FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2022-0012			Date of visit: 16/02/2022						
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Insp	pector:						
Site No: FS1256 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Plocrapol The Scottish Salmon Com	npany						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: W-8						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

# **Additional Case Information:**

Mortality information 2021 wk 1 - 2218 - 1.15% wk 2 6927 - 3.64% wk 3 1869 - 1.83% wk 4 - 3051 - 4.16% wk 5 end of cycle - fallow.

# 2021 lice numbers

wk 1 - 1.46 wk 2 - 3.25 wk 3 - 2.19 wk 4 - 1.33

# Lumpfish mortality

wk 44 2020 - 32 258 - 100% - End of cycle -blackloss

Last 4 weeks - wk52 - 825 (2.39%) - Wk1 - 626 (1.85%) wk2 - 509 (1.54%) wk3 - 2633 (8.07%)

Fish were feeding deep making collection of VMD samples difficult. Fish that were observed seemed healthy and in good condition.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0012		Site No:	FS1256				
Date of Visit:		16/02/2022	2		Inspector(s)	:		ı
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by	site representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	]
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sec	tions)					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	SAL	Lump						
Age group	2021 S0's	2021						
No Fish	609,487	33,625						
Mean Fish Wt	483.6g	30g						
Next Fallow Date (S		June 2023		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	end 2023		•
Recent (last 4 wks)		ems?			Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	·					`	·	
<ol> <li>Date of last inspe</li> <li>Are records comp</li> <li>Are movement re</li> <li>Are records comp</li> <li>Are records comp</li> <li>Are health certific</li> </ol> Transport Records <ol> <li>Are any movement</li> <li>yes, is there a sys</li> </ol> Mortality Records <ol> <li>Mortality records</li> </ol>	olete and corre cords available elete and corre ates for introd ates carried out tem in place f	e for dead fisectly entered luctions (outvoice) t by (or on be or maintenar	sh and waste? ? with GB) availa	able? usiness (not us			17/11/2020	Y Y Y N/A
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detai	1)		
If other detail:	white shore				Other (dotain	'/		
3. Mortality records			tered?					Y
				0.43%) wk2 (1	338 - 0 22%)	wk1 (1341 -	- 0.22%) wk52	2 (1011 -
4. Recent mortality (	last 4 wks):		0.16%)	(1	0.22 70,	(	0,0,0_	_ (
5. Evidence of recer		typical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		•		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i								Y
If yes, detail:	see additiona			. =				<b>.</b>
7. Have increased (	unexplained) i	mortalities be	een reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			10.16	1.4.7.	( - l') (	1		
8. Have 'mortality ev	rents been rei	ported to FH	r it no. enter	uetails on mor	iality events s	neet.		N

Treatments and Med	dicines Records			
1. Recent treatments	(see comment)?			Y
If yes, detail:	Slice TMS			
If other, detail:				
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?			Y
3. Are records comple	ete and correctly entered?			Y
4. Are fish in a withdra	awal period?			Y
5. If yes, what treatme	ent(s)?	Slice	TMS	
If other, detail:				
6. Are medicines stor	ed appropriately?			Y
<b>Biosecurity Records</b>	s			
1. Biosecurity records	s available for inspection?			Y
2. Has the manner ar	nd frequency of mortality removal, recor	rding and safe o	disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner ar	nd period in which the APB will notify So	cottish Ministers	s or veterinary professional of any	
	ned) mortality at the site been included?			Y
4. Has the action that	t will be taken in the event that the prese	ence or suspici	on of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been inclu	uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no	tified to Scottis	h Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health stat	tus of aquaculture animals being stocke	ed on the farm s	site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certifica				
6. Have the husbandr	ry and biosecurity measures implement	ed between ea	ch epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	ise been covered (movement of staff, vi			
7. Is documentation a	available regarding the measures in place	ce to maintain t	the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals h				
8. Have the biosecuri	ity procedures been adequately implem	ented on site?		Y
If no, detail:				
_				
Results of Surveilla	nce			
1. Has any animal he	alth surveillance been carried out by, or	r on behalf of, t	he business?	Y
2. If yes, are results a	available for inspection?			Y
3. Any significant resu	ults?			Y
If yes, detail (if not de	etailed under recent disease problems).		some lesions noted consistent with wi	nter ulcers
R	ecords checked between:	17/11/2020-16	6/02/2022	

П	HI 059, Version 13							188	uea by: F	. Ш			
	Case no:	2022-00	)12	Site No:		FS1256			Date of v		16/0	02/2022	16/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		<sub>у</sub> . НІ			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00	-	Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	13
	Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2-3	4-5									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL		SAL									
	Average weight	483.6g	483.6g										
	Sex	N/A		N/A									
	Water Type	SW		SW									
Stock Details		Geocrab	Couldoran Hatchery	Applecross									
Ċ.	Facility No	7	8	2									

02/2022 Additional Sample Information:													
	All fish	sampled	d for VM	D appea	ared hea	althy and	Showed	d no clin	ical sigr	s of disc	ease.		
0	1	Total T	acte acc	igned	Λ	1							
U		Total It	<i>c</i> 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	igned	U								

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0012		Site No:	FS1256		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/02/2022		No of me	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	10	26	0
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
					ļ		10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
Exposure via water	Indifficer of des	Site contacts			6-10	10	J
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	<u> </u>				
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	1				
	equivalent statu Processing fish	i from Category III farm	8				
		from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		! 			=
products		esses with other farms	0				2
		t for waste from other farms	3				3
				J I			
Use of unpasteurised feeds		•	0				0
	Feeding unpas	Number of sites	5	2 or 3	<b>\</b> 4		
Biosecurity Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	ı		≥4		
Contacts with other sites		taff and equipment	0		2		1
Disinfection of a suines and			1 0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		19
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0012	Site No:	FS1256
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)  1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the prevalue of the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) of the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) of the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) of the CoGP Farm Management as according to the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?	fallowed synchronously on a single yed and bath sea lice medications (in ess to suitable biological and/or med	chanical control measures, and
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Le 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard sp		Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the sugrecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	gested criteria for treatment in the C	coGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) num 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that reco		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspe 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is consider		Y   Y   N   N   N   N   N   N   N   N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or ot suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is		
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in coop 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewersea lice?	I a significant impact upon the lice le peration between participating farms	? Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management processenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	edure with waypoints describing set	actions to deal with recognised 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 pour section of the predation of		
Have escape incidents or events been experienced or	n or in the vicinity of the site since th	ne last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (who 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisher	n 10 ere they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If ye	es give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with low Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risconsidered under satisfactory measures of the Albert 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to compare the site inspected as satisfactory with regards the site in the site inspected a	sk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued b	y: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0012	Site No: FS1256		
Date of Visit: 16/02/2022	Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection located v	within a farm managemer	nt area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreemer	its and Statements	
2. Has a current farm management agre			Y
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in	spection?		Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan	•		Υ
<ol><li>Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far</li></ol>	m site(s) to which it applie	es?	У
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of		greement or statement?	У
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	review?		Υ
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimularm?		ne stocks to be introduced to the	e area or y
<ol><li>Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccinal</li></ol>	ation requirements for sto	cks held in the area or farm?	V
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie			V
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxin individual farm?	•		or the y
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	rements for the storage of	and disposal of any dead fish fro	um any
fish farm in the area or the individual fa	-	ind disposal of any dead lish no	y y
Arrangements for The Management o	of Sea Lice		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangem		ta on sea lice numbers and trea	atments? y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availa	bility and the use of medi	cines on farms covered by the a	agreement Y
of statement?	Sinty and the acc of mean	onios sir iainio sovorou by the c	29100mont
<ol><li>Does the FMAg/S identify any requirele on farms in the area or individual fa</li></ol>		testing of available treatments	for sea Y
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circun		logical controls and cleaner fish	are to be
used on farms in the area or individual f		nogical controls and dicarier han	Ture to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang		treatments on farms within the	are to be Y Y area?
Live Fish Movements			
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circun	nstances when live fish m	nay be introduced or removed fro	om the Y
area or farm?			
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangor individual farms?	gements for the moveme	nt of live fish on and off sites in t	the area Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or ind	lividual farms?
	y which the area or individual farm will be fall	low and the earliest y
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ed? e or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the y
agreement or statement?  23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brocovered by the agreement or statement?	oodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke	ept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ment Agreements Only ent include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be,
Management and operation  25. Is the fish farm being managed and o  26. What is the version no/date of issue o	perated in accordance with the agreement or 17/07/2021	r statement?

Site No: FS1256

Case No: 2022-0012

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2022-0012	7		Data of	isit: 16/02/20	22					
Case No.	2022-0012	J		Date of v	ISIL. 10/02/20	022					
Site No:	FS1256	Inspector:									
Results Summary	Freq.				Date of Notif	fication					
,		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Ins			
	+										
	1										
	_										
	+										
	+										
Report Summary			nel .	-							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	30/03/2022										
	+										
	+										





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0169
 Date of Visit
 16/02/2022

 Site No
 FS1256
 Site Name
 Plocrapol

 Case No
 20220012
 Inspector

# Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

# Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

# Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 30/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0013			Date of visit: 02/02/2022
Time spent on site:	nours	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1277 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Reibinish The Scottish Salmon Compan	у
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: W-8
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	n If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	reason below:	

# **Additional Case Information:**

16 pens in total, one removed due to damage from wear and tear during fallow.

At most recent input 4 pens of KLM stock were lost. Failed smolt transfer.

wk 35 - 7044 - 1.8% (2021) - Post input period.

Sea lice counts - 2021

week5 - 1.40

Week 6 - 1.80

Week 7 - 1.51

week 8 - 0.78 week 9 - 1.01

week 10 - 0.55

week 11 - 2.58

Fish had been fed quite well before the visit, Fish feeding very deeply so was unable to catch for VMD sampling.

Some fish were observed and seemed in good condition and no clinical signs of disease were observed.

Lumpfish mortality (Last 4 weeks)

wk52 - 53 (0.2%) wk1 - 958 (3.58%) wk2 - 982 (3.81%) wk3 - 1190 (4.79%)

FHI 059, Version 13	Version 13			ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0013		Site No:	FS1277				
Date of Visit:		02/02/2022			Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Author	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	itive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		15	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	SAL	Lump						
Age group	2021 S0's	2021						
No Fish	370,511	25,000						
Mean Fish Wt	1472g	30g						
Next Fallow Date (S		march 2023	•	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Late sumn	ner/Early autu	m 2023
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	•							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		inspection:					17/11/2020	·
3. Are records comp		actly entered?	•				17/11/2020	У
4. Are movement re		•						У
5. Are records comp								У
6. Are health certific				ıble?				N/A
							'	
Transport Records					. 075/0			
1. Are any movement					-			N
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place t	or maintenan	ce of transpor	tation records	<i>?</i>			
<b>Mortality Records</b>								
1. Mortality records	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	f?			Other (detail)			
If other detail:	white shore							
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
			wk 3(603-0.1	6%) wk2 (705	- 0.19%) wk1	(939 - 0.25%	%) wk 52 (339	- 0.09%)
4. Recent mortality	` '							
5. Evidence of recer		* *						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:				
6 Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring pariod ab	ookod?					V
<ol><li>6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:</li></ol>			ieckeu?					
7. Have increased (	See addition		en reported to	vet or EHI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	unexplaineu) i	nortalities De	cirreported to	Vet OI I III!				14/7
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' heen re	norted to FHI	2 If no enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet		Y
o. Have mortality ev	CINO DECITIO		. II IIO, CIIIOI (		anty events si	1001.		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: SLICE TMS	-
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? SLICE TMS	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	V
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
	V
<ul><li>1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?</li><li>2. If yes, are results available for inspection?</li></ul>	\ \
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
ii yoo, adaan (ii not adaanda anadi recent aldeade problema).	
Records checked between: 17/11/2020-16/02/2022	
1771112020 10/02/2022	

1-5 5 9 5 3 3	6-10 10 18	>10 14 26 14	Score 0
1-5 5 9 5 3 3	6-10 10 18 10	14	Score 0
5 9 5 3 3	10 18 10	14	0
9 5 3 3	18 10	26	0
5 3 3	10		
5 3 3	10		
3			0
3	l ol	10	10
		10	10
1-5			
2	4		2
3	6		
4	8		
Secure	Unsecure		
1	2		0
			0
			3
			0
2 or 3	≥ 4		
1	2		1
1	2		0
			0
			0
			0
	Total		19 MEDIUM
	3 4 Secure 1	3 6 4 8 Secure Unsecure 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2	3 6 4 8  Secure Unsecure 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of iss	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0013	Site No:	FS1277	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)  1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previou  2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallo  3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed a  azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	wed synchronously on a single and bath sea lice medications (i	including deltamethrin,	N Y Y
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreemed Management Area (or equivalent)?	ent or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm	Υ
<ul><li>5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Lega</li><li>6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard speci</li></ul>		(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the sugges records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ted criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that	N
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) number 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records		r above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	Υ
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspecto 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to		blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	Y N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is co			Υ
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a second state of the second stat	tion between participating farm	s?	Y Y Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedur scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	re with waypoints describing se	t actions to deal with recognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice	count data? If no please detai	I reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspection  1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to preda  2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced promets  Seal promets  ADD's Switched off top nets  If other, detail below:		•	N Y
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 104. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries	they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5	i.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes o	give detail		
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with loca Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk or be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	f further escapes? (Not covered	d in code but could	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to conta	inment? If no, please detail rea	ason(s)	Υ

TIII 050 Marrian 40	leaved by FIII	Data of income 40/05/0000
FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0013 Site	No: FS1277	
Date of Visit: 02/02/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located within	a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require completion.		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Mana	agement Agreements and Statements	S
2. Has a current farm management agreeme	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ed?
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspect		У
<ol><li>Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm</li><li>Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site</li></ol>	•	y v
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of com		nent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of revie	•	У
Arrangements for Fish Health Managemer	nt	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum he		oduced to the area or y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination i	requirements for stocks held in the area	or farm?
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of	•	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum sindividual farm?	•	
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	nts for the storage and disposal of any	dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual farm?		
Arrangements for The Management of Sea		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements	for the sharing of data on sea lice numl	pers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability of statement?	and the use of medicines on farms cov	ered by the agreement y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirement	nts for the sensitivity testing of available	e treatments for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual farms? 16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstan	ces under which highginal controls and	I cleaner fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual farms	•	y
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	nts for synchronous treatments on farm	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstan area or farm?	ces when live fish may be introduced o	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme or individual farms?	nts for the movement of live fish on and	d off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date	e of issue: 12/05/20	020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable har	vest practices on farms in the area or ind	dividual farms?	У	
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by what a when a farm or area may be restocked?		low and the earliest	У	
date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or agreement or statement?		sites covered by the	е у	
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broods covered by the agreement or statement?	stock or potential broodstock are to be ke	ept on any site	У	
Point of Compliance for Farm Managemen 24. Does the farm management agreement ir parties to the agreement?		ome, or cease to be,	у	
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and opera 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the		r statement?	У	

					20/20/20						
Case No:	2022-0013	J		Date of vi	sit: 02/02/20	)22					
Site No:	FS1277	]		Inspect	or:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification									
		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup>			
	+										
Report Summary				1							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI	30/03/2022	2									
	+										
	+										





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0169
 Date of Visit
 16/02/2022

 Site No
 FS1277
 Site Name
 Reibinish

 Case No
 20220013
 Inspector

# Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

# Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

# Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 30/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12	2/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0015			Date of visit: 15/02/2	022
Time spent on site:	hours	Ma	in Inspector:	
Site No: FS1042 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Seaforth Mowi Scotland Ltd		
Case Types: 1 REP 2	2 VMD 3	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 7.8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed	
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type:	S CoGP MA: W-6	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see addi	tional information/clinical score sheet tional information/clinical score sheet tional information/clinical score sheet	et.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:		

#### **Additional Case Information:**

2 and 12 combined to free up a pen. Biomass was low in both.

lump fish 180,000 ready to go into the pens once fresh water is complete. End of Feb

Surplus morts not able to be ensiled are taken to white shore cockles.

Site has recently suffered from a prolonged P.Skyensis infection which has resulted in high mortalities for several weeks running. Mortality is under control on site currently with some localised spikes attributed to post mechanical treatment loss.

Once the freshwater treatments are completed they will then feed medicated feed, staggered approach.

Thermolicer treatments under way during site visit. Most of site has been treated, 2 pens remaining. Good results from treatment over 90% clearance.

Some lethargic hanging fish observed in the pens that have recently been treated, also signs of lice damage on some fish, although mostly clear of lice. 2 pens that have yet to be treated had no hanging fish, except for a couple of runts. Some post treatment mortality was recorded but base line mortality in each pen is very low. Pens are 40 meters deep so catching fish for VMD was difficult, only one fish was able to be caught.

Sampling error occurred during collection of VMD samples. Two antibiotic treatments were administered, the first was florfenicol and the second was oxytetracycline. Paperwork was conducted remotely before the Oxytetracycline was administered to the fish on site. So samples were taken for AMS3 residues which resulted in a positive result. On receipt of the positive result, further information was gathered from the operator which confirmed that Oxytetracycline had been administered on site and all proper records for the treatment had been maintained.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0015		Site No:	FS1042				
Date of Visit:		15/02/2022	2		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	ite representa	itive?			N	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	]
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	s inspected	9
Species	SAL							
Age group	2021 Q2's							
No Fish	1.6 million							
Mean Fish Wt	1.2kg							
Next Fallow Date (S		July 2022		Next Input Da	_ '	March 202		
Recent (last 4 wks)		ems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last v	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	P.Skyensis							
Movement Records	s							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec	ction:						14/01/2022	
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement red	cords availabl	e for dead fis	sh and waste?					Y
5. Are records comp		•						Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records?	?			
<b>Mortality Records</b>								
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Ensiled - on s	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly enter	ered?					Y
			Week 3 - 2.7	79% - Week 2 -	- 2.56% - Wee	k 1 - 2.95%	- Week 52 2	2021 2.0%
4. Recent mortality (								
5. Evidence of recer		• •						Y
If yes, facility nos/no		•	ck per facility/	/reason:				
whole site, P.Skyens			-1 - 10					NI/A
<ol><li>6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:</li></ol>	n mortality du	ring period cr	necked?					N/A
7. Have increased (u	(nevolained)	martalities he	on reported to	2 yet or FHI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	illexplained) i	Hortanties be	en reported to	) Vet Of 1 Till:				1 4// .
8. Have 'mortality ev	rents' heen re	ported to FHI	2 If no enter	details on mort	tality events sh	poet		Y
o. Have mortality ev	enta been re	ported to 1 111	: II IIO, CIIICI V	Jetails off filory	anty events si	,eet.		•

Treatments and Me	edicines Records		
1. Recent treatments	s (see comment)?		Y
	TMS, Florocol, Oxytetracycl		
If yes, detail:	ine		
If other, detail:			
	s available for inspection?		Y
	plete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withd	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Y
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)?	S, Florocol, Oxytetracycline	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Record	ls		
•	Is available for inspection?		У
	and frequency of mortality removal, recording	·	У
	and period in which the APB will notify Scottish	n Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
,	ined) mortality at the site been included?		У
		or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	luded and how and when that will be notified		У
	atus of aquaculture animals being stocked on	the farm site been covered (equal or higher	У
health status, certific	ation if required)?		
		etween each epidemiological unit to minimise	У
	ase been covered (movement of staff, visitors		24
	available regarding the measures in place to	maintain the physical containment of	У
aquaculture animals		d on aita?	vi
	rity procedures been adequately implemented	on site?	У
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla			
	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or on b	pehalf of, the business?	Y
-	available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant res			Y
•	etailed under recent disease problems).		
See recent diseases			
F	Records checked between: 14/0	01/2022-15/02/2022	

ГП	059, Version 15							155	ueu by.	ГП			
C	Case no:	2022-00	)15	Site No:		FS1042			Date of Samplin		15/	02/2022	15/(
Р	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampiii	g. HI		1	
S	ime sampling tarts/ends:		0:00	15:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	5
E	Environmental conditions:	1	Wet	2		3		4		5			
S	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
	d Fish/Pools - click												
	ish nos	1											
	Pool Group	1											
	Species	SAL											
	verage weight	1.2kg											
	Sex	N/A											
	Vater Type	SW											
ock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	മ Arkaig											

)2/2022	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:											
	All fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.														
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0										

Site No: FS1042

Case No: 2022-0015

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

					1 = 10 0 10			
Case No:	2022-0015	J		Date of vi	sit: 15/02/20	)22		
Site No:	FS1042	1		Inspect	or:			
		_						
Results Summary	Freq.		Į.		Date of Noti		1.	
		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
	_							
	+							
	_							
	+							
Report Summary				7				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
REP, VMD	29/03/2022							
	+							
	+							
	Ī							





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 15/02/2022

 Site No
 FS1042
 Site Name
 Seaforth

 Case No
 20220015
 Inspector

# Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, after reports from the operator of increased mortality on the site in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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

# Records

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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



Fish Health Inspector

charter/

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

Date: 29/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020	
Case No: 2022-0016			Date of visit: 15/02/2022	
Time spent on site:	hours	Main In	spector:	
Site No: FS0149 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Langavat The Scottish Salmon Co	ompany	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 7.8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed	
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additiona		
Diagnostic samples taken?  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:				

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Morts 2020 - issues with fungus. - Reported to FHI wk 36 - 17825 - 2.25% wk37 - 83413 - 10.76% wk38 - 55549 - 8.03%

Water was very murky and fish could not easily be observed. Fish that were observed appeared to be healthy and no signs of damage or clinical disease was observed.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0016	\$	Site No:	FS0149				
Date of Visit:		5/02/2022			Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary ch		e representa	tive?			Y N	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fish f	or all sectio	ns)					
Total No facilities Species Age group	8 SAL 22S1's		Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilitie	s inspected	8
No Fish Mean Fish Wt	382,636 66g							
Next Fallow Date (S Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	,	arch 2022 s?		Next Input Da	ate (Site) Any escapes	August 20 (since last		N
Movement Records 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspe 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific  Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a systematical	s available for in ction: blete and correct cords available f blete and correct ates for introduc	y entered? or dead fish ly entered? tions (outwit	h GB) availa	siness (not us			04/12/2019	Y Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records	available for insp	ection?						Y
2. How are mortalities of their detail:	es disposed of?				Ensiled - on s	site		
3. Mortality records	complete and co	_		%) wk2 (101 -	· 0.02%) wk1 (	233 - 0.06%	6) wk52 2021	Y (278 -
<ul><li>4. Recent mortality (</li><li>5. Evidence of recent yes, facility nos/no</li></ul>	nt increased/atyp	ical mortaliti	0.07%) es?		(		-,	N
6. Any other peaks i		•	cked?					Y
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased ( If yes, detail action:	See additional i unexplained) mo		reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been repo	ted to FHI?	If no, enter o	details on mort	tality events sh	ieet.		Y

Treatments and Me	dicines Records					
1. Recent treatments			Y			
	Aquacen ,					
If yes, detail:	Cress , TMS					
If other, detail:						
	available for inspection?		Y			
•	ete and correctly entered?		Y			
4. Are fish in a withdr			Y			
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? TMS, Aquacen, Cress						
If other, detail:						
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Y			
Diagonality Dogord						
Biosecurity Record			Y			
	s available for inspection?	recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y			
		tify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	· ·			
	ned) mortality at the site been included.		Y			
` .	•	e presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease				
	uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will	·	Y			
		stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y			
health status, certific	•	grant and raining one seem controlled (equal or imgine				
,	' /					
6. Have the husband	ry and biosecurity measures imple	emented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y			
		taff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?				
7. Is documentation a	available regarding the measures	in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y			
aquaculture animals	held on site?					
8. Have the biosecur	ity procedures been adequately im	nplemented on site?	Y			
If no, detail:						
Results of Surveilla						
•		by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y			
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?						
3. Any significant res			N			
If yes, detail (if not de	etailed under recent disease proble	ems).				
	la canda ala calcad la atrocaca.	04/40/0040 45/00/0000				
K	lecords checked between:	04/12/2019-15/02/2022				

	mi 059, version 15							133	ueu by. r	1 11			
	Case no:	2022-00	)16	Site No		FS0149			Date of v		15/0	)2/2022	15/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG		y. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	17
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	1-8	9-16	17-24	25-34								
	Pool Group	1-0	3-10	17-24	25-54								
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	66g	66g	66g	66g								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW								
Stock Details		Geocrab	Geocrab	Geocrab	Geocrab								

02/2022 Additional Sample Information:													
	All fish sampled appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.												
0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		: 12/05/2020			
Case Number:	2022-0016		Site No:	FS0149		Insp:	
Date of Visit	15/02/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
•	Number of supp	ocluding third country pliers	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3		10	6
Wovernonts on	Number of dest		0			10	3
Exposure via water	,	Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	<u> </u>	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				- O
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					<b>Total</b> Rank		14 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0016		Site No:	FS0149
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)			
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?		
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or ed	quivalent) fallowed synchronously or	n a single y	year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as a can these be deployed in a reasonable period	well as access to suitable biological a		
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement releva	ant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
<ul><li>5. Are sea lice count records available for insp</li><li>6. Do records adequately reflect the required</li></ul>			Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatme	ent in the C	coGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salr</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period		vel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	•		lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been adminis suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. e</i>			
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?		
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions	s taken had a significant impact upor	the lice le	evels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participa	iting farms	?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, sea lice?	where fewer populations or part popu	ulations are	e held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice in		ribing set	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no plea	ase detail i	reasons.
Containment Inspection			
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage	•	•	
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the	he predation experienced on site? (D	etail belov	v) Y
top nets			
If other, detail below:			
<ol><li>Have escape incidents or events been exp</li></ol>	perienced on or in the vicinity of the s	ite since th	ne last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	-		is identify in inspection.
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	·		
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fo		4.4.37. 5.4	4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and			
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail		
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)			
9. What action was taken to prevent and minim		t covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measur	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	dotail rocc	con(c)
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	gards to containment? If no, please	uciaii ieas	l I

Case No:	2022-0016			Date of visit:	15/02/2022	2		
Site No:	FS0149	]		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	ation		
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
			-					
							_	
	1							
Report Summary				1				
	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	-				
Case Type ECI, CNI, VMD	24/03/2022		Z INSP					
201, 0111, 11112	2 1/ 00/ 2022							





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0169Date of Visit15/02/2022Site NoFS0149Site NameLoch LangavatCase No20220016Inspector

### Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

#### Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

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

Date: 29/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2022-0027			Date of visit: 15/02/2022				
Time spent on site: 2 h	nours	Main Inspecto	or:				
Site No: FS1046 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Larval Rearing Unit Mowi Scotland Ltd					
Case Types: 1 MOV 2	3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: B	CoGP MA: M-49				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N  UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							
OTTIFICE OTHY II driable to dairy of	sat interrace viole detail read	Soft Bolow.					

### **Additional Case Information:**

MOV inspection to accompany OV. No issues on site and the health certificate was issued by the OV.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0027		Site No:	FS1046				
Date of Visit:		15/02/2022	2		Inspector(s	):		
Registration/Author	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite represent	ative?			Υ	7
2. Changes made to	•	·	·				N	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		33	<b>1</b>		24	No facilitie	es inspected	24
Species	WRA	WRA					1	
Age group	Brood	Larvae						
No Fish	2,000	1 mil				_	_	
Mean Fish Wt	0.3 - 1.5 Kg							
Next Fallow Date (S		No plans		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	No plans		
Recent (last 4 wks)	•	•			_ ` '	es (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					,		,	
<ul> <li>4. Are movement re</li> <li>5. Are records comp</li> <li>6. Are health certific</li> <li>Transport Records</li> <li>1. Are any movement</li> <li>If yes, is there a sys</li> </ul>	olete and corre ates for introd ates carried out	ectly entered? luctions (outv	? vith GB) avail half) of the b	able? usiness (not us				Y Y N/A
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for ir	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (deta	il)		
If other detail:	Hazco - incir		e		,	,		
3. Mortality records								Y
4. Recent mortality (	•	•	3 fish					
5. Evidence of recer	•	tvpical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		v/reason:				
,	Trick terming pro-			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (	unexplained) i	mortalities be	en reported t	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events	sheet.		N/A

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

Case No:	2022-0027			Date of visit	: 15/02/202	2						
Site No:	FS1046	)		Inspector	:							
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification									
,	1.54	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp				
					-							
	+	-										
					-							
					-							
Report Summary												
Case Type MOV	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp									
MOV	13/05/2022	2										
	+											
	+											
	+											
	İ											





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

**BUSINESS No** FB0119 **DATE OF VISIT** 15/02/2022

SITE NO FS1046 SITE NAME Larval Rearing Unit

Case No 20220027 Inspector

## Inspection for export

The above site was visited and a consignment of wrasse larvae for export to Norway was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination.

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

Date: 13/05/2022

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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