

Case No:  Date of visit:

Time spent on site:  Main Inspector:

Site No:  Site Name:

Business No:  Business Name:

Case Types: 1  2  3  4  5  6

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

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA M-46

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.

Clinical signs of disease observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.

Gross pathology observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.

Diagnostic samples taken?

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

**Additional Case Information:**

MRT reports by site during 2018 - w/b 23/04/2018: reported 1.1%, however site records show 1,506 (1.02%) and 30/04/2018: reported 1.1%, and site records show 1,600 (1.62%) - attributed to physical damage relating to poor weather. Mortality events spreadsheet has been updated.

W/b 07/01/19: SLICE treatment

W/b 11/02/19: Hydrogen peroxide treatment (strategic gill amoeba treatment while water was at a lower temperature. Not in response to gill pathology).

SLICE treatment currently undergoing on site in response to an increase in caligus numbers.

Sealice: wk8 (2018) adult females reported as >3. Site harvested and numbers dropped <3 the following week. Site was fallow by the end of May 2018.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Inspection and paperwork completed by [REDACTED] under [REDACTED] supervision. VMD sampling completed by [REDACTED].

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

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

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

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="16 cages"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="16"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="16"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>	<input type="text" value="LUM"/>			
Age group	<input type="text" value="2018 S0s"/>	<input type="text" value="2019"/>			
No Fish	<input type="text" value="742,124"/>	<input type="text" value="59,958"/>			
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="1.2kg"/>	<input type="text" value="60-300g"/>			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="January/Feb"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="September 2020"/>	

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

**Movement Records**

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

**Transport Records**

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

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection?   
 2. How are mortalities disposed of?   
 If other detail:   
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?   
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):   
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?   
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?   
 If yes, detail:   
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?   
 If yes, detail action:   
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S., Slice	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S., Slice	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

**Biosecurity Records**

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

**Results of Surveillance**

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

Records checked between: 05/12/17 - 01/05/19

Case no:  Site No:  Date of visit/  
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI  BA  PA  MG  HI

Time sampling starts/ends:   Inspector:  VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1  2  3  4  5

Summary samples HIST  BA  MG  VI  PA  Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8								
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
Average weight	1.2kg	1.2kg	1.2kg	1.2kg								
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
Stock Details	Landcatch Oirmsary FS0575	Landcatch Oirmsary FS0575	Landcatch Oirmsary FS0575	Landcatch Oirmsary FS0575								
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	1	7	15	11								



Case Number:	2019-0199	Site No:	FS0336	Insp:		
Date of Visit	01/05/2019	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
<b>Management practices</b>		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 processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>20</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No: **2019-0199**

Site No: **FS0336**

**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 equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that records are inspected?
- If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

- 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

If other, detail below:

- 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?
- If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
- 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
- 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
- 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
- 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)



Case No: 2019-0199

Site No: FS0336

Date of Visit: 01/05/2019

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

**Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements**

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

**Arrangements for Fish Health Management**

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements 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 Lice**

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

**Harvesting**

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

**Fallowing**

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

**Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only**

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

**Management and operation**

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site No: FS0336

Case No: 2019-0199

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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



Case No: 2019-0199 Site No: FS0336

Date of visit: 01/05/2019 Inspector(s):

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

**ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)**

**a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures**

1.1. Have escape incidents or events <sup>1</sup> been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		N		
<b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b>				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH Regs <sup>4</sup> 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO <sup>2</sup> and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High			
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9	

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

General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1		
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			Facilities	Moorings	Nets
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low		Y	Y	Y
b) Any special adaptations	Low		N/A	N/A	N/A
c) The name of the supplier	Low		Y	Y	Y
d) The date of purchase	Low		Y	Y	Y

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
e) Each inspection including i) the name of the person conducting the inspection ii) the date of each inspection iii) the place of each inspection iv) the outcome of each inspection f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	Low Medium Low High High	Y Y Y Y Y	Y Y Y Y Y	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:	Medium Medium Medium Low	Y Y Y Y	SSI, 2,2	
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:	Low Low Low	Y Y Y	SSI, 2,3	
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-	Low Low Low	Y Y Y	SSI, 2,4	
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5	
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters <sup>3</sup>	Low Low Low Low	Y Y Y Y	SSI, 2,6	
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	Y		
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	Y		
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	Y		
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	Y		
2.6 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	Stanchion repaired following damage from storm, recorded in site diary.
Pen and mooring systems				
2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	
<b>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	Melissa workboat has prop guard fitted, but this is not detailed in any records.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.18	

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



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>Additional actions</b>	<b>Powers</b>			<b>Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary</b>
<b>e) Collection of samples</b> 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)			
<b>h) Enforcement Notice.</b> If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)			

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

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

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

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

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

Case No: **2019-0199**

Date of visit: **01/05/2019**

Site No: **FS0336**

Inspector: **[REDACTED]**

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI, SLI, VMD	03/05/2019	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
CNA	03/05/2019	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Case completed	23/07/2019	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

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

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0169	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	01/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0336	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Druimyeon Bay
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>CASE No</b>	20190199

### ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **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**

A minor issue was raised regarding records relating to procedures and risk assessments. The following recommendation has been made for improvement:

**To meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 6(c) of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 a record must be kept of the type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used for operations on the site.**

R10

**c) Inspection of the 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.**

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

The recommendation in this report should be implemented by 07/06/19. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendation has been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendation is 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: 07/05/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/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

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0169	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	01/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0336	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Druimyeon Bay
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>CASE No</b>	20190199


#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 07/06/19. 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: 23/07/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/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

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0169	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	01/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0336	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Druimyeon Bay
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>CASE No</b>	20190199

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R25

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.

An enhanced containment inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

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



Signed:

Date: 03/05/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

Case No:	2019-0267		Date of visit:	29/05/2019	
Time spent on site:	8 hours		Main Inspector:	[REDACTED]	
Site No:	FS1312	Site Name:	Skelwick Skerry		
Business No:	FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd		
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNA	3 SLI	4 VMD	5 [REDACTED] 6 [REDACTED]
Water Temp (°C):	9.3	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed	Y
Observations:	Region:	OR	Water type:	S	CoGP MA O-1
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>				

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

[REDACTED]
------------



**Additional Case Information:**

First Inspection since began operating  
Site due to beginning harvesting this week.

Dyneema nets will be removed after site is fallow as site manager and team do not like the design.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy and a good weight.

Morts are kept in bins on the shore base and are transported to Kirkwall where they are then transported by billy bowie down to Dumfries for biogas recycling.

Very high energy site, site manager reported that they have had no major issues with weather as facilities, nets and moorings are spec'd to cope with the high energy. Wear and tear does occur on surface area of nets where they rub against the cage sides. This damage is repaired in advance of any containment issues occurring and water lines are set up differently to try and mitigate any potential wear and tear to a minimum amount.

Site has no feed barge, instead a work boat with built in silos is used as a feeder which uses a blower to blast feed into the pen.

Fish were very low down in the water but were observed when feeding began. Fish looked happy and healthy, no signs of damage or disease.

Cooke are only operator in the farm management area. So not fallowed synchronously as per their FMS

Sampling completed by [REDACTED] supervised by [REDACTED]

Inspection and paperwork completed by [REDACTED] supervised by [REDACTED]

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

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

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

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="4"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="4"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="4"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="18 S1's"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="174,765"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="5.6 kilo"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="July 2019"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="October 2019"/>	

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

**Movement Records**

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

**Transport Records**

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

**Mortality Records**

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

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

**Biosecurity Records**

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

**Results of Surveillance**

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

Records checked between: 17/11/18 - 29/05/19

Case no:  Site No:  Date of visit/  
 Sampling:

Priority samples: VI  BA  PA  MG  HI

Time sampling starts/ends:   Inspector:  VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1  2  3  4  5

Summary samples HIST  BA  MG  VI  PA  Total Samples

**Add Fish/Pools - click**

Pool/Fish No													
Fish nos	1												
Pool Group													
Species	SAL												
Average weight	5.6kilos												
Sex	N/A												
Water Type	SW												
Stock Details		Vestness											
	Stock Origin												
Facility No	3												



Case Number:	2019-0267	Site No:	FS1312	Insp:		
Date of Visit	29/05/2019	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	0
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
<b>Management practices</b>		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 processing	0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>8</b>	<b>LOW</b>

Case No: **2019-0267**

Site No: **FS1312**

**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 equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that records are inspected?
- If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

- 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

If other, detail below:

- 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?
- If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
- 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
- 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
- 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
- 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2019-0267

Site No: FS1312

Date of Visit: 29/05/2019

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

**Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements**

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

**Arrangements for Fish Health Management**

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements 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 Lice**

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?



**Harvesting**

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

**Fallowing**

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

**Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only**

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

**Management and operation**

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site No: FS1312

Case No: 2019-0267

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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



Case No: 2019-0267 Site No: FS1312

Date of visit: 29/05/2019 Inspector(s):

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

**ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)**

**a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures**

1.1. Have escape incidents or events <sup>1</sup> been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		N		
<b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b>				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH Regs <sup>4</sup> 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO <sup>2</sup> and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High			
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9	

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

General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1	
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			Facilities	Moorings
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low		y	Y
b) Any special adaptations	Low		y	Y
c) The name of the supplier	Low		y	Y
d) The date of purchase	Low		y	Y

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	y	y	y	Moorings all inspected by an ROV team who provide a detailed digital report. Any repairs or adjustments made to moorings are recorded in site diary when repaired by Cooke work boats.
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	y	y	y	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	y	y	y	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	y	y	y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	y	y	y	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y		AL18111 - Pen 2 AL18110 - Pen 3	
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y		New site so no record of net storage or disposal. Spoke to site manager about keeping a record once nets are stored/disposed. Nets planned to be recycled.	
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	N		Very deep water site, 20 meters between bottom of net and seabed at all time. Mean low water spring distance from bottom of net not currently recorded. Site manager agreed that record of this would be kept moving forward.	
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	y	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	y			
iii) Its dimensions	Low	y			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	y			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	y			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	y			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	N	SSI, 2,5	Spoke to site manager, the navigational markers on the side of facilities will be recorded in future.	
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters <sup>3</sup>			SSI, 2,6		
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low				
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low				
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low				
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low				
2.6 A record of-			SSI, 2,7		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	Recorded in the daily checks sheet and any repairs are recorded in the site diary or the divers logs.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
<b>Pen and mooring systems</b>				
2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	y	CoGP 4.4.17	
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	N	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	N	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	Recorded in boat specifications. Custom propeller guards for each boat in use.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		n		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.27	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.18	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	N	SSI 2,2 ii	two Dyneema net does not have an ID tags as they did not come with one. Site manager is going to install an ID tag on these pens. Other two nets all have ID tags.  Yes kept in a shorebase shed. Heavy weight on nets. Seal predation non existent. High top nets lifted with carbon fibre poles to keep birds out.
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y		
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)	Low	Y		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA <sup>5</sup> 2010 P4, S21	Record of navigational marker position not currently recorded. Site manager is going to make sure that the position of navigational markers are recorded.
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	N	SSI 2,5	
<b>d. Inspection of site specific procedures</b>				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.31	Helicopter transfers are never used for this site. So no SOP for helicopter transfer is held. No smolts are taken to this site only grower salmon
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-	High		CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure		N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air		N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned		N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>Additional actions</b>	<b>Powers</b>			<b>Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary</b>
<b>e) Collection of samples</b> 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)			
<b>h) Enforcement Notice.</b> If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)			

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

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

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

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

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

Case No: 2019-0267

Date of visit: 29/05/2019

Site No: FS1312

Inspector: [Redacted]

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI SLI VMD	31/05/2019	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
CNA.	18/06/2019	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
ECI,SLI, VMD (Resent)	11/06/2019	[Redacted]	[Redacted]
Case Completion	31/07/2019	[Redacted]	[Redacted]

██████████  
Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd  
c/o Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd  
Crowness Road, Hatston Kirkwall  
Orkney  
KW15 1RG  
████████████████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0095	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	29/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS1312	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Skelwick Skerry
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	████████████████████	<b>CASE No</b>	20190267

### ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

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

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

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

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

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

Issues were raised regarding records relating to equipment, facilities and the site

The following recommendations were made for improvement.

**To meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 2 of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 in relation to each net, a record must be kept of:**

- i. the mesh size;
- ii. the code which appears on the identification tag;
- iii. the place of use, storage and disposal; and
- iv. the depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring.

To meet the requirements of schedule 2 section 5 of the Fish Farming and Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 A record of any navigational markers deployed must be put in place.

It is recommended that in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture Edition 2 (CoGP) Chapter 4 (section 4.19.) site managers should demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size supplied at input and at other relevant times in relation to net mesh size.

**b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training**

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

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

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

**c) Inspection of site and site equipment**

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

**d) Inspection of site specific procedures**


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

**Further Action**

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by **12/07/2019**. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 12/06/2019

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](http://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](mailto:ms.fishhealth@gov.scot)  
Website - [www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science)

[REDACTED]  
Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd  
Crowness Road  
Hatston  
Kirkwall, Orkney  
KW15 1RG  
[REDACTED]

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0095	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	29/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS1312	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Skelwick Skerry
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>CASE No</b>	20190267

#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 12<sup>th</sup> July 2019. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed:

[REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 31/07/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

██████████  
Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd  
c/o Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd  
Crowness Road, Hatston Kirkwall  
Orkney  
KW15 1RG  
████████████████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0095	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	29/05/2019
<b>SITE No</b>	FS1312	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Skelwick Skerry
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	████████████████████	<b>CASE No</b>	20190267

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

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

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

#### Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

R25

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**

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.

An enhanced containment inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

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



Signed:

Date: 10/06/2019

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)