, not fresh dead therefore not sampled, these were removed by site manager during inspection.

Visibility was good at time of inspection, 5 dead observed across site, not fresh dead, therefore not sampled. 7 lethargic fish observed across site deeper in the water. With the exception of the 7 lethargic and 5 dead, the fish were shoaling well. Site is stocked with wrasse and lumpfish, numbers have been increased on last cycle and now aiming for 7% stocking of cleaner fish. Cleaner fish are now fed from the barge through the same feeding system as salmon, may also reintroduce the feeding stations around the outside of cage if required.

Site has replaced the hamster wheel top net supports with poles around the cage. Site manager prefers these as it removes equipment from the water that the fish could damage themselves on.

Site hoping upgrade cages from 12 x 120m circles to 8 x 160m circles

Site utilises ROV mortality removal system, which reportedly works well, also capacity to use uplift system if required. Following confirmation of piscirickettsia, the site has been operating separately from the other Mowi sites in area and not sharing staff or equipment.

FHI 059, Version 13			Iss	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0537		Site No:	FS0805	5			
Date of Visit:		10/12/202	20		Inspector(s):		ı
Registration/Author	orisation Det	ails						
1. Business/site det			site represent	tative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ]
Site Details (include	de cleaner fis	sh for all se	ctions)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities st	ocked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12
Species	SAL	WRA	LUM					
Age group	2020 Q2	Mixed	2020					
No Fish	1,015,000	~75,000	~160,000					
Mean Fish Wt	2.4 kg	Mixed	Mixed					
Next Fallow Date (S		Dec 2021	_	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 202	22	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		Y	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:			1,904, wk 47	- 1,873, wk 48 -	47 and wk 4	9 -5	,	
 3. Are records complete. 4. Are movement respondent respond	ecords available ecords available end corrected for introsections.	ole for dead to rectly entered ductions (ou ut by (or on b	ish and wasted? twith GB) avai behalf) of the b	lable? ousiness (not us				Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed o	of?			Other (deta	il)		
If other detail:	Ensiled at K	(ames Pier ,	ensiler on bar	ge will be used	in future			
3. Mortality records	•	d correctly er	ntered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•			for site: WK 46	- 1,904 (0.18	3%), WK 47 ·	- 3,944 (0.38%	%), WK 48
5. Evidence of rece		•						Y
If yes, facility nos/no				•				
WK 44 -18,291 (1.7				eatment losses)			
6. Any other peaks	in mortality di	uring period	checked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities b	een reported	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		L	110.17		. 10			
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	eported to FI	H? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events :	sheet.		Y

Treatments and Me	dicines Rec	ords			
1. Recent treatments	s (see comme	ent)?			Y
		T.M.S.,			
		Oxytetracycl			
If yes, detail:		ine			
If other, detail:					
2. Medicines records	available for	inspection?			Y
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?			Y
4. Are fish in a withd	rawal period?				Y
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)?		T.M.S., Oxyte	tracycline	
If other, detail:					
6. Are medicines sto	red appropria	ately?			Y
Biosecurity Record	is				
1. Biosecurity record		or inspection?			Y
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•	ording and safe	disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner a	nd period in v	which the APB will notify S	Scottish Ministers	s or veterinary professional of any	
		y at the site been included		,,	Y
, ,	· · ·			on of the presence of a listed dise	ase
		w and when that will be n		•	Y
5. Has the health sta	itus of aquaci	ulture animals being stock	ed on the farm	site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific		_		((
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
6 Have the husband	dry and biosed	curity measures implemen	nted hetween ea	ch epidemiological unit to minimise	_ Y
				ent, live or dead fish etc.)?	
		,		the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals		•		the physical containment of	
		es been adequately implen	nented on site?		Y
If no, detail:	ity procedure	3 been adequately implem	nonted on site:		
ii iio, aotaii.					
Results of Surveilla	ance				
		ance been carried out by, o	or on behalf of t	he husiness?	
2. If yes, are results		-	on bonan or, t	ne business:	· ·
3. Any significant res		napodion:			·
, ,		recent disease problems)		AGD and Piscirickettsia	
ii yoo, actali (ii fiot d	stalled dridel	rooditt diooddo probiettia)		7.00 drid i loomokettola	
F	Records check	ked between:	20/04/20 to 06	6/12/20	

FΗ	ii 059, version 13							ISS	uea by:	FHI			
	Case no:	2020-05	537	Site No:		FS0805			Date of Samplin		10/1	12/2020	10/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		5:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	D. [30
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
	ld Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No			•									
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	2.4000	2.4000	2.4000	2.4000								
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
	Stock Origin Facility No	ധ Glenfinnan	Loch Lochy	ص Loch Lochy	Glenfinnan								
	I CACHILLY INC.	1.3	/	9									

1111000, ve	5131011 13								133	ueu by.			
12/2020 Additional Sample Information:													
0	Total T	ests ass	igned	0	1								
		<u> </u>											

Date of Visit	FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Live fish movements Novements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 0 5 10 14	Case Number:	2020-0537		Site No:	FS0805		Insp:	
Movements on (from out with GB) of ausceptible species Frequency of movements on from equivalent XOS 0 5 10 14	Date of Visit	10/12/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
with GB) of susceptible species Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country Number of suppliers Movements off Frequency of movements off Number of suppliers Movements off Frequency of movements off Number of suppliers Movements off Frequency of movements off Number of suppliers Site contacts 1 -5 6-10 Farm is protected (secure water supply through distants of the farm of holding species susceptible to same 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 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 Management practices Water contacts with processing within the rules of the directive 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-processed with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms 3 Collection point for waste from other farms Disposal of fish and fish by-processed with other farms Water contacts with other sites Sites own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Sites own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms 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 from single shorebase Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Disposal of fish and fish by-processing from single shorebase No Collection point for waste from other farms Disposal of fish and fish by-processing from single shorebase No Disposal of	Live fish movements			c	1-5	6-10	>10	
Species Compartment including third country		Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	(5	10	14	0
Number of suppliers 0 0 5 10 14 Movements off Frequency of movements off 0 3 6 10 Number of destinations 0 3 6 10 Number of destinations 0 3 6 10 Number of destinations 0 1 1 5 6-10 Number of destinations 0 1 1 2 Number of destinations 0 1 1 2 Number of sites sharing staff and equipment Number of sites 1 2 Number of sites sharing staff and equipment Number of sites 1 2 Number of sites 1 Number of sites 1 2 Number of sites 1 Numbe					9	18	26	0
Movements off Frequency of movements off Number of destinations 0 3 6 10 Number of destinations 0 1-5 6-10 Number of sites 0 1-5 6-10 Number of sites 1 2 4 Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category II farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 3 6 Number of sites 0 1 4 8 Number of sites 1 2 0 1 1 2 Number of sites 1 2 0 1 1 2 Number of sites 1 2 0 1 2 Number of sites								0
Number of destinations Site contacts O 3 6 10	Movements off) 3	l 6l	10	10
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases) Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole) Farm (holding species) Farm (son-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 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 Secure Unsecure 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 Processing fish from Sequiv III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by-processed in from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by-processed with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites own waste only processed. Ocommon processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites operating from Single shorebase Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment Ves No Coop/Regulator Procecing fish and equipment Yes No No No No No No No No No N	Movements on							3
tarms (holding species susceptible to same diseases) Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	Exposure via water		Site contac	ts (1-5	6-10		
diseases) farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 2 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 V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 4 8 Management practices Water contacts with processors Water contacts with processors Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters 0 1 2 On farm processing within the rules of the directive Processing with from Core or compartment of equivalent status 2 Processing fish from Category VI farm 8 Processing fish from Category VI farm 8 Processing fish from Category VI farm 8 Processing fish from Category VI farm 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed 5 Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 2 4 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase 5 Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoeP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	farms (holding species	disinfection or b	oorehole)	C)			0
farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 3 6 Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion 1 4 8 Management practices None Secure Unsecure Water contacts with processors Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters processors 0 1 2 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 V farm 10 Disposal of fish and fish by-processed 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 operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc 0 No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	susceptible to same	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
Management practices		farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
Water contacts with 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 Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm 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 Socolection point for waste from other farms 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 Socolection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Sites operating from single shorebase Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc OcopP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Yes No No No No 3			0 1	1	4	8		0
Disposal of fish and fish by- products Disposal of fish and fish by- products Disposal of fish and fish by- products No feeding unpasteurised feed Biosecurity No feeding unpasteurised feed 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 No on farm processing No on farm processing On farm processing On farm processing within the recycling risk) 1 1 2 3 3 4 4 4 9 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
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 III farm 8 Processing fish from Category V farm 10 Disposal of fish and fish byprocessed. 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 Ves No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice		Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent wate		1	2		0
Processing fish from MS of equivalent status 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 V farm Disposal of fish and fish by-processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solie's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Solies of unpasteurised feed Preeding unpasteurised feed Number of sites 2 or 3 ≥ 4 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Olimitation of equipment on the farms Sites sharing staff and equipment on the farms Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Olimitation of equipment on the farms Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Olimitation of equipment on the farms Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Olimitation of equipment on the farms Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Olimitation of equipment on the farms Contacts with other sites No No No No No No No No No N				(0
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 byproducts Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms S Use of unpasteurised feeds Feeding unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed 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 Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice		Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
equivalent status Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish by- products Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms 3 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds Feeding unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Sites operating from single shorebase Online Sites operating staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc COGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice		Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2			0
Processing fish from Category III farm Processing fish from Category V farm Disposal of fish and fish byproducts Site's own waste only processed. Common processes with other farms 3 Collection point for waste from other farms 5 Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Sites operating from single shorebase O1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No Sites sharing staff and sequipment of practice No 3 O2 O3 ≥ 4 O3 O4 O5								0
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 of unpasteurised feed No feeding of unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Number of sites 1 2 or 3 ≥ 4 Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase O 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc No TogP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 3								0
Common processes with other farms 3					_			0
Confinition processes with other farms Collection point for waste from other farms Use of unpasteurised feeds No feeding of unpasteurised feed Feeding unpasteurised feed Sibescurity Number of sites Sites operating from single shorebase O 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CogP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Cofficient of waste from other farms Sites of unpasteurised feed Number of sites 1 2 or 3 ≥ 4 2 or 3 ≥ 4 Corracts with other sites Number of sites O 1 2 Sites sharing staff and equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc No 1 CogP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 3		Site's own wast	e only processed.					0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3	3			3
Feeding unpasteurised feed 5		Collection point	for waste from other farms	5	5			0
Biosecurity Number of sites 1 2 or 3 ≥ 4	Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed]			0
Contacts with other sites Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice Sites operating from single shorebase 0 1 2 No 1 2 No 1 2 CogP/Regulator Yes No 3		Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	5			0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No Sites sharing staff and equipment 0 1 2 No No No No No No No No No N	Biosecurity		Number of site	es 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 No O No No	Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	() 1	2		2
between sites, use of footbaths etc No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No No 1		Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	C	1	2		0
footbaths etc No 1 CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No 3		Yes]			0
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice No O No O No O No O O O O O O O O O O O O O		No		1				0
with regulator or industry code of practice No 3								
code of practice No 3		Yes		C				0
Platform access to cages Yes		No		3	3			3
	Platform access to cages	Yes		(0
No 2		No		2				0
Total Rank MEDIU								23 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2020-0537	Site No	: FS0805
<u> </u>	s well as access to suitable biological and/or m	•
4. Is there a signed documented farm mana Management Area (or equivalent)?	gement agreement or statement relevant to the	e site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ir6. Do records adequately reflect the require	nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) d standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that N
-	almonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 of Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N/A
10. Have therapeutic treatments been admi	ch is considered to cause significant welfare pro- nistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmon</i> . elongatus is considered to have welfare implice	is levels have exceeded the Y
•	ons taken had a significant impact upon the lice	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site	ed out in cooperation between participating farm e, where fewer populations or part populations a gement procedure with waypoints describing se	are held without treatment for Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stock	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no please deta	il reasons.
Containment Inconstion		
2. Are measures in place to mitigate agains	age due to predators in the current or previous t the predation experienced on site? (Detail bel	
Top nets, tension nets, M.M.L. If other, detail below:		
		<u></u>
 Have escape incidents or events been e Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No sl Have these been reported to Scottish Mir 		the last FHI inspection?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover es	scapees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	agreed with local wild fish interests and was pe	ermission given by Scottish
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covere	d in code but could
be considered under satisfactory meas 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail re	ason(s)

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
	e No: FS0805	Date of 133de. 12/03/2020
2020-0337 Sit	e No. F30803	
Date of Visit: 10/12/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
Is the farm under inspection located with	in a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require completio		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Mai		
Has a current farm management agreemIs the current FMAg/S available for inspe		Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant fa		Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm s	•	Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of cor	•	nent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of rev	riew?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Managem	ent	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum h		oduced to the area or Y
farm?		
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	•	
 Does the FMAg/S identify the species of the species of the FMAg/S identify the maximum 	·	
individual farm?	rotocking denotes or any perion any lam	Thrule dreat of the
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangem	•	dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual farm?	?	
Arrangements for The Management of S	ea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	s for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
4.4. Doog the FMA of Cidentify the considerities		V
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availabilit of statement?	y and the use of medicines on farms cov	ered by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirem	ents for the sensitivity testing of available	e treatments for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual farms	?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumsta		d cleaner fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual farm 17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangem		ns within the area?
17. Does the Fiving/3 identity the arrangen	ients for synchronous treatments of fam	is within the area!
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumsta	ances when live fish may be introduced o	
area or farm?	ponts for the mayoment of live fish an an	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangem or individual farms?	ients for the movement of live lish on and	u on sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable h	narvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restocke		
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	or more year classes may be stocked onto s	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brocovered by the agreement or statement?	odstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	ot on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Managem 24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	nent Agreements Only nt include arrangements for persons to becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and op 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	perated in accordance with the agreement or so the FMAg/S? 21/04/2020	statement?

Once No.	0000 0507			D	40/40/000	7		
Case No:	2020-0537	J		Date of visit:	10/12/2020	4		
Site No:	FS0805]		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	1		Da	te of Notifica	ation		
ŕ		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
							_	
							_	
							_	
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	21/12/2020							





Mowi 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 SITE NO FS0805

INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 10/12/2020

SITE NAME Bagh Dail Nan Cean

CASE No 20200537

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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 21/12/20

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

FHI 059, Version 13	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2020-0538			Date of visit: 08/12/2020					
Time spent on site:	5 mins	Main Inspect	or:					
Site No: SS0740 Business No: SB0473	Site Name: Business Name:	Scottish Association for Marin Scottish Association for Marin						
Case Types: 1 ALA	2 3	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Site inspected following application to hold Litopenaeus vannamei, for forthcoming experimental trial. Site is due to receive the initial stock second week of January. 3 CT rooms are to be set up, with the same equipment in each - 8 tanks and two filter units in each room. 0.9mm mesh to be used in screens, GB Prawns confirmed to site rep that the smallest stock they will receive will be ~25mm. Tanks on site are ~200l maximum (82cm x 48cm x 65cm) (l x w x h)

Rooms expected to all be complete over next couple of weeks. Access to Aquarium area is controlled by access cards. Checklist completed by with site rep before site inspection.

Check list to determine the containment measures in place as defined in Council Regulation (EC) No 708/2007 concerning the use of alien and locally absent species in aquaculture. SAMS 20.12.04

· Does the facility involve the recirculation of water:

All stock will be held in small self-contained RAS utilizing: protein skimmer, biological trickle filter, fluidized sand bed, filter socks and continuous UV irradiation. There will not be continuous flow through involved within the systems.

• Do discharges not connect in any way to open waters before screening and filtering or percolation and filtering to prevent the release of solid waste into the aquatic environment:

All discharge will be made manually during a small daily water change (estimated maximum 10% of system volume). This will be taken from the sump and will therefore be after both 0.9 mm mesh screening on the overflow from the tanks and post filtration. The pipe used for water removal will also have a 0.9 mm mesh over the discharge end. Discharge will then be made to the main aquarium drain, which collects in the septic tank for the site prior to discharge to sea.

· Are measures in place to prevent the escapes from the facility of the farmed species and non-target species that may survive and subsequently reproduce:

Stock obtained from Great British Prawns is certified Specific Pathogen Free and will have been closely observed before transfer. Virasure footbath will be maintained at entrance to the aquarium building. All materials/equipment used within the trial will be disinfected at the end of the trial. Appropriate aquarium PPE will be worn within the rooms holding stock. Stock will be held at 30oc with local ambient conditions being out with farmed species survival range. UV units will be run continuously. Stock is held within contained rooms themselves within the enclosed aquarium building. Tanks will be netted and tank outflows will be covered by mesh. Doors of the individual rooms will be closed as much as possible and entry will be restricted to a limited number of personnel.

· Are measures in place to prevent the loss of reared specimens or non-target species and other biological material, including pathogens due to factors such as predators (e.g. birds) and flooding:

All stock will be held within 3 enclosed rooms within a contained (pest controlled) building. Flooding through over filling will be mitigated by manual filling while operator within the room- the systems are not connected to a permanent inflow. Environmental flooding will not lead to loss of reared specimens or non-target species due to tank rim being ~150cm from floor level. Tank surfaces will be covered with netting and the rooms themselves will have the doors shut (only entry point).

· For predators is there predator control plan and what are the measures in place to prevent predation:

The area is indoors and there are therefore physical barriers to predation including minimum 2 doors between outdoor space and tanks. The area is pest controlled with baited traps. Tanks will also be netted.

· For flooding what is the distance of the facility from open waters:

Around 40m and has never been flooded within the aquarium.

Case No:	2020-0538			Date of visit	08/12/2020	7		
Case No.	2020-0330			Date of visit	. 00/12/2020	J		
Site No:	SS0740			Inspector		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ite of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp		Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ALA	21/12/2020							





Scottish Association for Marine Science Scottish Association for Marine Science Dunbeg by Oban Argyll PA37 1QA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0473 SITE NO SS0740 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 08/12/2020
SITE NAME Scottish Association for Marine Science
CASE No 20200538

The above site was inspected following an application to holding the following non-native species,

Whiteleg shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*)

The facilities at Scottish Association for Marine Science, operated by Scottish Association for Marine Science, were inspected on 08 December 2020 to determine if an application for a permit was required under the Alien and Locally Absent Species in Aquaculture (Scotland) Regulations 2015 ("the 2015 Regulations"). Movements of alien or locally absent species to facilities meeting the definition of a 'closed aquaculture facility' are exempt from the permit process by these Regulations, provided that transport is carried out under conditions that prevent the escape of those species and of the non-target species.

It was determined that the facilities and their current operation met the requirements of a closed aquaculture facility under Article 3(3) of Council regulation (EC) No 708/2007. The transport methods proposed were deemed to be acceptable with regards to containment and prevention of escape. Operational activities include

- Aquaculture is carried out in a closed facility with recirculation systems where water travels through sand filters, protein skimmers and biofilters. Water does not exchange between individual tanks directly.
- All waste water passes through screens on tanks, through a filter sock, through a protein skimmer and then undergoes a UV treatment. The treated waste water then passes through a drain screen to the septic tank for the site.
- Mortality waste is autoclaved (20 minutes @ 133°C Core temperature) and disposed of as biological waste.
- All live animal transport is via sealed bags in sealed boxes both for animals arriving on site
 This transport is done by either employees of Scottish Association for Marine Science or
 Great British Prawns. Live animals will be released directly in to tanks on arrival.
- No live animals will be transport out of the facility.

The Scottish Association for Marine Science site will not require to apply for a permit to introduce alien species under Council Regulation (EC) No 708/2007 due to the facilities currently being regarded as meeting the requirements of a closed aquaculture facility and the transport of the alien species being conducted under conditions that will prevent their escape.

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 https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/

Date: 21/12/20

FHI 059, Version 13	lss	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2020-0539			Date of visit: 10/12/2020					
Time spent on site:	.5 hours	Main Inspect	or:					
Site No: FS0241 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Kingairloch Mowi Scotland Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 10.2	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-36					
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:								

Cleaner fish mortality - WRA - 24.1 % LUM - 53% since input Lumpfish mortalities were suspected to have been caused by Tenacibaculum maritimum and florocol has been administered.

Hydrolicer treatment in week 47 led to an increase in mortalities, although mortalities remained below the reporting threshold. Peroxide treatment for gill health, limited excess mortalities.

PRV-1, the causative agent of HSMI was confirmed onsite during routine health screening, although there has been no associated clinical signs.

Sea lice numbers remained below intervention level until week 49 when they rose to 1.1. Site has been conducting mechanical treatments since WK 47 when numbers began to rise.

accompanied for remote inspection which was carried out on 04/12/2020. Physical inspection took place on 10/12/2020.

Site temperature used as inspector's thermometer was faulty.

FHI 059, Version 13			Is	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0539]	Site No:	FS02	241			
Date of Visit:		10/12/202	20		Inspector(s):		ı
Registration/Autho	risation Det	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by	site represei	ntative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ]
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all se	ctions)					
Total No facilities		8	Facilities s	stocked	8	No facilitie	s inspected	8
Species	SAL	SAL	WRA	LUM				
Age group	2019 Q4	2020 Q1	MIX	2020				
No Fish	193,193	167,148	17,206	29,968				
Mean Fish Wt	5.1 Kg	3.9 Kg	MIX	40g				
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	May 2021			Date (Site)	January 20	022	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?			Y Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	HSMI			_				
 Are movement re Are records comp Are health certific Transport Records Are any movement If yes, is there a system 	elete and corr ates for introd ints carried ou	ectly entereductions (ou	d? twith GB) ava pehalf) of the	ailable? business (not				Y Y N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	of?			Whole fish	- Dundas Ch	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	I correctly er						Y
4. Recent mortality (•			11% WK 46 - (0.19% WK 47 0	.56% WK 48	3 0.04%	
5. Evidence of recer								N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no s	tock per facil	ity/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	iring period	checked?					N
If yes, detail:		,		=				
7. Have increased (unexplained)							Y
If yes, detail action:				see additional		-14		NI/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FI	ni? it no, ente	er details on m	iortality events	sneet.		N/A

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Records 1 Recent treatments (see comment)?		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records			
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y		
H2O2,			
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			
1. 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?			
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?	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).			
- Jan Carantan Comments			
Records checked between: 30/04/2019 - 04/12/2020			

Г	11 059, Version 15							155	ueu by. r	П			
	Case no:	2020-05	39	Site No:		FS0241			Date of v		10/1	12/2020	10/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	ı. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00	14:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No). [24
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	imples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
	Pool Group												
Г	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight			3.9 KG									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Details		ess	ess	ess									
		coch Ness	Loch Ness	Loch Ness									
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	1		<u>ک</u> 6									
(0)	r domey 110	9	9	0									

12/2020	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:									
0	1	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l							

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	Date of issue: 1		
Case Number:	2020-0539		Site No:	FS0241		Insp:		
Date of Visit	10/12/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26		
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	26 14		
N							40	
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10 10	3	
Exposure via water	Ivaniber of des	Site contacts			6-10			
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 I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2	
,		or in a coastal zone with category III						
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8			
	iainis upstream	TOT WILLIII T LIGHT EXCUSSION	<u> </u>	4	0			
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]			0	
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2					
		from zone or compartment of		1				
	equivalent stati		4					
	_	from Category III farm	8					
	Processing fish	r from Category ∨ farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0					
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3	
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	1				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0	1			0	
	Feeding unpas	· ·	5	1				
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			1			0	
	No		2				3	
				J				
					Total		19	
					Rank		MEDIUM	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0539	Site N	lo: FS0241
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
Has the site experienced sea lice problems		N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e		gle vear class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of lic		
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as	well as access to suitable biological and/or	mechanical control measures, and
4. Is there a signed documented farm manag Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to t	he site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGF	P? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in th	ne CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. sal.	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of	3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see commen	t. N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare p	roblems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been admini	istered or other actions taken when <i>L. salm</i> e	onis levels have exceeded the Y
suggested criteria for treatment or where C.	elongatus is considered to have welfare imp	lications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action	ns taken had a significant impact upon the li	ce levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	I out in cooperation between participating fa	rms?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site,	where fewer populations or part populations	s are held without treatment for Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage	ement procedure with waypoints describing	set actions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please de	tail reasons.
Containment Inspection		
Has the site experienced equipment dama		
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail b	elow) Y
Tensioned nets Top nets		
If other, detail below:		
Have escape incidents or events been exp	•	ce the last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis		
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fo		
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they	exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was p	permission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
9. What action was taken to prevent and min		red in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measu		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail	reason(s)

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0539	Site No: FS0241	
Date of Visit: 10/12/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require compl	letion.	
 Has a current farm management agr Is the current FMAg/S available for ir Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or state	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimularm?	gement um health standards for the stocks to be int	roduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	ation requirements for stocks held in the ar- ies of fish which may be stocked into the ar- mum stocking density of any pen on any far	ea or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	gements for the storage and disposal of an arm?	y dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	of Sea Lice nents for the sharing of data on sea lice nur	mbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms co	overed by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requilice on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of availabarms?	ole treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circur used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls ar farms?	nd cleaner fish are to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	gements for synchronous treatments on far	rms within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circur area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran or individual farms?	gements for the movement of live fish on a	nd off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harves	st practices on farms in the area or ir	ndividual farms?	
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by whic	h the area or individual farm will be fa	allow and the earliest	·
date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or m agreement or statement?	ore year classes may be stocked on	to sites covered by the	
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodsto covered by the agreement or statement?	ck or potential broodstock are to be l	kept on any site	
Point of Compliance for Farm Management A 24. Does the farm management agreement incl parties to the agreement?		come, or cease to be,	
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operate 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the F		or statement?	

Site No: FS0241 Case No: 2020-0539

Action taken (FHI):

Nature of non-compliance:

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

•	2000 0500				40/40/000	5		
Case No:	2020-0539	J		Date of visit:	10/12/2020	4		
Site No:	FS0241	1		Inspector:				
		4						
Results Summary	Freq.	5.44	1.		te of Notifica			■ nd
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary			nd					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	27/01/2021							
	-							





Mowi 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
 10/12/2020

 Site No
 FS0241
 Site Name
 Kingairloch

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200539

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 29/01/2021

FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0540			Date of visit: 08/12/2020
Time spent on site: 5.	5 hrs	Main Insp	ector:
Site No: FS0500 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Russel Burn The Scottish Salmon Comp	pany
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 MIX 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 5.3	Thermometer No:	T205	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•		nformation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	d?		nformation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?			nformation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Mortality notifications 2019: w/b 10/12/2018 (wk50 2018) <70g @ 3% damaged pipe; w/b 7/10/19 (wk41 2019) 5g to smolting @4.5% fungus; w/b 14/10/19 (wk42 2019) 5g to smolting 1.15% fungus; Mortality notification 2020: w/b 14/9/20 5g to smolting @ 2.73% fungus; w/b 21/9/20 5g to smolting @ 2.11% fungus &

handling

Site currently short staffed and tanks were being checked during the inspection, so 1 or 2 morts observed in some of the tanks. One tank had 5-10 fish with visible fungus but these were all swimming actively. Overall water was peaty and no visible fungus observed in any of the other tanks (fungus is more visible in peaty water conditions). Some issues with fin nipping (dorsal fins) recently on site, this was apparent across the site but more prominent is some tanks than others. This is due to fish taking some time to fully come back onto feed post vaccination and feeding not having been optimal recently as well as this strain of fish being thought to be more aggressive, but feeding rate has been adjusted and this is expected to resolve issues with fin nipping.

Accompanied by APHA Vet for training.

Required documents received and reviewed for MIX and EC/VMD issues raised on 26/01/2021.

FHI 059, Version 13	3		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0540		Site No:	FS0500)			
Date of Visit:		08/12/2020			Inspector(s)	:		
Registration/Auth	orisation Det	ails						
1. Business/site de			ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made t	o details?						Υ	1
Site Details (inclu	de cleaner fis	sh for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		54	Facilities sto	cked	28	No facilitie	es inspected	54
Species	SAL						T	
Age group	pre-smolt							
No Fish	872,000							
Mean Fish Wt	55.8g							
Next Fallow Date (none planne	d	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 202	21	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records communities 4. Are movement record 5. Are records communities 6. Are health certified Transport Record 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a system Mortality Records	ds available for ection: plete and correcords available plete and correcates for intro s ents carried outstem in place	rectly entered? ble for dead fis rectly entered? ductions (outw	sh and waste? ? vith GB) availa half) of the bu	able? usiness (not us	•		27/11/2018	Y Y Y N N/A
1. Mortality records		increation?						V
2. How are mortalit		•			Whole fish -	. Dundas Ch	emicals	
If other detail:	les disposed (JI :			WHOLE HISTI	- Duridas Cri	erricais	
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•	a correctly error		/11/2020 - 08/	12/2020 0 11	% mortality f	or the whole s	eito (1 814):
5. Evidence of rece	•	atypical mortal		/11/2020 - 00/	12/2020 0.11	76 IIIOI tailty I	or trie writie s	N
If yes, facility nos/n		* *		/reason:				
11 yes, racility 1105/11	o mortality po	i lacility/110 Stc	ock per racility	71003011.				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	iring period ch	necked?					Y
If yes, detail:		<u> </u>		fungus; 2020	wk 39 7 755	morts 2 11%	due to fundi	IS .
7. Have increased		•			00 7,700		ado to farige	N/A
If yes, detail action:	• • •		eponoa te					
8. Have 'mortality e		eported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events s	sheet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Decords	
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	
If yes, detail:	'
Aquacen,	
If other, detail: Cress	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Υ
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
Aquacen,	
If other, detail: Cress	
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	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	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: 27/11/2018 -08/12/2020	

	Case no:	2020-0	540	Site No		FS0500			Date of Samplin		08/	12/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	00:00	16:0	0:00	l	Inspect	or:			VMD N	0.	20
	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	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	22-24	25-27	28-30	31-33	34-36
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL							
	Average weight	45g	45g	45g	45g	45g							
	Sex	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW							
		6		0	<i>w</i>	(0)				60			(0.
ock Details	Stock Origin	Applecross	Applecross	Applecross	Applecross	Applecross							
Sto	Facility No	A10	A10	A10	A10	A10	B2	B2	B2	B2	B2	D7	D7

Additional Sample Information: Tanks, B2, A10, D7 and F4 (three fish per sample appart from F4 was 4 fish per sample) Total Tests assigned 0 37-39 10-42 43-45 46-49 50-54 55-58 59-62 63-66 SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL SAL 45g 45g 45g 45g 45g 45g 45g 45g N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A FW FW FW FW FW FW FW FW Applecross Applecross Applecross Applecross Applecross Applecross Applecross Applecross

F4

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	ase Number: 2020-0540					Insp:	
Date of Visit	08/12/2020		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	40	00	
species	compartment in Number of supp	cluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Eveneure vie weter	Number of dest	inations Site contacts	0			10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	s 0	1-5 	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I		_			
diseases)		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					
	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	3				
processors			0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	T 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	IS	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	T 0	1			0
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Feeding unpas	•	5	1			
Biosecurity		Number of sites	5 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	Το	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes						
between sites, use of	No		0	_			0
footbaths etc	140		1	J			
CoGP/Regulator	Ivaa		1	7			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		<u> </u>	1			0
	No		2				
				J			
					Total		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0540	Site No:	FS0500	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)			
• •	nced sea lice problems in the previou	us 4 years?		
•	ianagement Area (or equivalent) fall	•	year class basis?	
3. Does the site have a	access to a range of licenced in-feed amectin benzoate) as well as access	and bath sea lice medications (i	ncluding deltamethrin,	
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e	cumented farm management agreem equivalent)?	ent or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection? (Lega	al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		
	ely reflect the required standard spec		(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the suggest (CoGP Annex 6)	sted criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult f	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbe	rs per fish been at a level of 3 o	r above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	
~	reported to the Fish Health Inspecto	•		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered	to cause significant welfare prol	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
-	eatments been administered or othe reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is co			
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where applicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions taken had a	significant impact upon the lice	evels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried out in coopera	ation between participating farms	s?	
14. Is there a harvestin	g strategy for the site, where fewer p	opulations or part populations a	re held without treatment for	
15. Is there a site speci	ific written lice management procedu	re with waypoints describing set	actions to deal with recognised	
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea lic	e count data? If no please detail	reasons.	
Containment Inspecti				
•	nced equipment damage due to pred	·	•	N
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against the predation e	experienced on site? (Detail belo	W)	Υ
lf ather shate! hele				
If other, detail below:				
tank lids, rent-o-kill	nts or events been experienced on o	r in the vicinity of the site since t	ha last FUI inspection?	N
-	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 1	·	ne last FHI inspection?	IN
	ported to Scottish Ministers?	O .		
·	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where	thou exist)? (CoCB 4427 E	4 17)	
·	ported to the SSPO and local fisherie		-	
o. Have these been rep	borted to the SSFO and local lishere	s trusts fortilwith (where they ex	ist)! (COGP = 4.4.57, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If yes	give detail		
	oyed was this action agreed with loca	al wild fish interests and was per	mission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG				
	en to prevent and minimise the risk of		in code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the Act			N/
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to cont	ainment? If no, please detail rea	son(s)	Υ

Site No: FS0500 Case No: 2020-0540

Action taken (FHI):

Nature of non-compliance:

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

Case No:	2020-0540			Date of visit:	08/12/2020			
Site No:	FS0500]		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
·		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
			-					
	_							
	+	1						
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
ECI, CNI, VMD			Z INSP					
MIX	23/12/2020 17/12/2020							
case closed	26/01/2021							





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 SITE NO FS0500 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 08/12/2020 SITE NAME Russel Burn CASE NO 20200540

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.

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.

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

The waste transfer note did not state the quantity of fish waste uplifted. It was
discussed with a site representative that this must be recorded in future and that this
should be rectified retrospectively if this information can be obtained from the
contractor.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be inadequately maintained.

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

The treatment record did not state the withdrawal period for Cress (Bronopol). The
withdrawal was stated as 500 degree days on the prescription. There seems to
currently be no option for site staff to include the withdrawal period for this particular
treatment on the database system used to record treatments. This must be rectified
retrospectively and proof must be submitted that this has been completed.

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.

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: 23/12/2020

Fish Health Inspector

R04

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





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
 08/12/2020

 Site No
 FS0500
 Site Name
 Russel Burn

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200540

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 23/01/2021. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

Issues were raised in relation to the above case, with a requirement for records unavailable for inspection to be submitted by 17/01/2021. 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: 26/01/2021
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2020-0541			Date of visit: 08/12/2020				
Time spent on site:	5 hrs	Main Insp	ector:				
Site No: FS1333 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross Hatchery The Scottish Salmon Com	pany				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: HI	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:							

Additional Case Information:

Unhatched eggs not yet measured out as still given stragglers a few extra days. 10 comp hatch units with 8 trays each (80 trays total) 60 trays stocked. A few weeks fallow in between batches planned for cleaning and disinfection in January 2021. Current batch of Ova arrived 20/11/2020. No treatments applied in the hatchery. Hatchery has it's own recirculation system, separate from the system for the fry unit. Single biosecure entry point to the unit. Plan to eventually have 4 inputs of ova to the unit every year to have fish ready each quarter, however implementation depends on the progression of building works and refurbishment of the other units (smolt).

Due to biosecurity concerns used sites own thermometer.

Accompanied by APHA Vet for training.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0541		Site No:	FS1333				
Date of Visit:		08/12/2020]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta			ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•	·	·				Υ	1
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities			Facilities sto	cked	60 trays	No facilitie	es inspected	1 hatchery
Species	SAL						I	
Age group	Alvins							
No Fish	1,672,800							
Mean Fish Wt	0.1g							
Next Fallow Date (S		January 202	1	Next Input Da	te (Site)	Jan-21		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						`	·	
4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a sys	olete and corre ates for introd ats carried ou	ectly entered? luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able? usiness (not usi	•			Y Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	Dundas Ch	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (•			ality since input	on 20/11/202	0 (33,000)	dead eggs.	
Evidence of recer		•						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			0.16					.
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N/A
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	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	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:	
in no, dotain.	
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: 10/12/2019 - 08/12/2020	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue:	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0541		Site No:	FS1333		Insp:	
Date of Visit	08/12/2020		No of m	No of movements/supp./dest. Sco			
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	5
			-				5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0				3
Function with western	Number of dest	inations Site contacts	0			10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	s 0	1-3 	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I		_			
diseases)		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	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	3				
processors			0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	T 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 from zone or compartment of			-			
	equivalent statu	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	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		<u>.</u> 1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 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	No		1				0
footbaths etc			<u> </u>	J			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes		1 .	1			
with regulator or industry			0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
				J			
					Total		22
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No: 202	20-0541	Site No:	FS1333	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seaw	vater Sites Only)			
	sea lice problems in the previous	4 vears?	Г	
· ·	gement Area (or equivalent) fallow	•	year class basis?	
3. Does the site have access	ss to a range of licenced in-feed and the string benzoate) as well as access the string benzoate.	nd bath sea lice medications (ir	ncluding deltamethrin,	
4. Is there a signed docume Management Area (or equiv	ented farm management agreeme valent)?	nt or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count record	ls available for inspection? (Legal	SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Г	
6. Do records adequately re	eflect the required standard specific	ed in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i> records are inspected? (Co) record levels below the suggeste GP Annex 6)	ed criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult fema	ale sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers	per fish been at a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	
If yes, have these been repo	orted to the Fish Health Inspector	ate? If no, FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infestatio	on at a level which is considered to	cause significant welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•	nents been administered or other annents or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is con			
11. Has any other action be	een taken (where applicable)?		Г	
12. Have therapeutic treatm	nents or the actions taken had a si	gnificant impact upon the lice le	evels recorded?	
·	conducted, carried out in cooperat	* '		
	rategy for the site, where fewer po	• • •		
	ritten lice management procedure			
·	bserved on stocks reflect sea lice	* *	· ·	
Containment Inspection				
-	equipment damage due to predat	tors in the current or previous n	roduction cycles?	
· ·	mitigate against the predation ex			·
2. Are measures in place to	miligate against the predation ex	perienced on site: (Detail belo	w <i>)</i>	
If other, detail below:				
Site inside, Rent-o-kill				
3. Have escape incidents of	or events been experienced on or	in the vicinity of the site since t	ne last FHI inspection?	I
If Yes proceed with question	ns 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10		_	
4. Have these been reported	d to Scottish Ministers?		Г	
5. Have these been reported	d to local DSFB forthwith (where t	hey exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)	
•	d to the SSPO and local fisheries		-	
7. Were methods (if any) us	sed to recover escapees? If yes gi	ve detail		
O If will made years along	wee this estimate and with the	wild field internal and a second	minnian mirran hr. Ozzati zb	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4	was this action agreed with local 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	who had interests and was perr	mission given by Scottish	
	prevent and minimise the risk of	further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could	
	isfactory measures of the Act)			
	satisfactory with regards to contai	nment? If no, please detail reas	son(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
The the one moperior do			(-)	

Case No:	2020-0541			Date of visit:	08/12/2020			
Site No:	FS1333	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	<u> </u>							
	 							
	 							
	 							
	 							
Report Summary			1	1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	11/12/2020		z irisp					
201, 0111	11,12,2323							





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 SITE NO FS1333 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 08/12/2020
SITE NAME Applecross Hatchery
CASE NO 20200541

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.

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

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

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

The waste transfer note did not state the quantity of fish waste uplifted. It was
discussed with a site representative that this must be recorded in future and that this
should be rectified retrospectively if this information can be obtained from the
contractor.

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.



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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2020-0543			Date of visit: 16/12/2020				
Time spent on site:	0mins	Main Inspecto	r:				
Site No: FS0168 Business No: FB0388	Site Name: Business Name:	Belton Ford Belhaven Trout Company Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 10.1	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: LO	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:							

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection conducted on 15/12/2020 by Records sent via email

Heavy rain in recent weeks has caused water levels in nearby rivers and burns to increase but has not caused any escapes on site.

If rain is heavy the water on the farm turns darker. If the water turns too dark the fish aren't fed. This has led to fish not being fed during times of increased rain this year, for no longer than 1-2 days at a time.

Top nets over ponds containing smaller fish, lines over site to deter birds, electric fence around site.

Otter very occasionally observed on site, herons are more common but not thought to be taking fish.

BMP updated during following site inspection to ensure the procedure described are being implemented on the farm

FHI 059, Version 13			lss	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0543		Site No:	FS01	68			
Date of Visit:		16/12/202	20		Inspector(s)):		l
Registration/Author	risation Det	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by	site represer	ntative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						N]
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	sh for all sed	ctions)					
Total No facilities		19	Facilities s	tocked	16	No facilitie	s inspected	19
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR			T .	
Age group	2020	2020	2019	2019				
No Fish	6,616	2,336	2,335	147				
Mean Fish Wt	<1lb	1-1.9lb	2-2.9lb	3lb +				
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans	_	Next Input	Date (Site)	January 20	21	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lems?			N Any escape	s (since last v	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	s							
Movement record		or inspection	?					Y
2. Date of last inspe							11/12/2019	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	d?					N
4. Are movement re		•		e?				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		ilable?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movemen		ut by (or on b	ehalf) of the l	business (not	using a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys		• •						Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Domestic w	aste - <25kg		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly er	ntered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		15 RTR at	tributed to bac	ckground morta	lity		
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical mort						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	r facility/no s	tock per facili	ity/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	uring period (checked?					Y
If yes, detail:		•	•	•	nd 13 affected, a	s these were	only two por	ids receiving
7. Have increased (ks following to		2			N/A
If yes, detail action:	ипехріаніей)	mortalities D	een reported	to vet of FILE				IN/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	enorted to EL	112 If no ente	r details on m	ortality events	sheet		N/A
o. Have mortality ev	cins peen it	sported to FF	ii: ii no, ente	i ucialis on ii	ioriality events	oneet.		IN/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	NI/A
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	N/A
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	N1/A
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
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and <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?	N
If no, detail: BMP out of date. BMP updated follwing the inspection and inspected to be adequate.	
Results of Surveillance	
	NI
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	IN
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: 11/12/2019 - 16/12/2020	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0543		Site No:	FS0168		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/12/2020		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	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off			I 0		6	10	10
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10	10
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through borehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
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		1			
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	0				1
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				<u>'</u>
	Processing fish	from zone or compartment of					
	equivalent stat		4				
		n from Category III farm	8				
			10				
Disposal of fish and fish by- products	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	unpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites		from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			1
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0
accook to daged	No		2				
				J			
					Total		26
					Rank		HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0543	Site No:	FS0168
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites	•••	
Has the site experienced sea lice pro	blems in the previous 4 years?	
_	a (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	
	e of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in e) as well as access to suitable biological and/or med	
4. Is there a signed documented farm m Management Area (or equivalent)?	nanagement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available f	for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
	quired standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (I	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record lever records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6	els below the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the	Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level	which is considered to cause significant welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been a	administered or other actions taken when L. salmonis	s levels have exceeded the
suggested criteria for treatment or when	re C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implica	ations? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (w	here applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the	actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice le	evels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, c	arried out in cooperation between participating farms	s?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the	e site, where fewer populations or part populations are	re held without treatment for
•	anagement procedure with waypoints describing set	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on s	stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
	damage due to predators in the current or previous p	
	ainst the predation experienced on site? (Detail belov	
	aller fish, lines over site to deter birds, electric fe	nce around site.
If other, detail below:		
2		ha laat Filliman astian O
•	en experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	ne last FHI Inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If N	• •	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish		4.47)
•	SFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	
6. Have these been reported to the SSF	PO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recove	er escapees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this ac	tion agreed with local wild fish interests and was pern	mission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP - 4.4.38, 5.4.1		
9. What action was taken to prevent an	d minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory m		
•	with regards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s)

O N	0000 0540			D	40/40/000	7		
Case No:	2020-0543	l		Date of visi	t: 16/12/2020	4		
Site No:	FS0168	1		Inspecto	r:			
Results Summary	Freq.	5	1.		ate of Notifica		1.	
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
					_			
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	17/12/2020							





Belhaven Trout Company Ltd 6 Steading Gardens Dunbar EH42 1GS

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0388
 Date of Visit 16/12/2020

 Site No
 FS0168
 Site Name
 Belton Ford

 Inspector
 Case No
 20200543

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 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.

R04

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

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be inadequately maintained and implemented. The biosecurity measures plan was updated since the inspection and has been inspected to be satisfactory.

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

The unique site number (also known as FS or FIS number) must be included in the movement record for each entry on or off the site. This should be included for all future movements and should be available for inspection during the next visit from Marine Scotland.

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 https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/

Date: 17/12/2020

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0544			Date of visit: 09/12/2020
Time spent on site:		Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1244 Business No: FB0544	Site Name: Business Name:	Strathclyde Scotland	
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: B	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving for Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry of	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Case added to facilitate addition of movement restrictions to area. Case was the first positive for Bonamia ostreae in wild stocks in West Loch Tarbert 2007.

Order originally added in Aquadat on two farm sites, but these stocks were not confirmed positive.

Review of how movement restrictions served on areas was carried out in 2020.

Case No:	2020-0544			Date of visit:	09/12/2020]		
Site No:	FS1244	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	ition		
,	'	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Donort Cummon				1				
Report Summary	Doto	Inon	and I					
Case Type	Date 18/12/2020	Insp	2 nd Insp					
INF- no report	10/12/2020							

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2020-0545			Date of visit: 15/12/2020			
Time spent on site:	Hr	Main Inspecto	or:			
Site No: FS1046 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Larval Rearing Unit Mowi Scotland Ltd				
Case Types: 1 MIX 2	3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: B	CoGP MA M-49			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:				

Additional Case Information:

Site records, mortality records, treatment records and BMP checked remotely by 09/12/20

Site will no longer be producing wrasse for going directly to sea sites and will primarily be a broodstock site, with production of cleaner fish being undertaken at Anglesey site. Site manager expects they will be preparing less medicate feed on site due to the change of roll from larval rearing unit to broodstock site.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issue	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0545		Site No:	FS1046				
Date of Visit:		15/12/2020			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by si	te representa	tive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all secti	ons)					
Total No facilities		28	Facilities sto	cked	28	No facilitie	s inspected	
Species	WRA							
Age group	Mixed							
No Fish	10,328							
Mean Fish Wt	Mixed							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	never fully fa	llow	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	unknown		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						•	<u> </u>	
 Are movement ref. Are records comp. Are health certific. Transport Records Are any movement yes, is there a systematical experiences. 	lete and corre ates for introd	ectly entered? luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	ible? siness (not usi			į	Y Y
Mortality Records							_	
1. Mortality records	available for in	nspection?					Г	Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Biogas - Ene	rgen, Cumb	ernauld	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	red?					Y
4. Recent mortality (r previous 4 we	eeks			
5. Evidence of recer	•			·				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:			_	
	, ,	•						
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					
If yes, detail:		<u> </u>						
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities bed	en reported to	vet or FHI?				
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI?	If no, enter o	details on mort	ality events sl	neet.		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Records		

Treatments and Medic			
1. Recent treatments (s	see comment)?		Y
	Formalin,		
If yes, detail:	Pyceze		
-	alamid		
2. Medicines records av	vailable for inspection?		Y
3. Are records complete	e and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdraw	val period?		N
5. If yes, what treatmen	it(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored	d appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records			
1. Biosecurity records a	available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and	frequency of mortality removal, recor	rding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and	period in which the APB will notify So	cottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained	d) mortality at the site been included?	?	Y
4. Has the action that w	ill be taken in the event that the pres	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been include	ed and how and when that will be no	otified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status	s of aquaculture animals being stocke	ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification	on if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry	and biosecurity measures implement	ted between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease	been covered (movement of staff, v	isitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation ava	ailable regarding the measures in pla	ce to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals he	ld on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity	procedures been adequately implem	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilland	ie i		
1. Has any animal healt	th surveillance been carried out by, o	r on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results ava	ailable for inspection?		
3. Any significant result	s?		
If yes, detail (if not deta	illed under recent disease problems).		
Red	cords checked between:	18/09/2019 - 09/12/2020	

Case No:	2020-0545			Date of visit	: 15/12/2020			
Case No.	2020-0343			Date of visit	. 15/12/2020			
Site No:	FS1046			Inspector				
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					
MIX	18/12/2020							
	1							

FHI 059, Version 13	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2020-0548			Date of visit: 21/12/2020			
Time spent on site:		Main Inspec	tor:			
Site No: FS0423 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Lamlash The Scottish Salmon Compa	ny			
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-48			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail reas	son below:				

Additional Case Information:

Records checked between 12/11/20 to 21/12/20 as had checked records in case 20200507 upto the 12/11/20 although site visit could not be conducted due to ferry cancellation and will be rescheduled in 2021.

PSI conducted following reports of increased boat traffic in area from 3rd party.

AGD and PGD on site - due to gill health problems in previous cycles, gills are swabbed weekly so can act quickly - FW treat in September with good results and then treated with peroxide once temp down to 10c 29th Nov-2nd Dec following this treatment morts decreased to low levels

Morts wk47 - 0.54%, wk48 0.59%, wk49 1.81%, wk50 0.17%, wk 51 0.12%

Lice levels on site low across all stages, wild caught local wrasse used. Mechanical and medicinal interventions available if required.

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued	by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020								
Case No:	2020-054	3	Site No:	FS0423								
Date of case:	21/12/2020				Inspector(s):							
Registration/Authorisation Details												
Business/site contacts correct? (if no update site summary sheet)												
Site Details												
Total No faciliti	es	14	No facilities sto	cked	14	1						
Species	sal	wrs	Tto Idominos oto	one u								
Age group	20s1	mix										
No Fish	368,135	20,882										
Mean Fish Wt	2.7kg	50g										
Next Fallow Da	ate (Site)	summer 2021		Next Input Date	(Site)	during Q1 2022						
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI) 12/11/2020												
Mortality Information												
1. Any recent in	ncreased or aty	oical mortalities?	(last 4 weeks).			Y						
If yes, detail:				.81% (see addi	tional info)							
•		since last inspec	ion.)			Y						
If yes, detail:	as above											
	rtalities dispose	d of?			Whole fish - Du	undas Chemicals						
If other detail:												
Treatments ar	nd Medicines											
1. Any treatme	nts? (since last	inspection)				Y						
If yes, detail:	H2O2											
Other:	29th											
Health status	and Results of	Surveillance										
		last inspection)				Y						
-	AGD, PGD	, ,										
	,	eillance been carr	ied out by, or or	behalf of, the b	usiness?	Y						
3. Any significa	nt results?		•			Y						
If yes, detail	AGD, PGD											
Sea lice												
	experienced se	a lice problems ir	the previous 4	years?		N						
If yes, detail:												
	els stayed belo	w the suggested	criteria for treatr	ment in the CoG	P since the last	inspection?						
If no, detail:		1: /1		:	-f 0h	(
		sea lice (L. salmo			level of 3 or ab	ove (prior to w/b N						
•	•	/b 10/6/19) since	•			N//A						
•		reported to the F	•		see comment.	N/A						
		nt discharge cons ■		sea lice?		, —						
If yes, detail: Salmosan Alphamax Alphamax N/A												
6. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? N/A												
If no, detail: 7. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Y												
Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?												
8. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?												

FHI 059, Version 13

Escapes/Containment

1. Any reported escapes? (check prior to phone call)

2. Any escapes? (since last inspection)

If yes, detail: (include date)

Biosecurity Records

1. Any significant changes to your biosecurity procedures since previous visit?

If yes, detail:

Case No:	2020-0548			Date of visit	: 21/12/2020						
				Date of Visit	. 21/12/2020						
Site No:	FS0423			Inspector	:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notifica	of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
PSI	21/12/2020										





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
SITE NO FS0423
INSPECTOR

DATE OF CASE 21/12/2020 SITE NAME Lamlash CASE NO 20200548

Routine surveillance frequency assessment under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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

Signed:

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Date: 21/12/2020

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