

Case No: 2020-0129 Date of visit: 05/03/2020

Time spent on site: 5h Main Inspector: [redacted]

Site No: FS1296 Site Name: Colonsay
Business No: FB0119 Business Name: Mowi Scotland Ltd

Case Types: 1 CNA 2 ESC 3 [redacted] 4 [redacted] 5 [redacted] 6 [redacted]

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

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA None

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

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

Additional Case Information:

Following an extreme weather event (Storm Brendan) a loss of fish from pen 4 occurred due to equipment failure. A pin that holds the base units that house the stanchions in the correct position on the horizontal axis failed. The base units and some stanchions had slid along the pen ring buckling the walkway due to the failure of the metal bracket. Plastic stays holding the stanchions in place had 'popped out' allowing the stanchion to lift up out of the holding bracket and resulting in the handrail collapsing into the pen beneath the waterline as well as a 1-2m tear in the net. It was reported that 73,600 fish had escaped.

A bracket has been placed around some of the pins to prevent excessive lifting. Divers have been onsite re-tightening the nuts (on all pens) that hold the pins in place.

Last visit to the site was 7/11/2019, [REDACTED] partly completed an enhanced containment inspection (2020 - 0050) on the 18/2/2020 but this was completed on the mainland as access to Colonsay has been challenging due to weather and flight issues. The enhanced containment inspection was completed during this visit to the site.

Dive inspection reports were inspected and a number of repairs have been made to the nets by divers, it is reported that there have been issues with seal interaction during the winter months when there is a lack of wildfish available.

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

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="14"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="13"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="13"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="2019 Q2"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="940,000"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="2kg"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Late 2020"/>	Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="April/August 2021"/>		

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

Movement Records

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

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection?
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of?
 If other detail:
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?
 If yes, detail:
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?
 If yes, detail action:
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between: Movement records only checked from 18/2/2020 to 5/3/2020

Case No: 2020-0129 Site No: FS1296

Date of visit: 05/03/2020 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)				
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events ¹ been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		Y		Damage to one cage following storm 17/01/2020, estimated 73,600 fish escaped. Hole in net a result of failure in fixing, which connects steel bar between stanchions, causing structural failure in cage.
If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH Regs ⁴ 31D,E	FHI notified on 17/01/2020 - MSe170120SAL1
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO ² and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	Notification was given although there was a delay with SSPO notification on the 20th January and the Argyll DSFB on the 22 January.
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail		N		
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
	High	y		Remaining cages being inspected and maintenance being carried out. Dive checks increased, previously monthly checks and before and after specific procedures and poor weather events. Now inspecting whenever weather allows. ROV has been purchased for inspecting the cage system. Steel plates are to be installed on fixings for steel bars to keep them in place. No documents in place indicating the correct installation of fixing nuts for steel bar supports for stanchions, or SOP for how they can be inspected as correctly installed. Update, fish were moved out of the damaged pen, pen manufacturer has been out to site recommended to retighten the nuts, brackets have been secured around pins that have been lifting to restrict movement, self tapper screws were installed on either side of pins. Diver have been on site to retighten all the pin nuts, and fully inspect.
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken?				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9		
b(l). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site					
General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1		
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-					
			Facilities	Moorings	Nets
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	y		Y	Y
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A		N/A	N/A
c) The name of the supplier	Low	y		Y	Y
d) The date of purchase	Low	y		Y	Y
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	y		y	y
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y		Y	Y
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	y		y	y
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	y		y	y
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	y		y	y
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y			
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y			
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	Y			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5		
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters			SSI, 2,6		
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low				

Dive reports detail subsurface observations and repairs made
Nets serviced at Morenot Scalpay

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low			
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low			
2.6 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	dive reports for net repairs, pen damage has not been repaired yet.
Pen and mooring systems				
2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	No records of assessments made maintained on the site.
2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.10	Scale AQ report states incorrect fastening points for ropes.
2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	Letters of competence - Mallaig marine, more not, (aqualine letter of competence not available)
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with	High	N	CoGP 4.4.16	No records could be located.
a) a documented SOP				
b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment				
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.20	No records of this
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	N	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	dive reports held on barge
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	Following escape event MSe170120SAL1, net was repaired, remaining fish in cage then harvested out. Net subsequently removed. Remaining cages being inspected with fixings being tightened. Additional equipment (steel plates) are to be installed on fixings.
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		Y		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	Y		Additional brackets have been placed over bolt fastenings to prevent further lifting of pins however the damaged pen remains in place.
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.18	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	MML, top nets, ADD in place but cant be used continuously Froya ring with 300kg centre weight, seal blinds.
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y		
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		Y		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA ⁵ 2010 P4, S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.31	
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

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

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

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

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

4 The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

██████████
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	05/03/2020
SITE No	FS1296	SITE NAME	Colonsay
INSPECTORS	████████████████████	CASE No	20200129/20200050

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

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

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

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

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

The following recommendations are made for improvement.

It is recommended that, following a documented review of site equipment, records should be put in place, in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) Chapter 4, points 4.9 & 4.14, to demonstrate the design specifications of pen and mooring systems, along with evidence that they are suitable for purpose and are correctly installed.

It is also recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.10, evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the pen system deployed at the site, including any modifications, meets the manufacturers guidelines.

Evidence was not available, during the inspection, to demonstrate the competence of pen designers or Mowi Scotland Ltd staff involved in their installation and maintenance.

It is also recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.15, evidence should be provided to demonstrate the competence of all personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems.

It is recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.16, pen and mooring components should be inspected in accordance with a documented standard operating procedure (SOP) and a documented inspection plan which is based on risk assessment.

There was no evidence to demonstrate that the suitability of the net design, quality and standard of manufacture, take into account the conditions likely to be experienced on the site. In addition dive records detailed that a high number of subsurface repairs had been made due to seal interaction and also, reports of nets looking worn.

It is recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, points 4.20 and 4.21, evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins, along with treatment with UV inhibitor.

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

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

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

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice, the following recommendation is made due to the nature of the breach of containment reported on 17 January 2020.

It is recommended that a documented review of the pen and mooring system, including any modifications, is undertaken to ensure they are suitable for purpose, correctly installed and meet the manufacturers guidelines in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, points 4.9, 4.10 and 4.14

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by **21st May 2021** . Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 20/11/2020

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

R10

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel - 0131 244 3498 Fax - 01224 295620 Email - ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0119	DATE OF VISIT	05/03/2020
SITE No	FS1296	SITE NAME	Colonsay
CASE No	20200129/20200050	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 21st may 2021. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed: [REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 24/08/2022

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/>

[REDACTED]
Mowi Scotland Ltd
Stob Ban House
Glen Nevis Business Park
Fort William
PH33 6RX
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0119	DATE OF VISIT	05/03/2020
SITE No	FS1296	SITE NAME	Colonsay
INSPECTORS	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20200129/20200050

Escape Investigation

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of 73,600 Atlantic salmon on 17/1/2020.

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

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.

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

Signed: [REDACTED]

Date: 20/11/2020

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/>

R27