

Case No: 2019-0734 Date of visit: 04/12/2019

Time spent on site: 5h Main Inspector:

Site No: FS0737 Site Name: Loch Huamavat
Business No: FB0169 Business Name: The Scottish Salmon Company

Case Types: 1 ESC 2 CNA 3 4 5 6

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

Observations: Region: WI Water type: F CoGP MA

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

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

Additional Case Information:

Water very dark and peaty, visibility very limited. No moribund or lethargic fish observed.

When transferring fish off site by helicopter on a very calm day the increased downdraft of the helicopter caused the lifted net to bag and snag on metal stanchions on the steel cages. This caused a approximately 10 mesh large (~10 cm) hole about 0.5-0.6m below the waterline. To date no counts have been conducted at the sea site to ascertain the numbers lost. Numbers on the final notification are worst case scenario figures.

Changes made to procedures are that the raft and the helicopter are to be kept as far from the pen that is to be transferred as possible on the cage group. Before the raft was right next to the pen to be transferred. A pipe is used to pump the fish from the cage to the helicopter bucket that is kept on the raft. The helicopter then collect the bucket from the raft.

Update Helicopter Lifting procedure to include change as above.

Documents received 21/07/2020 and further documents received 10/05/2021. Ongoing review of the helicopter procedure has taken into account updated health and safety guidance, the initial mitigation suggested has been replaced by increased monitoring of equipment that may be at risk of increased damage due to downdrafts. Other documents required or recommended to be updated have been received and reviewed as satisfactory 24/05/2021.

Case No: **2019-0734** Site No: **FS0737**
 Date of Visit: **04/12/2019** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details

Total No facilities	8 cages	Facilities stocked	7 cages	No facilities inspected	8 cages
Species	SAL				
Age group	2020 S1				
No Fish	231,515				
Mean Fish Wt	34g				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Mid April 2020	Next Input Date (Site)	September 2020		

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **N** Any escapes (since last visit)? **Y**
 If yes, detail: **Escape reported MSe250419SAL1**

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **28/02/2017**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Ensiled - on site**
- If other detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **w/b 4/11/19 2 morts for the whole site, w/b 11/11/19 & w/b 18/11/19 zero morts for the whole site, w/b 1,135 fish culled for quality at vaccination**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**
 If yes, detail: **w/b 30/9/19 20,948 quality cull, w/b 14/10/19 20,940 quality cull**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
 If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **N/A**

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Records checked between: 28/02/2017 - 4/12/19

Case No: 2019-0734 Site No: FS0737

Date of visit: 04/12/2019 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (FRESHWATER)				
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? If yes answer 1.2-1.8:		Y		
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH 31D,E	Helicopter movement occurred on 25/4/2019, holes were not noticed until the 2/5/2019 (day it was reported) when the nets were taken off the pens as the site was fallow. Verbally a change to the procedure was confirmed(see additional information). However, the written procedure has not been updated to reflect the change yet. See on site "Helicopter Lifting Operations" Date of edit: 18/2/2019 Version C Site specific containment measures document (dated 2019) in place, prevention of escapes procedure (dated 2007) in place, however both don't mention recover of escapees.
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	Y	CoGP 2.4.31, 3.4.39	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail		N		
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed of appropriate mesh size with regard the size of the escaped fish?	Low	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.28, 3.4.36 SSI, 2,9	
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site				
General records				
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			SSI 2,1	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
			Facilities Moorings Nets		
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	N	Y	Facilities: steel cages were bought in 1990 second-hand (previously on marine site), manufacturer: ME steel cages, (no purchase records), moorings second hand from sea site)
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N	N	N/A	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	N	N	Y	
d) The date of purchase	Low	N	N	Y	
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	Y	Y	Facilities, nets and moorings: daily visual inspections conducted by site staff. Issues noted or repairs are recorded in the site diary. Nets are strength tested on site by site staff with Sauter FK 1K force gauge (manufactured 2016) gauge checked with certified weight, net in question (net tag number 10874) was strength tested as 50+ on 14/11/2019. (10mm mesh) Date of manufacture for the net is 2018. Damage on the net was repaired in house with a patch and double stitched, 14/5/19 record in the diary for net repair.
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y	Y	Y	Records for replaced mooring components (ie. ropes in diary or daily checklist - none replaced for Humavat in last year)
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Y	Y	Y	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Y	Y	Y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	Y	Y	Y	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y			
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	N	SSI, 2,3		bought second-hand in 1990 no records of the date of construction
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y			12x12m steel cages
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	Y			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,5		no navigational markers on the cages

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters[3]			SSI, 2,6	cages are in a freshwater loch
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A		
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	N/A		
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A		
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A		
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)	Loch Humavat is very shelterd no damage in recent memory.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				Cages and moorings are designed for a sea site and are now deployed in a sheltered freshwater loch. Cages and marring have been deployed since 1990 and have never failed. staff conducting tests, inspections, repair and deployment have between 18-33 years experience in fish farming each. No certificates availabe from Knox for this, site manager to check if these can be made available.
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that pens and moorings are designed, manufactured and installed suitable for purpose at the location of the site?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.11	
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.12	
2.10 Can the site demonstrate evidence that all nets have been designed and manufactured under the control of a Quality Management System to ensure they provide containment for the whole of their working life?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.13	
2.11 Are all screens inspected daily and relevant action taken? Are records maintained of inspection frequency and the outcomes?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	No screens, but all nets are checked daily.
2.12 Are screens constructed from a suitably strong and robust material, and therefore fit for purpose?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.19	Nets are constructed of danline polysteel rope and nylon
2.13 Can the site demonstrate awareness of the minimum net strengths to be used at all times?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.14	site operates in accordance with breaking strength in CoGP
2.14 Does the site have a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.15	No documents found, CoGP states no nets oder than 5 years to be used and follow that. Audited to GoPG standard.
2.15 Does the site use nylon nets older than 5 years?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.16	no net older than 2017 currently on site, follow CoGP
2.16 Can site managers demonstrate awareness of the minimum fish size supplied where new stock is introduced?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.18	
2.17 Have nets been treated with UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low	Y	CoGP 3.4.20, 3.4.21	
2.19 Can the site demonstrate evidence of nets being inspected and strength tested after each cycle by a competent person?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.22	Site staff strength test nets on site (see comments above).

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
2.20 Is in accordance with a detailed procedure based on manufacturer's advise and using a documented quality control system?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.22	No procedure but under CoGP.	
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23		
a) net base	High	Y			
b) side wall	High	Y			
c) above the waterline	High	Y			
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.24		
2.23 Are additional inspections undertaken following adverse weather where required?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.25	After storms the whole site is checked for damage.	
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training					
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Inhouse training course on stock containment completed for all site staff 4/4/19.	
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High	Y	CoGP 7.4.7		
3.3 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working in the site in relation to any helicopter operations?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.27, 3.4.33		All site staff have had helicopter training.
3.4 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.35 SSI 2,6,a		All staff have powerboat level 2.
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37		Inhouse training course on stock containment completed for all site staff 4/4/19. This course is to be done annually. No records of read/signed of SOPs for procedures that may give rise to an escape however.
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments					
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.6, 3.4.8, 2.4.7, 3.4.9	Risk assessments all pertain to health and safety of staff, contractors and member sof the public. None in relation to containment or escapes.	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 2.4.23, 3.4.27 SSI 2,7, b SSI 2, 8, c		
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y			Specific but focused on human health and safety
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y			

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
c) contingency plan	High	Y		generic document for the whole site, just states to make safe any obvious equipment failure are to be made safe.
4.3 Is the integrity of all handling equipment checked, including pipelines, pumps, transport tanks, graders, counters and vaccination stations, before fish are handled?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.24, 3.4.28	
4.4 Do these checks include the suitability of the above equipment for use during adverse weather conditions where appropriate?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.25, 3.4.29	
4.5 Are mitigation measures such as safety nets, security devices, or bunding used at potential risk points, such as pipe connections?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.26, 3.4.30	
4.6 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,a	
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?	Medium	Y	2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.10 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including			SSI, 2,6,a	
-The type and location of each net, fence and scarcer deployed	Medium	Y		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,6,a	
4.11 Where predator nets are deployed is this done in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of access by predators? For example, see requirements of Annex 7.	Low	N/A	3.5.34-37 2.5.34-37	

c. Inspection of site and site equipment

5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the site is not located within an area likely to be affected by flood, or suitable flood defences in place?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.4.11	
5.3 Does the site have effective measures in place to prevent fish from jumping out of holding facilities into surface waters or natural water courses?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.12	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.4 Is the site inflow system designed to prevent any upstream escape of farm stock?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.14	
5.5 Are the screen sizes capable of containing the entire range of fish sizes within the unit in every instance?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.15	
5.6 In the case of a land-based aquaculture system, are there two screens incorporated into the outflow system of a suitable size to prevent the passage of fish in all potential water conditions?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.20	
5.7 Does the net mesh size contain the entire range of fish sizes in every instance of the species involved?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.17	
5.8 Are boat operations conducted in a manner which avoids damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.34	

d. Inspection of site specific procedures

6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.24	No site specific procedure observed during the inspection.
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-				
a) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.31	
b) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.32	

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

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

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
---------------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

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

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

██████████
The Scottish Salmon Company
1 Smithy Lane
Lochgilphead
Argyll
PA31 8TA
████████████████████

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	04/12/2019
SITE No	FS0737	SITE NAME	Loch Huamavat
INSPECTOR	██████████	CASE No	20190734

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

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

The following recommendation is made for improvement.

It is recommended that to meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 9 of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 and to ensure compliance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (chapter 3, sections 4.36 and 4.40) the record maintained of the site-specific contingency plans for preventing escapes should be updated to include details for recovery of escaped fish.

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

The following recommendations are made for improvement.

It is recommended that to meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 1 of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 farmers should maintain a record for facilities and moorings containing :

1. (a) the name of the manufacturer
(b) any special adaptations
(c) the name of the supplier
(d) the date of purchase

It is also recommended that to meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 3 of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 farmers should maintain a record for facilities containing:

3. (i) the date of construction

It is recommended that in accordance with CoGP (chapter 3, section 4.13) a system or records are put in place to demonstrate that all nets have been designed and manufactured under the control of a Quality Management System to ensure they provide containment for the whole of their working life.

It is recommended that in accordance with CoGP (chapter 3, section 4.15) a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements is put in place for the site.

It is recommended that in accordance with CoGP (chapter 3, section 4.22) a detailed procedure should be put in place, based on manufacturer's advice and using a documented quality control system, for the inspection and strength testing of nets at the end of each production cycle.

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

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

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice, the following recommendations are made due to the notification received on 02 May 2019

It is recommended that in accordance with CoGP (chapter 3, sections 4.27) documented reviews of the site specific written standard operating procedures (SOPs) for helicopter transfers, net raising and net checking are undertaken to include improvements to operations to prevent the occurrence of a similar breach in containment. Staff should also be trained in the resulting updated SOPs.

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

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

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

No site specific procedures were observed during the inspection.

Further Action

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by **29 November 2020**. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

Please do not hesitate to contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:



Date: 29/05/2020

R10

Fish Health Inspector

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

R10

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	04/12/2019
SITE No	FS0737	SITE NAME	Loch Huamavat
CASE No	20190734	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 29 November 2020. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed:



Date: 24/05/2021

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/>

[REDACTED]
The Scottish Salmon Company
1 Smithy Lane
Lochgilphead
Argyll
PA31 8TA
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	04/12/2019
SITE No	FS0737	SITE NAME	Loch Huamavat
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20190734

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of an unknown number of fish (but at most approximately 4465) on 25/04/2019.

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

All epidemiological units were inspected.

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:

[REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 19/12/19

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

R10

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel - 0131 244 3498 Fax - 0131 244 0944 Email - ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science