FHI 059, Version 13	lssu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0497			Date of visit: 18/11/2020
Time spent on site: 5	hours	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0616 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Nevis B Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 11	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-23
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	ison below:	

FHI 059, Version 13 Additional Case Information:

Mortality data

2017 week 39 - 1.12% - 1315 2017 week 41 - 1.11% - 1279 2017 - week 45 - 6.91% - 117 2017 week 46 - 4% - 63

Was end of cycle, very small numbers of fish. Numbers not reported to FHI.

2020 -Plankton event observed at end of october, followed by a localised mortality event. Mortality back to normal levels now. Treatments have been taking place to treat AGD.

Fish appeared to be in good condition with good feeding response. All fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 13			lss	ued by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020		
Case No:	2020-0497		Site No:	FS0616	3					
Date of Visit:		18/11/202	20		Inspector(s)			I		
Registration/Autho										
 Business/site det Changes made to 		y checked by	v site represent	tative?			Y			
2. Changes made it	Juetans:							L		
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fi					-				
Total No facilities		12	Facilities st	ocked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12		
Species	SAL	WRS	LUM	_		_				
Age group No Fish	20 Q1	mixed	mixed	_						
Mean Fish Wt	356,506	15,800	30,608							
Next Fallow Date (S	3.3kg	mixed May 2021	mixed	Next Input Da	ato (Sito)	October 2	2021			
Recent (last 4 wks)	,				Any escapes			N		
If yes, detail:					Any cocape.	5 (51100 1431	visit):			
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?						Y		
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed	of?			Incinerated -	on site				
If other detail:										
3. Mortality records	•	d correctly e	ntered?					Y		
4. Recent mortality	• •).27% 980fish) ^v	Week 44 (0.4	6% 1646) W	/eek43 (2.03%	6 7410) week		
5. Evidence of recen		••						Y		
If yes, facility nos/no										
Enviromental insult				t mortality.						
6. Any other peaks i		• •	cnecked?					Y		
If yes, detail:	see addition		oop roported	to yet or FUID						
7. Have increased (If yes, detail action:	unexplained)	mortaillies t	been reported							
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been r	eported to FI	H? If no enter	r details on mor	tality events s	heet.		N		
er i al e montanty of										

Treatments and Medicine	s Records			
1. Recent treatments (see c	omment)?			Y
If yes, detail:	Peroxide TMS	S SLICE		
If other, detail:				
2. Medicines records availa	ole for inspection?			Y
3. Are records complete and	d correctly entered?			Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal p	eriod?			Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		TMS		
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stored app	propriately?			Y
Biosecurity Records				
1. Biosecurity records availa	•			Ý
-		-	e disposal been considered?	ŕ
•		•	ers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) m	•			T
			icion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included a				
health status, certification if	•	g stocked on the fam	n site been covered (equal or higher	· · ·
	required)?			
6. Have the husbandry and	biosecurity measures im	plemented between o	each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease bee	n covered (movement of	f staff, visitors, equip	ment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation availab	le regarding the measure	es in place to maintai	n the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held or	n site?			
8. Have the biosecurity proc	edures been adequately	implemented on site	?	Y
If no, detail:				
Results of Surveillance				
1. Has any animal health su		out by, or on behalf of	, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results availab	e for inspection?			Y
3. Any significant results?				Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed	under recent disease pro	blems).		
Mild AGD and signs of bact				
Records	checked between:	24/07/17-18	/11/2020	

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling starts/ends: 14:00:00 15:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. 12 Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No 1 2 1 1 1 Pool/Fish No 1 2 1<	Fł	HI 059, Version 13			Issued by: FHI									
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 14:00:00 15:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. 12 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 12 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click		Case no:	2020-04	197	Site No:		FS0616					18/1	11/2020	18/ [,]
starts/ends: Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 2 Pool/Fish No Species SAL SAL Species SAL SAL Water Type SW SW		Priority samples:	VI	VI			PA			Sampling	-			
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No 0 0 0 0 0 Fish nos 1 2 0 0 0 0 Pool Group 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 Species SAL SAL 0 0 0 0 0 0 Sex N/A N/A 0 0 0 0 0 0 Water Type SW SW 0 0 0 0 0 0 Image: Set of the set			14:00:00		0 15:00:00		l	Inspecto	or:			VMD No). [12
Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 Pool Group Species SAL SAL Average weight 3.3000 Sex N/A N/A Water Type SW SW		Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Pool/Fish No Image: Constraint of the second se		Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Fish nos 1 2 <th< th=""> <!--</td--><td>A</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	A													
Pool Group SAL														
Species SAL SAL SAL SAL Main Average weight 3.3000 3.3000 Image: Second state s			1	2										
Average weight 3.3000 3.3000 Image: Constraint of the second secon		•												
Sex N/A N/A Image: Calibration of the second														
Water Type SW SW SW SW		Average weight	3.3000	3.3000										
Details Ccaldine Ccaldine			N/A											
ck Details Barcaldine Barcaldine		Water Type	SW	SW										
G Facility No 12 11	Stock Details		5 Barcaldine	11 Barcaldine										

11/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
All fish sampled appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

		133064 by: 111			Date	1 13300	. 12/03/2020
Case Number:	2020-0497		Site No:	FS0616		Insp:	
Date of Visit	18/11/2020		No of me	ovements/s	supp./dest.	_	Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	_
Movements on (from out		novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup		0	-		14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	povements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of des		0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	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		
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				
	Processing fish	n from zone or compartment of	4				
	Processing fish	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				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				C
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	-	Number of sites	5 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator			· ·	1			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry	No		2				
code of practice			3	J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		21
					Rank		MEDIUM
							-

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2020-0497	Si	ite No: FS0616							
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)									
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?		N						
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or ed		a single vear class basis	? Y						
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medica	ations (including deltame	ethrin, Y						
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as w									
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevan	t to the site and CoGP F	Farm Y						
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		Y						
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)									
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels belorecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment	in the CoGP during the	period that N						
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. saln	<i>nonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a leve	I of 3 or above (prior to	w/b 10/6/19) or Y						
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see com	iment.	Y						
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfa	are problems? (CoGP 4.	.3.81, 5.3.50) N						
10. Have therapeutic treatments been adminis suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C</i> . e									
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?		Y						
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions	s taken had a significant impact upon t	he lice levels recorded?	N/A						
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participatir	ng farms?	Y						
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site,	where fewer populations or part popula	ations are held without tre	eatment for Y						
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage			with Y						
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no pleas	e detail reasons.	Y						
Containment Inspection									
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage	ae due to predators in the current or pre	evious production cycles	? N						
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the			Y						
Seal pro nets Top nets	Weighted nets								
If other, detail below:									
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	-	since the last FHI inspe	ection? N						
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 and	l local fisheries trusts forthwith (where	they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4	4.37, 5.4.17)						
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail								
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag	read with local wild fish interacts and		Spottich						
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	reed with local wild lish interests and v	vas permission given by	Scotlish						
9. What action was taken to prevent and minir		covered in code but coul	d						
be considered under satisfactory measur									
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re-	egards to containment? If no, please de	etail reason(s)	Y						

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0497	Site No: FS0616	
Date of Visit: 18/11/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require compl		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
	reement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared	d? Y
 Is the current FMAg/S available for in Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant 	•	Y Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far		Y
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	f commencement of the agreement or stateme f review?	
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	romont	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimu	um health standards for the stocks to be introd	luced to the area or Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina	ation requirements for stocks held in the area	or farm?
- · · ·	es of fish which may be stocked into the area	
individual farm?	mum stocking density of any pen on any farm i	In the area or the
	gements for the storage and disposal of any d	ead fish from any fish
farm in the area or the individual farm?		
Arrangements for The Management of	of Sea Lice nents for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	are and treatments?
13. Does the FMAg/3 identity allangen		
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availa of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cove	red by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requi lice on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available tarms?	treatments for sea Y
	mstances under which biological controls and	cleaner fish are to be Y
	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	s 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	
	gements for the movement of live fish on and	off sites in the area Y
or individual farms?		

Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?	Y
20. Dues the FinAg/S identity acceptable harvest practices of farms in the area of individual farms:	
Fallowing	
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest	Y
date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the	V
agreement or statement?	
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site	Y
covered by the agreement or statement?	
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be,	Y
parties to the agreement?	
Management and operation	
25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	Y
26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S? 09/12/2019	

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No: 2020-0497 Site No: FS0616 Date of visit: 18/11/2020

Start date:		Size of fish:	weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass (SW SAL only):	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
13/11/17	19/11/2017	≥750g	N/A	SAL	S1	Weekly	4.00	Explained	

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):	Yearclass Year
	63	End of cycle - low numbers of fish.	Historical data collected during inspection. No further action.	2017

Case No:	2020-0497			Date of visit:	18/11/2020			
Site No:	FS0616]		Inspector:		I		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case Type ECI,CNI,SLI,VMD	23/12/2021	1100	2 1139					

marine scotland science



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS
 No
 FB0125

 SITE NO
 FS0616

 CASE NO
 20200497

DATE OF VISIT18/11/2020SITE NAMENevis BINSPECTORInspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

R25

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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



Signed:

Date: 23/12/2021

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	Issu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2020-0498			Date of visit: 18/11/2020					
Time spent on site: 5	hours	Main Inspecto	pr:					
Site No: FS0546 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Nevis C (Ardintigh) Scottish Sea Farms Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 11	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-23					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?NIf yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.Clinical signs of disease observed?NIf yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.Gross pathology observed?NIf yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.Diagnostic samples taken?N								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	ason below:						

Mortality not reported at end of cycle - 2019, low numbers.

week 35 - 2.58 - 1385 - Background CGD driving back ground mortality. week 36 - 3.43 - 721

spike in lice number during the summer months, mechanical thermolicer treatment conducted to get number back down. Lice counts went back down to low numbers in week following

Lice numbers above threshold

week 27 - 2019 - 2.20 - reported to FHI

Lumpfish imported from Republic of Ireland - 12th and 22nd February 2020 - 15,000 and 10,000

Fished appeared to be in good condition. Good feeding response. All fish sampled for VMD appeared to be healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0498]	Site No:	FS0546	3			
Date of Visit:		18/11/202	0		Inspector(s):			I
Registration/Autho	orisation Det	ails					_	_
1. Business/site deta		checked by	site representa	ative?			Y]
2. Changes made to	details?						Y	J
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	sh for all sec	tions)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	ocked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL	WRS	LUM					
A	19 Q4/20	mixed	mixed					
Age group No Fish	Q1	4.4 750	47.050					
Mean Fish Wt	333,650	11,759	17,352					
Next Fallow Date (S	3.6kg	mixed May 2021	mixed	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	October 2	021	
Recent (last 4 wks)	,				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:				<u> </u>			viole) :	<u> </u>
, ,								
Movement Record								
1. Movement record		or inspection?)					Y
2. Date of last inspe							11/10/2018	
 Are records comp Are movement re 				,				Ý
 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific 		-		ahle?				N/A
Transport Records	5							
1. Are any movement	nts carried ou	ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place	for maintena	nce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records	ovolloble for	in an a stick O						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 Mortality records How are mortalitie 		•			Incinerated -	on site		'
If other detail:		JI :				UT SILE		
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly en	tered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•			-857) wk44(0.	21%-738) wk4	13(0.37%-14	25) wk42(0.7	7%-3031)
5. Evidence of recer	· /	atypical morta						Y
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	r facility/no st	ock per facility	/reason:				
tail end of plankton								
6. Any other peaks i								Y
If yes, detail:				affecting gill h	ealth - some p	oost treatme	nt mortality.	N1/A
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev	(onte' boon r		12 If no ontor	details on mor	tality overte e	hoot		N
o. have mortality ev	ents been te		in: in no, enter		tailty events s	neet.		IN

1. Recent treatments (see comment)? Y If yes, detail: Peroxide Slice TMS 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)? TMS ff other, detail: Y 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Y Biosecurity Records 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 <i>increased (unexplained)</i> 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 health status, certification if required)? Y 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	Treatments and Medicines Records	
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 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 reasmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 4. Has the detailed under recent disease problems). 5. mild to moderate gill pathology associated with	1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
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 <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 inplemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. Yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	If yes, detail: Peroxide Slice TMS	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? Y 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? TMS If other, detail:	If other, detail:	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? Y 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? TMS if other, detail:	2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? TMS If other, detail:	3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
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 <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? 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). If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
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: Y	5. If yes, what treatment(s)? TMS	
Biosecurity Records Y 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 <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 health status, certification if required)? Y 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y If no, detail: Y 9. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 9. Hay eight can tresults? Y 17. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 1. Has any a	If other, detail:	
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 <i>increased (unexplained)</i> 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 health status, certification if required)? Y 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y If no, detail: Y Y Y Y A results of Surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y Y Y Y Y </td <td>6. Are medicines stored appropriately?</td> <td>Y</td>	6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
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 <i>increased (unexplained)</i> 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 health status, certification if required)? Y 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y If no, detail: Y Y Y Y A results of Surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y Y Y Y Y </td <td>Pieceouvity Peeerde</td> <td></td>	Pieceouvity Peeerde	
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 realth status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, ater as using the for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 3. Any si		V
 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 Y health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y Y		T V
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? Y 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease 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 health status, certification if required)? Y 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y 9. Have the biosecurity procedures been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? Y 9. Any significant results? Y 9. Any significant results? Y 9. Hyes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		·'
 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 If yes, are results available for inspection? Y If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). 		
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 If yes, are results available for inspection? Y If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		'
 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Have animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. May significant results? 9. Mid to moderate gill pathology associated with 		
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: Y As any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		Y
 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Have the biosecurity procedures been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). 		· ·
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 9 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). 9 1. Mathematical	6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
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). Mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		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? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). Mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		
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). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		Y
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). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with	If no, detail:	
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). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? Y 3. Any significant results? Y If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		_
3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with	•	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology associated with		Y
		Y
Reporte checked between: 11/10/2018 19/11/2020	If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). mild to moderate gill pathology asso	ciated with
Beenride checked between: 11/10/2019 19/11/2020		
	Records checked between: 11/10/2018-18/11/2020	

Fł	HI 059, Version 13			Issued by: FHI									
	Case no:	2020-04	498	Site No:		FS0546			Date of visit/		18/	11/2020	18/ ⁻
	Priority samples:	VI		BA		PA		MG	Samplin	ig: HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:0	0:00	16:3	0:00	l	Inspecto	or:	_		VMD No	D.	13
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2										
_	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight		3.6000										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
ails		line	line I										
Detail		alc	alc										
		Barcaldine	Barcaldine										
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	<u> </u>	<u> </u>										
S		2	11										

11/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
All fish sampled appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													
-														
-														
	-													

		133060 by: 1111			2 4.10 1		12/03/2020
Case Number:	2020-0498		Site No:	FS0546		Insp:	
Date of Visit	18/11/2020		No of mo	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	_
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
0,0000	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0	-		14	5
Movements off	Frequency of n	•		3	6	10	10
	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	, O	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or l	oorehole) or in a coastal zone with category I	0				
diseases)		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V	1	3	6		
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices	<u> </u>		None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters					
processors		,	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)					
			1				
		n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			C
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				C
Use of unpasteurised feeds	Į	Inpasteurised feed		1			
	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	_	J	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			
between sites, use of	No		0				0
footbaths etc			1	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				
	No		2				
				1			
					Total		31
					Rank		HIGH

Case No: 2020-0498 Site No: 50546 Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) N N Y 1. Has the state experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? N Y 2. Is the COSP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? N Y 3. Des the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including detamethin, azamethiphos and emametich benzoate) as a well be biological and/or mechanical control measures. Y 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? Y 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoCP Annex 6) N Y 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoCP Annex 6) N N 7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP? (Logal SSI, CoCP Annex 6) N N 8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to who 106/19) or Y Y Y ves, have these been reported to the action taken when L. salmonis levels have exceeded the salmonis levels have exceeded the salmonis levels have acceeded the salmonis level, have exceeded the salmonis levels have exceeded the salmonis levels have exceeded the salmonis levels have exceeded the salmonis	FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of is:	sue: 12/05/2020
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including detamethrin, azamethiphos and emametin benzoetle) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, 4. Is there a single documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or 9. Is <i>C. aongatus</i> : infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) 10. Have therapeutic treatments been appriced to the Fish Health Inspectrone? If ino, FHI see comment. 9. Is <i>C. aongatus</i> : indestation at a level which is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 2.5.51) 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for 15. Is there a ste specific writem lice management procedure with wayoints describing set actions to deal with 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. 7 Y 7 Has the site specific writem lice management procedure with wayoi	Case No: 2020-0498		Site No:	FS0546	
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? Y Y A is there a single documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? Y Y A is there a single documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? Y Y A result ice (<i>L</i> salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) B. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) A. Take sea lice (<i>L</i> salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) B. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L</i> . salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or Y Y yes, have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L</i> . salmonis levels have exceeded the Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? Y 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deliamethrin, azamethripho sender) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, Y 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management ac (or equivalent)? Y 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Y 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Y 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Y 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or Y Y 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N 10. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorder? Y 11. Has any other action beat haken (where gapplicable)? Y Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorder? Y 13. Are treatment		in the previous 4 years?			N
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including delimenthin, azamethiphos and emamecin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoCP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? Y 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoCP Annex 6) Y 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoCP Annex 6) Y 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoCP Annex 6) N 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or Y Y 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) Y 10. Have thereputit treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable?) Y Y 12. Have thereputit treatments or the actions take had a significant impact upon the lice levels actions to deal with Y Y 13. Is there a hare specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal			a single v	/ear class basis?	Y
azamethiphos and emametin benzate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or 9. S. C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) 10. Have therspeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where lever populations or part populations are held without treatment for 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	. .	. ,	•••		Y
Management Area (or equivalent)? 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or Y Y Y Solution of the sea been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N Y Y Suggested criteria for treatments or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Seal pro nets 17. Op nets 17. Have these been reported to to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recov	-			-	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Y 7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) N 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or Y Y 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant weffare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant weffare problems? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) N 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Y Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for the reatement damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N Y Y Y Y Question Y Y 14. Is there a barvestion state against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Y Seal ince levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please		ement agreement or statement releva	int to the s	site and CoGP Farm	Y
7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) N 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 Y Y 9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when L. salmonis levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where few populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y Y 15. Le brogatus If entity and the action between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y Y 15. Le brogatus If entity and the experienced on site? (Detail below) Y 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y S	5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			Υ
records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or Y I yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the Y U. Have therapeutic treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y 15. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets to p nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: N 1. Have these been reported to local DES forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) Have these been reported to bactoffs for whise respects? N 2. Have these been reported to bactoffs for thesites for they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) Have these been reported to bactoffs for thesites for they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) Have these been reported to bactoffs for thesites for threat exists for thwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) Have these been reported to bacat DES for thwith (wher	6. Do records adequately reflect the required s	standard specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	_egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. Y 9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.0) Y 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the yagested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) Y 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Y Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y Y 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N 17 Yes proceed with questi		ow the suggested criteria for treatme	nt in the C	OGP during the period that	Ν
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when L. submonis levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) Y 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Y Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y Y 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: If on please detail reasons? N 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If yes proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10 . <td< td=""><td>8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. saln</td><td><i>nonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a lev</td><td>el of 3 or</td><td>above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o</td><td>r Y</td></td<>	8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. saln	<i>nonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a lev	el of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r Y
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y Y 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y 17. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 17. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N 16 ther, detail below: If other, detail below: If other, detail below: 3. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where the	If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		Υ
suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? Y 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y 14. Is there a a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N 14. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? N N 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give det	9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant we	lfare probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	Ν
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Y 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: If other, detail below: N 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? N N 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N N 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail N N N 8. If gill nets were	-				Y
 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 	11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?			Y
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for Y 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y Containment Inspection Y 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: If other, detail below: N 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10 N N 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? N N 5. Have these been reported to SCOT all SEP forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail N 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local w					Υ
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with Y 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y Containment Inspection . 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: . . 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 . . 4. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) . . 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) . . 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) . . 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of furthe			-		Υ
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons. Y Containment Inspection . 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: . . 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10 . 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? . 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17) . 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17) . 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail . 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18) . 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) .					Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below:			-		Y
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: If other, detail below: N 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 N 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? N 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) N 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail N 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) N 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) N	16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no plea	ise detail r	reasons.	Y
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: If other, detail below: N 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 N 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? If a verthese been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)					
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below: 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	Containment Inspection				
Seal pro nets top nets Tensioned nets If other, detail below:			-	·	Ν
If other, detail below: 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? S 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) S S 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) S S 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail S S S S 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish S S S 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) S </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>etail below</td> <td>v)</td> <td>Y</td>			etail below	v)	Y
 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 		Tensioned nets			
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)					
 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 	3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicinity of the si	te since th	e last FHI inspection?	Ν
 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 	If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10			
 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17) 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 	4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	ters?			
 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 	5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	
 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 	6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	l local fisheries trusts forthwith (where	e they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail			
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)					
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)		reed with local wild fish interests and	was perm	nission given by Scottish	
			t covered i	in code but could	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s) Y	•				
	10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please	detail reas	son(s)	Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0498 Sit	e No: FS0546	
Date of Visit: 18/11/2020	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located with	in a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require completion		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Man		
 Has a current farm management agreem Is the current FMAg/S available for inspe 		y y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant fa		<u>у</u>
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm s		у
 Does the FMAg/S identify the date of cor Does the FMAg/S identify the date of rev 	U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U	ent? y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manageme	ent	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum h farm?	ealth standards for the stocks to be intro	duced to the area or y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	•	
 Does the FMAg/S identify the species o Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum 	•	
individual farm?		
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangem farm in the area or the individual farm?	ents for the storage and disposal of any o	dead fish from any fish y
Arrangements for The Management of S 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements		pers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability of statement?		
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirem lice on farms in the area or individual farms	?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumsta used on farms in the area or individual farm	is?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangem	ents for synchronous treatments on farm	s within the area? y
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumsta area or farm?	nces when live fish may be introduced or	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangem	ents for the movement of live fish on and	l off sites in the area y
or individual farms?		

Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?	У
 Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement? 	У У У
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only 24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?	Y
Management and operation25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?09/12/2019	Y

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Issued by: FHI

Case No: 2020-0498 Site No: FS0546 Date of visit: 18/11/2020

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass (SW SAL only):	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reas	on(s):	
26/08/19	01/09/2019	≥750g	N/a	SAL	S1	Weekly	2.58	Explained		Click to selec	
02/09/19	09/09/2019	≥750g	N/a	SAL	S1	Weekly	3.45	Explained		(ensure in co	

· · · · · · · · ·			
		Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):	Yearclass Year
		Historical data gathered during inspection. No further action	
21	End of cycle mortality - low numbers of fish	Historical data gathered during inspection. No further action	2019
/e 38	ent (if available):	End of cycle mortality - low numbers of fish	ent (if available):company):applicable):35End of cycle mortality - low numbers of fishHistorical data gathered during inspection. No further action1End of cycle mortality - low numbers of fishHistorical data gathered during inspection. No

Case No:	2020-0498			Date of visit: 18/11/2020							
Site No:	FS0546]		Inspector:		I					
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion					
-		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary											
	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
Case Type ECI CNI SLI VMD	23/12/2021	linop	2 1139								
	1										

marine scotland science



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS
 No
 FB0125

 SITE NO
 FS0546

 CASE NO
 20200498

DATE OF VISIT18/11/2020SITE NAMENevis C (Ardintigh)INSPECTORInspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

R25

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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



Signed:

Date: 23/12/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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