FHI 059, Version 12	ls	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0665			Date of visit: 05/11/2019			
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspect	tor:			
Site No: FS1328 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Smolt Unit Scottish Sea Farms Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 13	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail i	reason below:				

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0665		Site No:	FS1328				
Date of Visit:		05/11/2019	9		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	16	No facilitie	s inspected	16
Species	sal smolts					_		
Age group No Fish	1,888,115					-		
Mean Fish Wt	88g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	no fallow		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	ongoing		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?			Any escape	es (since last	visit\2	N
If yes, detail:	small amour		ost vaccine		Arry Cocapc	3 (Sirice last	visit):	14
Movement Records	5							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							new site	
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement red	cords availab	le for dead fis	sh and waste?	•				Y
Are records comp		•						Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	nce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities If other detail:	es disposed o	f?			Ensiled - or	n site		
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	,		%, 0.65%, 0.02	2%			
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								N/A
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FH	l? If no, add I/	IRT case and e	enter on mor	tality events	sheet.	N/A

ii yes, detaii.	i oiiiiaiiii, Fyceze		
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records ava	•		Y
3. Are records complete	and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawa	al period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	Formalin, Pyceze	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored a	appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records			
1. Biosecurity records av	ailable for inspection?		Y
•	•	ding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
		cottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	mortality at the site been included?		Y
, ,			
4. Has the action that will	be taken in the event that the prese	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included	d and how and when that will be no	tified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of	of aquaculture animals being stocke	d on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification	n if required)?		
		ed between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	sitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
		ce to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held			
	rocedures been adequately impleme	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveillance			
1. Has any animal health	surveillance been carried out by, or	on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results avail	•		
3. Any significant results?	•		
•	ed under recent disease problems).		
j.c., wotan (ii iiot dotano	and the second and deep problems).		
Page	rde shocked between:	0/10/10 5/11/10	

Fish ensiled on site and waste transported by Murdoch and Sons ltd to Deerdykes composting, Scottish Waters Cumbernauld.

Morts; 0.44% wk 42, 0.11% wk3, 0.65% wk44, 0.02% wk45. Attributed to post vaccine and fungal. 2 tanks treated with formalin and pyceze (Cress). Formalin under prescription. Smolt Unit; SU1Tanks 5,6

Saprolegnia post vaccine. Hoped that would not be issue on site as water is UV treated. Thought time of year (organic matter in water) and post vaccine damage has lead to the sap. Fish are being vaccinated at a larger size than normal as the unit was not ready for fish input. Large size of fish at vaccine has lead to some damage however mortality levels remain low.

First FHI visit to this site since in operation.

Site thermometer use due to biosecurity rules at site.

	11 059, VEISION 12							155	sueu by. Fr				
	Case no:	2019-06	665	Site No:		FS1328			Date of vis		05/	11/2019	05/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		Н			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:3	0:00	16:0	0:00	1	Inspect	or:			VMD No	D. [14
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI	P.	A		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21-24	25-28					
	Pool Group		0 0	0 12	10 10	17 20		20 20					
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL					
	Average weight	100g	100g	100g	100g	100g	100g	100g					
	Sex												
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW					
Stock Details	Stock Origin												
St	Facility No	SU1T1	SU2T2	SU1T8	SU1T7	SU1T4	SU2T6	SU1T3					

	,												
11/2019	11/2019 Additional Sample Information:												
killed with TMS													
0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0665		Site No:	FS1328		Insp:	
Date of Visit	05/11/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off			0			10	10
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	10
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					-
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iaims upstream	TOT WITHIN T HOUSE EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	٥		$\overline{}$
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				-
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				-
Tab of product							
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		27
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2019-0665		5	Site No:	FS1328	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the	e previous 4 vears	٠?			
•	lanagement Area (or equival			a single y	ear class basis?	
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	access to a range of licenced amectin benzoate) as well as in a reasonable period of tim cumented farm management	in-feed and bath s access to suitab ne?	sea lice medic le biological a	ations (indo	cluding deltamethrin, hanical control meas	
	ecords available for inspection	n? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)			
	ely reflect the required standa		Ť	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Ann	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the (CoGP Annex 6)	e suggested criter	ia for treatmer	nt in the Co	oGP during the perior	d that
_	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i> 0/6/19) during the period that	•		el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10	0/6/19) or
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Health	Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see cor	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is con	sidered to cause	significant wel	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)
	reatments been administered reatment or where <i>C. elonga</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applica	able)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions take	n had a significan	t impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in	cooperation betw	veen participat	ing farms?	?	
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where					
	ific written lice management scalation of a sea lice infesta		aypoints descr	ibing set a	actions to deal with re	ecognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflec	t sea lice count d	ata? If no plea	se detail r	easons.	
	nced equipment damage due				-	N
•	ce to mitigate against the pre	edation experience	ed on site? (De	etail below	')	Υ
inside and pest conti						
If other, detail below:						
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been experience	ced on or in the vi	cinity of the sit	e since the	e last FHI inspection	? N
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to qu	estion 10				
	ported to Scottish Ministers?					
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith	h (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4	4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and local	fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37,	5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	y) used to recover escapees	? If yes give detai	il			
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed of P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	with local wild fish	n interests and	was perm	ission given by Scott	ish
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise t	he risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered i	n code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures of	the Act)				
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with regards	to containment?	If no, please of	letail reas	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0665	Date of visit: 05/11/2019									
Site No:	FS1328	l	Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary											
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Inch	and Image								
ECI, CNI, VMD	26/11/2019	Insp	2 nd Insp								
LOI, OIVI, VIVID	20/11/2013										





Scottish Sea Farms Ltd Laurel House Laurelhill Business Park Polmaise Road Stirling FK7 9JQ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 SITE NO FS1328 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 05/11/2019
SITE NAME Barcaldine Smolt Unit
CASE No 20190665

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since input to the smolt unit.

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

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

Date:26/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0669			Date of visit: 06/11/2019
Time spent on site:	.5h	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: fs0265 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Inverkerry Smolt Unit Landcatch Natural Selection L	d
Case Types: 1 MOV	23	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

220,000 salmon smolts inspected for export to France.

No issues to note therefore certificate issued (intra.gb.2019.003147, local ref MD/136)

Mortalities mainly attributed to fungus

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0669		Site No:	fs0265				
Date of Visit:		06/11/2019	9		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		117	Facilities sto	cked	70	No facilitie	s inspected	1/
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group	2019 s0s	2020 s1						
No Fish	222,000	514,000						
Mean Fish Wt	115g	55g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	May 2020		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	June 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	touch of fund				r any coordinate	(, .	
Movement Records	S							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		•					18/03/2019	•
3. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availab	e for dead fis	sh and waste?					N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	?					N/A
Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outv	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys			•					
Mortality Records								
Mortality records:	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Ensiled - on	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	•		t four weeks (0	0.84%) mainly	fungus)		•
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	tvpical morta		,	, ,			N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
		·						
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:				, 5,00				NI/A
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		naminal to EU	0 Kma = 11 M	DT age		lite e as combo	baat	N1/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FHI	i 🖰 it no, add M	ik i case and e	enter on morta	anty events s	sneet.	N/A

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

N/A

18/3/2019 to 6/11/19

Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp In
Poport Summany
Report Summary Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp
MOV 12/11/2019





Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd Ormsary Fish Farm Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8PE

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0061
 Date of Visit
 06/11/2019

 Site No
 FS0265
 Site Name
 Inverkerry S

SITE NO FS0265 SITE NAME Inverkerry Smolt Unit INSPECTOR CASE NO 20190669

Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of Atlantic salmon for placing on the market in France was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 12/11/2019

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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0674			Date of visit: 06/11/2019
Time spent on site:	h	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: SS0759 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Fearna Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 MOV 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N	nation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	nil reason below:	

Certificate INTRA.GB.2019.0031609 (MD19/140) for 14 bags to Carlingsford Lough (FHA-184) issued.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI		Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0674		Site No:	SS0759			
Date of Visit:		06/11/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	itive?		Y N	}
Site Details			•				
Total No facilities Species	MED	10 long lines	Facilities sto	cked	7 long lines	No facilities inspected	0 lines
Age group No Fish	2018 84 tonnes						
Mean Fish Wt	35mm	December 2	010	Next Input Da	oto (Sito)	wild anot fall	
Next Fallow Date (S	oile)	December 2	019	Next Input Da	ne (Sne)	wild spat fall	_
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last visit)?	N/A
Movement Record	s						
Movement record Date of last inspec	ection:					05/11/2019	
Are records comp Are movement re Are records comp	cords availab	le for dead fis ectly entered?	h and waste?				Y N/A N/A
6. Are health certific		luctions (outw	rith GB) availa	able?			N/A
1. Are any moveme flyes, is there a sys	nts carried ou		•	•	_		
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?					Y
2. How are mortaliti If other detail:		•			Other (detail))	
3. Mortality records		correctly ente					N/A
4. Recent mortality5. Evidence of recent	•	typical mortal		s observed, er	npty shells fall	to the seabed.	N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:			
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?				N/A
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?			N/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	: 08/10/2018
	available for inspection? lete and correctly entered? rawal period? ent(s)?			
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records 2. Has the manner ar 3. Has the manner ar		tify Scottish Ministers or veteri		
is detected been inclu	t will be taken in the event that the uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will tus of aquaculture animals being sation if required)?	be notified to Scottish Minister	rs?	
transmission of disea 7. Is documentation a aquaculture animals	ry and biosecurity measures imple ase been covered (movement of st available regarding the measures i held on site? ity procedures been adequately im	taff, visitors, equipment, live or in place to maintain the physic	r dead fish etc.)?	
Results of Surveilla	nce			
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out	by, or on behalf of, the busine	ess?	N

5/11/19-6/11/19

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

Case No:	2019-0674]		Date of visit:	06/11/2019]				
Site No:	SS0759	Inspector: SAE								
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification								
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
				_						
Report Summary										
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
MOV	14/11/2019									
	1	Ī								
	Ī	Ī								
	1									
	Ī	Ī								
			_							





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0530
 Date of Visit
 06/11/2019

 Site No
 SS0759
 Site Name
 Fearna

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190674

Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of mussel spat for placing on the market in Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 14/11/2019
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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0675			Date of visit: 07/11/2019
Time spent on site:	1h	Main Ins	pector:
Site No: SS0759 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Fearna Loch Striven Mussel Farn	ns Ltd
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Certificate INTRA.GB.2019.0031610 (MD19/141) for 17 bags to Carlingsford Lough (FHA-184) issued.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0675		Site No:	SS0759				
Date of Visit:		07/11/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details Total No facilities Species Age group No Fish Mean Fish Wt	MED 2018 70 tonnes 35mm	10 lines	Facilities sto	cked	6 lines	No facilitie	es inspected	0 lines
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	December 20	019	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	wild spat s	settlement	
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N/A
Movement Records 1. Movement records 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records comp 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certifications	s available fo ction: lete and corre cords availab lete and corre	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered?	h and waste?				06/11/2019	Y N/A N/A
Transport Records 1. Are any movemer If yes, is there a syst	nts carried ou							
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records a 2. How are mortalities					Other (detail)		Y
If other detail: 3. Mortality records of the second	•	•		es observed, er	npty shells fal	ll to the sea	bed.	N/A
5. Evidence of recent If yes, facility nos/no		* 1		/reason:				N/A
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N/A
7. Have increased (ull liftyes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality ev					enter on morta	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
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 remo	val, recording and safe disposa	al been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will	•	erinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been i	included?		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that	t the presence or suspicion of th	ne presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that	will be notified to Scottish Minis	ters?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals bei	ng stocked on the farm site bee	en covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?			
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures in	•	•	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of		_	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measur aquaculture animals held on site?	res in place to maintain the phy	sical containment of	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequatel	ly implemented on site?		
If no, detail:	y implemented on site.		
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?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

6/11/19-7/11/19

Case No:	2019-0675			Date of visit:	07/11/2019			
Site No:	SS0759	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MOV	14/11/2019							





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0530
 Date of Visit
 07/11/2019

 Site No
 SS0759
 Site Name
 Fearna

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190675

Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of mussel spat for placing on the market in Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 14/11/2019
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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0680			Date of visit: 06/11/2019
Time spent on site:		Main	Inspector:
Site No: SS0002 Business No: SB0002	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Fyne Loch Fyne Oysters Ltd	d
Case Types: 1 INF 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see addition	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	I reason below:	

IDN to be served as site has received stock from a site confirmed with Bonamia ostreae.

Statutory test to be conducted to confirm or rule out presence of Bonamia ostreae.

Further investigation has concluded oysters were not moved from the confirmed site to this one. IDN therefore withdrawn.

Case No:	2019-0680			Date of visit:	06/11/2019			
Cubb No.	2010 0000	Balle of Viola.						
Site No:	SS0002	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
					-			
					—			
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
No report	06/11/2019		2 11155					

Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
D	Pate of visit: 06/11/2019
Main Inspector:	
Loch Craignish Native Oyster Res Loch Craignish Native Oyster Res	
4 5	6
F	HI 045 completed
Water type: S	CoGP MA
If yes, see additional informa If yes, see additional informa If yes, see additional informa	tion/clinical score sheet.
etail reason below:	
	Main Inspector: Loch Craignish Native Oyster Res Loch Craignish Native Oyster Res 4 5 Water type: S If yes, see additional informa If yes, see additional informa If yes, see additional informa

IDN to be served as site has received stock from a site confirmed with Bonamia ostreae.

Statutory test to be conducted to confirm or rule out presence of Bonamia ostreae.

Case No:	2019-0681			Date of visit:	06/11/2019			
Site No:	SS0925	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
No report	06/11/2019		2 11130					

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0682			Date of visit: 12/11/2019
Time spent on site:	3.5 hours	Main Ins	spector:
Site No: FS0537 Business No: FB0007	Site Name: Business Name:	Invicta Trout Invicta Trout Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 MIX 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 10.6	Thermometer No:	T274	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	Y If yes, see additiona	I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	il reason below:	

50,000 triploids from Spain due next week. First batch from new supplier.

Ongoing RTFS. No current issues with Costia or white spot. ERM bath vaccines - no issues.

Some movements off recorded as Bells - this is table fish directly to a fish van.

Egg imports not included in movement records. Updated during visit.

Eggs imported from Troutlodge USA, Troutex Denmark and Seven Springs. All other documentation available as required with the exception of one Danish import, which only had an unsigned copy of the health certificate.

Mortalities removed as whole fish - collected by Oakbank.

Morts generally low except in eggs - swim up. Were losing ~20% between egg arrival and swim up. Since last inspection also lost 22k to RTFS and 19k to Costia.

Anticipate going forward to be taking in eggs on a monthly basis.

Additional stock information - 2018 Tiger - 2000 @ 200g

A few (~20) dead fish in hatchery raceways and about 10-15 dead in hatchery ponds. One spiralling fish in middle of one of the main ponds. Otherwise no moribund fish seen. Visibility in ponds not good due to recent rainfall.

Water temp - 10.6 in hatchery (river/borehole mix) and 6.2 in outside ponds.

Updated 18/11/19 - movement records checked fully on return to laboratory. Majority of records completed with sufficient information, but a few required clarification as difficult to identify the farm/fishery.

FHI 059, Version 12	2		ls	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0682		Site No:	FS053	7			
Date of Visit:		12/11/2019	9		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	tails summary		site represer	ntative?			Y N	3
Site Details								
Total No facilities	DTO	54	Facilities s		54		ies inspected	54
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	TRO	Tiger	Tiger
Age group	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019	2017	2016	2017
No Fish	550,600	823	10,998	49,000	6,250	1,400	500	2,800
Mean Fish Wt	0.5-7g	1.5kg	750g	400g	150g	450g	1.5kg	1kg
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	No plans		Next Input D	ate (Site)	Novembe	er 2019	
Pagent (last 4 wkg)	diacena prol	hlama?			V Ary assance	(cinno loc	tuicit\2	N
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	RTFS.	olems?			Y Any escapes	(Since las	t visit)?	N
if yes, detail.	KIFS.							
Movement Record	Is							
1. Movement record	ds available f	or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							14/11/2018	
3. Are records comp	•	•						Y
4. Are movement re				e?				Y
5. Are records comp	•	•						Y
6. Are health certific	cates for intro	ductions (out	with GB) ava	ailable?				N
Transport Records	s							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried o	ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the	business (not us	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys	stem in place	for maintenar	nce of transp	portation records	s?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records		inspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti					Other (detail)		
If other detail:	Whole fish	collected by C	Dakbank Wa	ste Managemer		,	cinerated.	
3. Mortality records								Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		0-1.12% ir	n hatchery, 0-30	/pond/4 days ir	n main site		
5. Evidence of rece	nt increased/	atypical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality pe	r facility/no st	ock per facili	ity/reason:				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality d	uring period c	hecked?					N
If yes, detail:	(unavalained)	mortalities b	con reported	to yet or EUI2				N/A
7. Have increased (If yes, detail action:		mortalities be	en reported	to vet or Fire				INCO
8. Have 'mortality e		reported to FH	12 If no. add	MRT case and	enter on morta	ality events	sheet	N/A
o. Have mortality c	vents been i	eported to 111	i. ii iio, aaa	WITCH COSC OFFICE	Citter off morte	anty events	SHOOL.	

If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records comp	lete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withd	rawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)? Florfenicol, Formalin	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Record	s	
_	s available for inspection?	Y
•	nd frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
	nd period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ned) mortality at the site been included?	Y
` '		
4. Has the action tha	t will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been incl	uded and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health sta	tus of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	ation if required)?	
	<u> </u>	
	lry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	ase been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals	-	
	ity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveilla	ınce	
1 Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N
•	available for inspection?	
3. Any significant res	·	
	etailed under recent disease problems).	
ii jes, detaii (ii fiot di	valied direct recent dissasse problems).	
	Records checked between: 14/11/2018-12/11/2019	

11/2019	1/2019 Additional Sample Information:													
Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	Date of issue		
Case Number:	2019-0682		Site No:	FS0537		Insp:		
Date of Visit	12/11/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14		
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	26	
Special Control	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5	
Movements off			I 0			10	10	
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	10	
Exposure via water	rtaniber of des	Site contacts	_					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through						
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				\vdash	
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1	
,		or in a coastal zone with category III						
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8			
	iaims apstream	TOT WILLIEF T HAZI EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>		$\overline{}$	
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0					
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1	
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2					
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4					
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8					
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0	
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3					
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	-				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5					
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			-	
CoGP/Regulator				•				
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		2	1			╟──┤	
code of practice				J				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0	
	No		2					
					Total		53	
					Rank		HIGH	

Case No:	2019-0682	:	Site No:	FS0537	
-	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the pre	evious 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or equivalent)	fallowed synchronously on	a single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and en can these be deployed	access to a range of licenced in-f namectin benzoate) as well as ac id in a reasonable period of time? ocumented farm management agr	cess to suitable biological a	nd/or mech	hanical control measure	es, and
Management Area (o					
5. Are sea lice count	records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequa	ately reflect the required standard	specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)
records are inspected		-			
	t female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) nu 10/6/19) during the period that rec	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6	/19) or
If yes, have these bee	en reported to the Fish Health Insp	pectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus info	estation at a level which is conside	ered to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)
	treatments been administered or treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>				
11. Has any other act	tion been taken (where applicable))?			
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the actions taken ha	ad a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, w	here conducted, carried out in coo	pperation between participat	ting farms?	•	
	ing strategy for the site, where few		_		for
	ecific written lice management proc escalation of a sea lice infestation		ribing set a	ctions to deal with reco	ognised
16. Do the sea lice le	vels observed on stocks reflect se	a lice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspec	tion				
1. Has the site experi	enced equipment damage due to	predators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pl	ace to mitigate against the predat	ion experienced on site? (De	etail below)	Υ
If other, detail below					
Electric fence, overhe					N
	lents or events been experienced		te since the	e last FHI inspection?	IN
	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to questi	on 10			
4. Have these peen in	eported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (w	here they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local fish	neries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)
7. Were methods (if a	any) used to recover escapees? If	yes give detail			
8. If all nets were der	ployed was this action agreed with	local wild fish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottist	1
Ministers? (Legal, Co		and and	Point	g. ver. in j eestion	
9. What action was ta	aken to prevent and minimise the r	isk of further escapes? (Not	t covered in	n code but could	
be considered und	er satisfactory measures of the	Act)			
10. Is the site inspect	ed as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0682			Date of visit:	12/11/2019			
				Date of Vien.		•		
Site No:	FS0537			Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary	T			1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
	18/11/2019		2 11130					
ECI, CNI, VMD MIX	18/11/2019	_						
Case closed	06/01/2020							
0400 010004	00/01/2020							
	 							
	1							
	_							





Invicta Trout Ltd Newtonairds Dumfries Dumfries and Galloway DG2 0.JL

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0007 SITE NO FS0537 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 12/11/2019
SITE NAME Invicta Trout
CASE NO 20190682

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be mostly adequately maintained. However, movements onto site in the last year had not been recorded, only movements off site.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

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

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

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

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

The original health certificate was missing for one consignment of eggs from Denmark (INTRA.DK.2019.0004905-V1), only an unsigned copy was available. The original certificate should remain with the consignment for three years after the introduction. The original certificate should be located (or a certified true copy obtained) and retained on site.

Movements of aquaculture animals onto site in the last year had not been recorded. The missing records were completed during the visit, so no further action is required for this point. In future, all movements of aquaculture animals must be recorded, both on and off site.

Following return to the laboratory the movement records were checked in more detail. While the majority of movements contained sufficient information there were a few which required clarification. In future, if no registration number is available for the site of destination/source please include sufficient information to enable the farm or fishery location to be identified.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of the date this report was issued.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained. Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 18/11/2019

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

R04





Invicta Trout Ltd Newtonairds Dumfries Dumfries and Galloway DG2 0JL

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0007
 DATE OF VISIT
 12/11/2019

 SITE NO
 FS0537
 SITE NAME
 Invicta Trout

 INSPECTOR
 CASE NO
 20190682

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 18 December 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: Date: 06/01/2020
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

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0683	D	ate of visit: 06/11/2019
Time spent on site:	Main Inspector:	
Site No: SS0548 Site Name: Business No: SB0553 Business Nam	Lamb Holm Orkney Shellfish Hatchery (OSH)	Ltd
Case Types: 1 INF 2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): Thermometer	No:	HI 045 completed
Observations: Region:	OR Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	If yes, see additional informa If yes, see additional informa If yes, see additional informa	tion/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended vis	it detail reason below:	

IDN to be served as site has received stock from a site confirmed with Bonamia ostreae.

Statutory test to be conducted to confirm or rule out presence of Bonamia ostreae.

Case No:	2019-0683			Date of visit:	06/11/2019			
Cust No.				Date of Visit.	00/11/2010			
Site No:	SS0548			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
			-					
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
No report	06/11/2019							
·		_						

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0685			Date of visit: 13/11/2019
Time spent on site:	5 hours	Main	Inspector:
Site No: FS0371 Business No: FB0235	Site Name: Business Name:	Yetts O' Muckart Cooke Aquaculture (F	reshwater) Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 6.9	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: CE	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see addition	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	I reason below:	

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI		Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0685		Site No:	FS0371]		
Date of Visit:		13/11/2019	1		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author	risation Deta	ails					
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	site representa	ative?		Y	
2. Changes made to	details?					N	
Site Details							
Total No facilities		15	Facilities sto	ocked	9	No facilities inspected	15
		SAL				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Age group		2019 S0					
No Fish	560,000	63,000					
Mean Fish Wt	66g	115g					
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	end March 2	2020	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	May 2020	
					7		
Recent (last 4 wks) o	disease proble	ems?		Y	Any escapes	s (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	Fungus						
Movement Records							
Movement records		r inspection?					Y
Date of last inspect		шэрсоко				29/11/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	2			20,11,231	Y
4. Are movement red				,			Y
5. Are records comp							Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?			N/A
Transport Records							
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?		N
If yes, is there a syst				•	_		
Mortality Records							
Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?					Y
2. How are mortalitie					Ensiled - on s	site	
If other detail:							
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?				Y
4. Recent mortality (I	last 4 wks):		wk 46: 83 fis 42: 956 fish	•	fish, wk 44: 60	00 fish, wk 43: 1232 fish ((0.14%), wk
5. Evidence of recen	•	typical mortal					Y
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		//reason:			
	7 1	•	1 7		s. This is due t	to the fish being bigger ar	nd the
	_		_			1 fish, A3 453 fish, A4 41	
in last 4 weeks)							
6. Any other peaks in							Y
		al information		FUID			V
7. Have increased (u			•				1
If yes, detail action:				pany biologist	enter en morts	olity avanta sheet	N/A

If no. detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of

- 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:

29/11/18 - 13/11/19

Inspection and sampling conducted by , supervised by

Aquacen treatments used to treat fungus. These treatments were successful. Cress prescribed.

Fish currently being moved off the site to sea.

Peak in mortality during week 30 and 31. Warm weather combined with grading and fungus caused morts of 1,570 in wk 30 and 4,672 in wk 31 (0.51%). Mortality was controlled with Aquacen treatments.

Small increase in mortality for the 6 weeks post input from wk 21 - wk 26.

It was the policy that a prophylactic treatment would be administered for fish arriving on site. Prophylactic treatments are no longer administered.

Aquacen used on 7/11/19 due to fungus. Fish still on withdrawal for Aquacen (500 DD)

Prescription for Cress says a withdrawal of 500 degree days but the Special treatment certificate from VMD says 0 degree days. Statement 8 of the STC details the withdrawal period for all food producing animals as 500 DD. Discussed with manager and asked him to change treatment records post inspection.

All fish sampled for VMD appeared clinically healthy and no gross pathology was observed.

Vet report submitted after the inspection. It was inspected and there were no significant results. Biologist commented that the fish were ready to be moved to sea

11 059, Version 12							155	ueu by.				
Case no:	2019-06	85	Site No:		FS0371					13/	11/2019	
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA	\blacksquare	MG					
Time sampling starts/ends:	13:3	0:00	14:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	р.	6
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
ld Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1-6	7-12	13-22			\neg						
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL			\neg						
Average weight	115g	110g	66g									
Sex												
Water Type	FW	FW	FW									
Stock Origin	Cairndow	Holmwrangle	Holmwrangle									
Facility No	C6	B1	B3									
	Case no: Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples Id Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type Stock Origin	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST Id Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species SAL Average weight Sex Water Type Stock Origin	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST Id Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species SAL Average weight Sex Water Type Stock Origin Stock Origin VI Indoors 1	Case no: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 13:30:00 14:0 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA Id Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1-6 7-12 13-22 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL SAL Average weight 115g 110g 66g Sex Water Type FW FW FW Stock Origin Site No: Date No: BA Site No: BA Indoors 2 Indoors 2 Indoors 4 Indoors 5 Indoors 6 Indoors 7 Indoors 8 Indoors 9 Indoors 9	Description Case no: 2019-0685 Site No:	Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2019-0685 Site No: FS0371 Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling starts/ends: 13:30:00 14:00:00 Inspector Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG Id Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1-6 7-12 13-22 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 115g 110g 66g Sex Water Type FW FW FW	Case no: 2019-0685 Site No: FS0371 Priority samples: VI BA PA MG Time sampling starts/ends: 13:30:00 14:00:00 Inspector: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI Id Fish/Pools - click BA MG VI Pool/Fish No 1-6 7-12 13-22 13-22 Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 115g 110g 66g 36g Sex Water Type FW FW FW Stock Origin FW FW FW	Case no: 2019-0685 Site No: FS0371 Date of Sampling	Date of visit/ Sampling Date of visit/ Sampling Sampling Date of visit/ Date of visit/ Sampling Date of visit/ Date of visit Date of vis	Case no: 2019-0685 Site No: FS0371 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2019-0685 Site No: FS0371 Date of visit/ Sampling: Time sampling 13:30:00 14:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. Starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Sampling: Total Sampling: VMD No. Starts/ends: Total Sampling: Total

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	U					

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0685		Site No:	FS0371		Insp:	
Date of Visit	13/11/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26	
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	-
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10 10	10
Exposure via water	Number of des	Site contacts			6-10	10	
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	<u> </u>		0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	1		2
uiseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	<u>'</u>	2	-		-
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		$\overline{}$
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			0
the fales of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				-
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
		from zone or compartment of					-
	equivalent state		4				-
		from Category III farm	8				-
	Processing list	r from Category ∨ farm	10				\mathbf{L}
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	1			
Biosecurity	•	Number of sites	. 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				ш
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				ш
Platform access to cages	Yes		1 ^	1			
i lationii access to cages	No		0				·
	140			J			
					Total		15
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2019-0685	;	Site No:	FS0371	
•	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the pre	evious 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or equivalent)	fallowed synchronously on	a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and en can these be deploye	access to a range of licenced in-f namectin benzoate) as well as ac id in a reasonable period of time? ocumented farm management agi	cess to suitable biological a	nd/or mecl	hanical control measures	s, and
Management Area (or					
5. Are sea lice count i	records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequa	ately reflect the required standard	specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. sali</i> records are inspected	monis) record levels below the sud? (CoGP Annex 6)	ggested criteria for treatmer	nt in the Co	oGP during the period th	at
	t female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) nu 10/6/19) during the period that red	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6/	19) or
If yes, have these bee	en reported to the Fish Health Insp	pectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is conside	ered to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	.50)
	treatments been administered or treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>				
11. Has any other act	tion been taken (where applicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the actions taken ha	ad a significant impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, w	here conducted, carried out in coo	operation between participat	ting farms?	?	
sea lice?	ing strategy for the site, where fev				
	ecific written lice management pro- escalation of a sea lice infestation		ribing set a	actions to deal with recog	gnised
16. Do the sea lice lev	vels observed on stocks reflect se	ea lice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspec	tion				
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment damage due to	predators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pl	ace to mitigate against the predat	ion experienced on site? (De	etail below	")	Y
Nets over tanks, ve	rmin control by contractor				
If other, detail below	v:				
3 Have escape incid	lents or events been experienced	on or in the vicinity of the sit	te since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to questi	•		o lact i il illopocacii.	
	eported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (w	here they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)	
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local fish	neries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.	17)
7. Were methods (if a	any) used to recover escapees? If	yes give detail			
9 If all note were day	played was this action agreed with	local wild figh interests and	W00 D05	ingion divon by Cooffish	
Ministers? (Legal, Co	oloyed was this action agreed with GP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	nocal wild fish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottish	
, •	ken to prevent and minimise the r	risk of further escapes? (Not	t covered in	n code but could	
	er satisfactory measures of the				
10. Is the site inspect	ed as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0371

Case No: 2019-0685

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2019-0685			Date of visit:	13/11/2019			
Site No:	FS0371	l		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	 							
	1							
	1							
	 							
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD	21/11/2019							
	+							
	1							
	1							





Cooke Aquaculture (Freshwater) 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

BUSINESS NO FB0235
SITE NO FS0371
SITE NAME Yetts O' Muckart
CASE NO 20190685

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 appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were not available for inspection. However, this document has been submitted since the 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 inadequately maintained.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

 A minor issue was raised regarding the incorrect withdrawal period recorded for the use of a veterinary treatment.

The issue was discussed with the site manager. No further action is required regarding this matter.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Date: 21/11/2019
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/FHl/charter

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0686			Date of visit: 12/11/2019
Time spent on site: 4.	5 hrs	Mair	n Inspector:
Site No: FS0813 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Puldrite Scottish Sea Farms I	_td
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.9	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA O-2
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additi	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

AGD on site but has been treated with H2O2 and SLICE, water temperatures also dropping. No increase in mortalities. Fish staying low in water due to rough weather at time of inspection but were coming up when fed. All fish appeared in good condition. Lice numbers very low, no signs of physical damage. Fish sampled for VMD appeared in very good condition both externally and internally.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2019-0686]	Site No:	FS0813					
Date of Visit:		12/11/2019	9		Inspector(s):]	
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails	_					_	
1. Business/site det	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	1	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	1	
Site Details									
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	s inspected	10	
Species	SAL								
Age group	2019 S1								
No Fish	268,209								
Mean Fish Wt	1.78kg								
Next Fallow Date (S	site)	Jan. 2021		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Aug. 2021			
					1				
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N	
If yes, detail:									
Movement Record	s								
Movement record		r inspection?						Y	
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					21/11/2017	<u> </u>	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?				21/11/2011	Y	
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y	
5. Are records comp								Y	
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A	
Transport Records		•	,						
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N	
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_				
Mortality Records									
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y	
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)				
If other detail:									
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?									
14/10-10/11/19: ranging from 0.16% (47) - 0.30% (96) per week across site									
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):									
Evidence of received		• •						N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:					
C. Amy other meets		wiw.w.w.awi.a.d.al	l d O					l N	
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	in mortality du	ring period cr	тескеа?					N	
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI2				N/A	
If yes, detail action:	anexplained)	nortaintes be	on reported to	70.011111:				107	
•	Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. N/A								
	Have mortality events been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sneet.								

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?		Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspec	ion?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly ent	ered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspec	tion?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mort	ality removal, recording and safe disposal be	en considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which th	e APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterin	ary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the	site been included?	Y

21/11/2017 - 12/11/2019 Records checked between:

ы	11 059, Version 12							ISS	uea by: i	-HI			
	Case no:	2019-06	886	Site No:		FS0813			Date of Samplin		12/1	11/2019	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:						Inspecto	or:		e.	VMD No). 	21
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5		l	
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	imples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
П	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
П	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	1.7800	1.7800	1.7800	1.7800								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
ails													
Details													
λ	CALLED CONTROL												
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	2	4	6	0								
S	I acility INO	2	4	6	8								

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	U					

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0686		Site No:	FS0813		Insp:	
Date of Visit	12/11/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
Specific	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	0
Movements off			0			10	10
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Transcr or doo	Site contacts	5 0		6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				ш
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		4				
		from Category III farm	8				ш
	Processing fish	from Category ∀ farm	10				ш
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			\Box
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				-
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Ιο	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	j			
					Total Rank		21 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0686	Site No: FS0813	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site experien	iced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	N
	mectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and d of time?	Υ
 Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e 		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ
_	•	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?	N
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N
		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	N/A
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	N/A
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	N/A
		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	У
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspection	on		
1. Has the site experien	iced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ
Sapphire seal pro net	ts, Tensioned Nets,	Top Nets, M.M.L	
If other, detail below:			
 Have escape incider 	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	·	•	
5. Have these been ren	orted to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
		d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
·			=
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoGl		greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
· -		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under			
	•	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0686	Site No: FS0813	
Date of Visit: 12/11/2019	9 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for it4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statemen	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the area of ies of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	ngements for the storage and disposal of any de arm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	ments for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available to arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and c farms?	eleaner fish are to be
	ngements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or rengements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	vidual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	y which the area or individual farm will be fallo	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether bro covered by the agreement or statement?	podstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager	nent Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	nt include arrangements for persons to becor	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and op	perated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	f the FMAg/S? 28/01/2019	

Site No: FS0813

Case No: 2019-0686

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2019-0686			Date of visit:	12/11/2019					
Site No:	FS0813	l		Inspector:		l				
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
Report Summary				1						
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	19/11/2019		2 11150							
,,,										





Scottish Sea Farms Ltd Laurel House Laurelhill Business Park Polmaise Road Stirling FK7 9JQ

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 12/11/2019

 Site No
 FS0813
 Site Name
 Puldrite

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190686

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 19/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0687			Date of visit: 11/11/2019
Time spent on site:	hours	Main	Inspector:
Site No: FS0102 Business No: FB0067	Site Name: Business Name:	Moffat Water Selcoth Fisheries Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 MIX	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 5.8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additio	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site has a "wet" fallowing system where a line of ponds is fallowed synchronously, whole site does not fallow at once due to cycle stocking from hatchery to ponds.

movement records are now maintained in a excel spread sheet rather than the movement book. With a plan to eventually have movement records contained within fish talk.

Site has a written procedure for filling up water from one source for their movements between Moffatt water and new farm. Any movements undertaken that are destined for outside the company are completed by a STB.

2 compatches have been added to the hatchery section of the site for housing imported eggs. 10 indoor tanks are also present in the hatchery for first feeding.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy and in good condition.

Inspection, sampling and paperwork carried out by supervised by

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0687]	Site No:	FS0102				
Date of Visit:		11/11/201	9		Inspector(s):]
1. Business/site deta	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		23	Facilities sto	ocked	13	No facilitie	s inspected	23
Species	trout	trout	trout				Ī	
Age group	to: 2019-0687 Site No: FS0102 FVisit: 11/11/2019 Inspector(s): 11/11/2019 ration/Authorisation Details ness/site details summary checked by site representative? reges made to details? Py reges made to details? retails lo facilities store trout trout trout trout 2019 eyed Feb-19 Jun-18 h 646,680 648,546 16,893 lo.1g 46g 441g allow Date (Site) does not fallow. Next Input Date (Site) April 2020 records complete and correctly entered? retailt records available for inspection? retailt records available for inspection? retail records complete and correctly entered? retail							
No Fish		648.546	16.893					
Mean Fish Wt	•	•						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	does not fa	llow.	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) (disease probl	lems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
1 Movement record	s available fo	r inspection	?					Y
		i inopoduoni	•				15/03/2018	
•		ectly entered	1?				10/00/2010	Y
•		•		>				N/A
								N/A
·		-		able?				Y
Transport Records								
•		t by (or on b	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
			•	•	_			Y
Mortality Records	·		·					
-	available for i	nspection?						Y
•					Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:		4.			momerated	OH OILC		
	complete and	correctly er	ntered?					Y
•	•			ity over last 4 w	veeks. (0.12%)		
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical mort			,	,		N
		• •		/reason:				
, ,	71		. ,					
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period	checked?					Y
	wn18/08/19	- RTFS - MF	² 05 spike. Spik		ortality when tr	ansferred fr	om compatch	nes to first
If yes, detail:								NI/A
•	inexplained)	mortalities b	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	onto' baan "a	ported to El	JIO If no and A	ADT ages and a	ntor on mort-	lity overte -	hoot	NI/A
o. Have mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FF	ni ∕ii no, add N	irk i case and e	enter on morta	ility events s	neet.	N/A

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?

								_				
Case no:	2019-06	87	Site No:		FS0102					11/	11/2019	11/
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	17:0	0:00	17:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD N	0.	2
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
d Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No	F1	F2										
	F1											
Pool Group												
	RTR	RTR										
Average weight	441g	441g										
Sex	N/A	N/A										
Water Type	FW	FW										
Stock Origin Facility No	Aquasearch - Denmark - Halleso	Aquasearch - Denmark - Halleso										
	Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Priority samples: VI Time sampling 17:0 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Summary samples HIST d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 Fish nos F1 Pool Group Species RTR Average weight 441g Sex N/A Water Type FW Stock Origin	Priority samples: Time sampling 17:00:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors Summary samples HIST d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Fish nos F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A N/A Water Type FW FW Stock Origin Pool Stock Origin	Priority samples: VI	Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 Summary samples HIST BA d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Fish nos F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A N/A Water Type FW FW Stock Origin Stock Origin	Priority samples: VI BA PA Time sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A N/A Water Type FW FW Stock Origin Stock Origin	Priority samples: VI BA PA Imme sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 Inspectors and starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 Summary samples HIST BA MG A Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Pool Group F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A N/A Water Type FW FW Stock Origin Stock Origin	Priority samples: VI BA PA MG Time sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 Inspector: starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Fish nos F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A N/A Water Type FW FW Stock Origin PA G O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	Priority samples: VI BA PA MG Sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 Inspector: Starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI A Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Fish nos F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A N/A Water Type FW FW Stock Origin Sampling A MG VI Sampling Inspector: Indoors 2 3 4 Indoors 3 4 Indoors 4 4 Indoors 2 3 4 Indoors 2 3 4 Indoors 3 4 Indoors 4 4 Indoors 5 4 Indoors 6 7 Indoors 7 8 Indoors 8 7 Indoors 8 7 Indoors 9 8 Indoors 9 9 In	Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 Inspector: starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Pool Group Species RTR RTR Average weight 441g 441g Sex N/A	Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 Inspector: VMD No starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA d Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No F1 F2 Fish nos F1 F2 Pool Group Pool Gro	Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 17:00:00 17:30:00 Inspector: VMD No. Inspe

11/2019	1/2019 Additional Sample Information:													
2	2 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0687		Site No:	FS0102		Insp:	
Date of Visit	11/11/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5
Mayamanta off							10
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	10
Exposure via water	rtainber of des	Site contacts	_				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					$\vdash \vdash$
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		0
	iaims apstream	TO WILLIAM FACUSION	<u>'</u>	-	<u> </u>		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				$\overline{}$
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			$\overline{}$
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	-			\vdash
Jan S. Pidolioo							
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		29
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2019-0687	;	Site No:	FS0102	
Sea Lice Inspection (
•	nced sea lice problems in the p	•			
	Management Area (or equivaler				
azamethiphos and emacan these be deployed	access to a range of licenced in amectin benzoate) as well as a l in a reasonable period of time cumented farm management a	access to suitable biological a ?	nd/or mecl	hanical control measu	res, and
Management Area (or	equivalent)?				
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standar	d specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the seconds (CoGP Annex 6)	suggested criteria for treatmen	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	that
_	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) r 0/6/19) during the period that r	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/	6/19) or
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Health In	spectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is consi	dered to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)
	reatments been administered or reatment or where <i>C. elongatu</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicab	e)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions taken	had a significant impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in c	ooperation between participat	ting farms?	?	
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where for				
	ific written lice management pr scalation of a sea lice infestation		ribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect	sea lice count data? If no plea	ise detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion				
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage due t	o predators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	Υ
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the pred	ation experienced on site? (D	etail below	')	Y
Top nets, otter fencir	ng, mink traps, vermin contr	ol, side nets, keeping feed	locked aw	vay	
If other, detail below:					
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been experience	d on or in the vicinity of the si	te since the	a last FHI inspection?	N
•	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to que	•	te since the	e last Frii ilispection?	<u></u>
	ported to Scottish Ministers?	SHOTT TO			
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith	where they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)	
	ported to the SSPO and local fi				4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escapees?	lf yes give detail			
9. If all note were dead	oved was this action careed wi	th local wild fish interests and	Was name	iesion given by Coeffic	- In
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed wi GP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	un local wild lish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottis	
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the	risk of further escapes? (No	t covered in	n code but could	
be considered unde	r satisfactory measures of th	ne Act)			
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with regards t	o containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0102
Case No: 2019-0687
Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2019-0687			Date of visit:	11/11/2019			
						•		
Site No:	FS0102			Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	_							
	-							
	†							
	-							
	<u> </u>							
	+							
	+							
	1 		 					
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MIX ECI CNI VMD	18/11/2019							
	ļ							
	 							
	<u> </u>							
	_							
	+							





Selcoth Fisheries Ltd Selcoth Moffat Dumfriesshire DG10 9LG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0067 DATE OF VISIT 11/11/2019
SITE NO FS0102 SITE NAME Moffat Water
INSPECTOR CASE NO 20190687

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business 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.

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

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

A batch of ova imported to site from Denmark in march was not recorded in the movement records. This was amended at the time of inspection and records updated accordingly. It was agreed with the site manager that this would be recorded in the future. No further action required.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.



Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

1 ish i ledith mspector

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

Date: 18/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12	1	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0689			Date of visit: 13/11/2019
Time spent on site: 6.	5 hrs	Main Ins	spector:
Site No: FS0645 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Kirk Noust Cooke Aquaculture Scotl	and Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLA	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA O-2
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional	I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Hard to see the fish as they were staying low in the water and water was still with clear bright skies. Did see them come up for feeding and the fish caught for VMD sampling looked in very good condition externally and internally. Sea lice count also witnessed with only 1 Lep. being counted and a total of 8 Caligus counted over 5 fish. Gill scores mainly 0 with the odd fish scoring 2. Caligus levels had gone up during the summer months but never to a level to cause welfare issues.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0689		Site No:	FS0645				
Date of Visit:		13/11/2019	9		Inspector(s)]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details			_			_		
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	SAL							
Age group	2019 S1							
No Fish	254,080							
Mean Fish Wt	1.7 kg			N (1 (5	(8'1	1 0000		
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Jan. 2020		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	S							
1. Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							22/11/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			
Mortality Records	•		•					
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities					Other (detail)		
			ecycling Ltd, H	lillhead, Auchr			Aberdeenshir	e
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly enter	ered?		·			Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		14/10 - 10/1	1/2019: 369 (0.	.15%) across	whole site		
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
7. Have increased (Inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	onpiamoa)		oportou to					
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on mort	ality events s	sheet.	N/A

If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	V
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	V
Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
morodood (unoxplamod) morally at the site been moraled.	
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
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	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
yee, actum (ii. ii.e. actument and account allocated problems).	
Page rde abacked between: 22/11/2017 12/11/2010	

	Case no:	2019-06	89	Site No:	FS0645			Date of		13/	11/2019	
ı	Priority samples:	VI		ВА	PA		MG	Samplin	ig: Hi		ı	
	Time sampling starts/ends:					Inspecto	or:			VMD N	o.	27
٠	Environmental conditions:	1	Sunny	2	3		4		5			
ı	Summary samples	HIST		ВА	MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click											
	Pool/Fish No											
	Fish nos	1-3	4									
	Pool Group											
П	Species	SAL	SAL									
п	Average weight		1.7000									
п	Sex	N/A	N/A									
п	Water Type	SW	SW									
Stock Details		ص Loch of Cliff	Loch Garasdale									
O.) I domity No	9	4									

	Additional Sample Information:												
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0								

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018	
Case Number:	2019-0689		Site No:	FS0645		Insp:		
Date of Visit	13/11/2019		No of m	ovements/s		Score		
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26		
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0	
Movements off			I 0			10		
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	3	
Exposure via water	rtaniber of des	Site contacts	_					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through						
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				igwdow	
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2	
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					-	
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		oxdot	
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8			
	iaims apstream	TOT WILLIEF T HAZI EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	٥			
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0	
and raics of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				-	
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				-	
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4					
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8					
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10					
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3	
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				-	
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0	
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5					
Biosecurity	•	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	ĺ			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-	
CoGP/Regulator				J				
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	1			╟──┤	
code of practice				J				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0	
	No		2					
					Total		17	
					Rank		MEDIUM	

Case No:	2019-0689	Site No: FS0645						
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)							
 Has the site experient 	iced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	N					
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	N					
azamethiphos and ema	B. 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 doc Management Area (or e		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Υ					
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ					
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ					
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ					
_	•	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?	N					
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A					
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N					
		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	N/A					
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	N/A					
•	•	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	N/A					
•			Υ					
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?								
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	Υ					
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ					
Containment Inspection	on							
1. Has the site experien	iced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ					
Tensioned Nets, Top	Nets, M.M.L., A.D.D	D.						
If other, detail below:								
Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N					
If Yes proceed with que		•						
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	sters?						
5. Have these been rep	orted to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail						
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoGl		greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish						
9. What action was take	en to prevent and mini	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could						
be considered under	satisfactory measu	res of the Act)						
10. Is the site inspected	as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ					

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0	Site No:	FS0645		
Date of Visit:	13/11/2019	Inspector:	_	
Point of Compliance				
1. Is the farm under inspe	ection located within a farr	m management area?		Y
If N, no further questions	require completion.			
Points of Compliance f	or Both Farm Manageme	ent Agreements and Sta	atements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S4. Does the FMAg/S ider5. Does the FMAg/S ider	ntify the relevant farm man ntify the fish farm site(s) to ntify the date of commence	nagement area? o which it applies?		Y Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish	Health Management			
8. Does the FMAg/S ider farm?	ntify the minimum health s	tandards for the stocks to	be introduced to the area	a or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S ide	ntify the vaccination require entify the species of fish w entify the maximum stocking	hich may be stocked into	the area or farm?	Y Y Y
	entify the arrangements for he individual farm?	r the storage and disposa	al of any dead fish from ar	y Y
Arrangements for The I	Management of Sea Lice	:		
13. Does the FMAg/S ide	entify arrangements for the	e sharing of data on sea l	ice numbers and treatmer	nts? Y
14. Does the FMAg/S ide of statement?	entify the availability and th	ne use of medicines on fa	arms covered by the agree	ement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S ide	entify any requirements for	r the sensitivity testing of	available treatments for se	
	entify the circumstances u	nder which biological con	trols and cleaner fish are	to be Y
	entify the arrangements for	r synchronous treatments	s on farms within the area	? Y
Live Fish Movements				
area or farm?	entify the circumstances wentify the arrangements for			

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable I	harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	vidual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	y which the area or individual farm will be fallo	ow and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether bro covered by the agreement or statement?	podstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Managen	nent Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	nt include arrangements for persons to becor	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and op	perated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	f the FMAg/S? 28/01/2019	

Case No: 2019-0689 Site No: FS0645

Date of visit: 13/11/2019 Inspector(s):

Point for consideration Risk level Satisfactory? Requirement Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records				
1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2,	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in	Low & Medium	Υ	Annex 6	
the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ?			SSI 1,2,	
(Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date				
of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility				
number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed				
and correct stages recorded ⁴				
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not	Low	Υ	SSI 1,2(g)	
conducting the count stated?				
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give	Low	Υ		
detail.				
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4		N	Detail if necessary:	
years?				
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea li2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:	ce			
** *	Lliab	N/A	CoCD Annoy 6	L colmonia levela have not been above CoCD averatord exitoria since
a) L. salmonis record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	N/A	CoGP Annex 6	L. salmonis levels have not been above CoGP suggetsed criteria since last inspection
b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	C. elongatus levels have not been at a level to cause welfare problems since last inspection
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a			VMD ¹² 19	
record of :			SSI 1,3	
the name / identity of the product	High	N/A		All details listed recorded in treatment records but were to treat for AGD
the date of administration	High	N/A		
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered	High	N/A		
the method of administration of the product	High	N/A		
the identification of the fish / facilities treated	High	N/A		
name of the person administering the treatment	Low	N/A		
the withdrawal period	Medium	N/A		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:			VMD 18	
the name of the veterinary surgeon	•	N/A		
name of the product	High	N/A		

1111 039, VEISIOII 12		issued by		Date of issue, 60/10/2010	
Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
batch number	High	N/A			
the date of administration	High	N/A			
amount administered	High	N/A			
identification of fish treated	High	N/A			
withdrawal period	Medium	N/A			
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant	High	N/A			
impact upon the lice levels recorded?					
Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site					
average <i>L.salmonis</i> numbers (all stages)					
2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their	Low	N/A	SSI, 1,4		
impact is there a record of:					
the nature and date of the method employed; the identification					
number of all facilities subjected to the method; the name of the					
person employing the method					
2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:			VMD 19		
proof of purchase of the medicine concerned	Medium	N/A	VMD 17		
name of the product	High	N/A			
batch number	High	N/A			
the date of purchase	Medium	N/A			
the quantity purchased	High	N/A			
the name and address of the supplier	Medium	N/A			
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19		
the date of disposal	Medium	N/A			
the quantity of product involved	Medium	N/A			
how and where it was disposed of	Medium	N/A			
2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83		
protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea					
lice?					
Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments conducted on site					
2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	No treatments have been required	
2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89		
2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89		
2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use, available to those responsible for treatment administration?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?		Υ	Detail if necessary:	
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and	farm managen	nent agreements		
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of	Low	Υ	SSI 1,5,b	
contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?			CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
provisions of the NTS ⁶ ?				
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider: -agreed basis for monitoring sea lice	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	
-coordinated monitoring and treatment -co-operation between participating farms				
This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine				
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?	Low	N/A	SSI 1, 5, c	
3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy?	Medium	N/A	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
For example, the principles of ISLM include: Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD.				
The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice)				
Appropriate discharge consent in place Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary				
Monitoring lice numbers				
Using an array of treatments where possible				
Treating all stocks on site at the same time Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients				
Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and				
certainly not on the same cohort of lice				
Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities.				
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?				
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?		Υ	AFSA ¹³ 4A Detail if necessary:	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium	Υ	AFSA 4B	
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined, is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?	High ¹⁰	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High	N	CoGP 4.3.100	
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.101	
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures				
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site?	High	Υ	CoGP 7.1.8	
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1	
parasite identification	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High	Υ	5.3.53-55	
recording counts	High	Υ		
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Υ		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Υ		
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this				
Where records exist regarding SOPs and site procedures these				
should be inspected to confirm suitability				
e. Inspection of site and site stock 5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?	Medium	V	VMD schedule 5	
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count	High	Y	VIVID Scriedule 5	
data?	riigii	ľ		
Refer to section e) of guidance notes			1	
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating	High	Υ	1	
to sea lice infestation?				
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Υ	CoGP Annex 6,	
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording?	High	Υ	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
(Cross reference to training records – Section d)				
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54	
6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)?	Medium	Υ	Annex 6	
N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice			1	
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct?	High	Υ	Annex 6	
Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are:				
for Caligus elongatus all identifiable stages and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg				
strings) ¹¹				
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be	Medium	Y	1	
satisfactory?				
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner?	High	N/A		
Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per				
prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations,				
appropriate product used				
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	
7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication,		N/A		
or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
	under the Act – section 3 (2)	Sea lice count conducted while on site following CoGP protocol. 5 random fish, only AF Leps @ 0.2 per fish and Cal. @ 1.9 per fish spotted.
·	Power granted under the Act — section 3 (3) (a)	
j. 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] Scottish Statutory Instrument The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008
- [2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture
- [3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be s
- [4] Recording requirements:- for C. elongatus all identifiable stages and for L. salmonis mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)
- [5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately
- [6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS
- [7] FMA = Farm Management Area
- [8] FMS = Farm Management Statement
- [9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement
- [10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18
- [11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate for Caligus elongatus: mobiles; and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis: non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.
- [12] VMD The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)
- [13] AFSA Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)

Case No:	2019-0689			Date of visit:	13/11/2019			
				Date of Tion.	10/11/2010	•		
Site No:	FS0645			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	<u> </u>							
	_							
	_							
	_							
	-							
	-							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD	19/11/2019							
ECI, CNI, VMD SLA	19/11/2019							
	1							
	1							





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0095
 DATE OF VISIT
 13/11/2019

 SITE NO
 FS0645
 SITE NAME
 Kirk Noust

 INSPECTOR
 Case No
 20190689

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION

An enhanced sea lice inspection to ascertain the levels of sea lice and for assessing the measures in place for the prevention, control and reduction of sea lice was conducted in accordance with the Aguaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of records with regards to sea lice, site procedures with regards to sea lice and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of sea lice records

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

b) Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

c) Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and area management agreements.

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

d) Inspection of records relating to training and procedures

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

e) Inspection of site and site stock

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

f) Inspection of farm count procedures

An inspection of site staff conducting and recording a sea lice count was carried out This met the requirements of The Fish Farming Business (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 and CoGP. No further recommendations or further action required.

g) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

Procedures were not inspected as a treatment was not taking place at the time of inspection. However, discussions on procedures with the company correspondent would suggest that the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice.

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



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





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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0095
 Date of Visit
 13/11/2019

 Site No
 FS0645
 Site Name
 Kirk Noust

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190689

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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 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 fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

An enhanced sea lice 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.



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

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0690			Date of visit: 12/11/2019
Time spent on site:	0 min.	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS1126 Business No: FB0089	Site Name: Business Name:	Old Pumping Station Orkney Trout Fishing Associati	on
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): N/A	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	
	Site currently fallo	w so ECI could not be completed	

Additional Case Information:

Site fallow since 16th March 2019. Unsure exactly when site will be stocked again. Stock never treated so no medicine records kept on site. ECI could not be done as site currently fallow, but full ECI paperwork completed.

FHI 059, Version 12	Is	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-069	0 Site No:	FS1126				
Date of Visit:	12/11/2019		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authorisation D 1. Business/site details summa 2. Changes made to details?		ntative?			Y N	
Site Details Total No facilities Species fallow Age group	1 Facilities s	stocked	0	No facilities	s inspected	1
No Fish		_				
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (Site)	site fallow	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Dec. 2019?	?	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease pr	oblems?	N/A	Any escapes	(since last v	risit)?	N/A
Movement Records 1. Movement records available 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and c 4. Are movement records avai 5. Are records complete and c 6. Are health certificates for integral.	orrectly entered? lable for dead fish and wast orrectly entered?			ı	21/11/2017	Y Y Y Y
Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried If yes, is there a system in place			_			Y
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records available for 2. How are mortalities dispose If other detail:			Incinerated -	on site		Y
Mortality records complete a Recent mortality (last 4 wks)		fallow since mid I	March 2019			Y
5. Evidence of recent increase If yes, facility nos/no mortality	• •	lity/reason:				N
6. Any other peaks in mortality If yes, detail:	during period checked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplaine If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality events' been			enter on morta	ality events sl	heet.	N/A

If no. detail:

aquaculture animals held on site?

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

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

- 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: 21/11/2017 - 12/11/2019

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:						: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0690		Site No:	FS1126		Insp:	
Date of Visit	12/11/2019		No of m	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS			5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country			9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup		0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off		3	6	10	10
Wovernorms on	Number of des		0			10	10
Exposure via water		Site contact	:s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	С)			
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	's C	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		С				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status			}			
		n from Category III farm	8	3			
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				ш
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	C				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	3			$\overline{}$
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	<u>-</u>			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	5			
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	C	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		C				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				ш
CoGP/Regulator				4			
Practices in accordance	Yes		C				
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	3			3
Platform access to cages	Yes						0
	No		2				Ш
					Total Rank		24 MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0690	Site No: FS1126							
•	(Seawater Sites Only)								
1. Has the site experie	enced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?							
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?									
azamethiphos and em	namectin benzoate) as d in a reasonable period ocumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and d of time? ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm							
. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)									
	. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salr</i> records are inspected		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that							
		<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?							
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.							
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)							
		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)							
11. Has any other acti	on been taken (where a	applicable)?							
12. Have therapeutic t	treatments or the action	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?							
13. Are treatments, wh	here conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating farms?							
sea lice?	•	where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for							
	cific written lice manage escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised infestation?							
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.							
Containment Inspect	tion								
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N						
2. Are measures in pla	ace to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ						
Rentokil, Indoors									
If other, detail below	<i>r</i> :								
2. Have escape incide	anta ar avanta haan ayr	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N/A						
•	ents of events been exp lestions 4 – 9. If No skip								
	eported to Scottish Minis	•							
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)							
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)							
7. Were methods (if a	ny) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail							
8 If all nets were den	loved was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish							
Ministers? (Legal, Co		green and record with the permission given by deciden							
9. What action was tal	ken to prevent and min	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could							
be considered unde	er satisfactory measu	res of the Act)							
10. Is the site inspecte	0. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)								

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2019-0690			Date of visit:	12/11/2019			
Cubb No.	2010 0000			Date of Visit.	12/11/2010			
Site No:	FS1126			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
·	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	 				-			
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Inch	and Image					
REG	19/11/2019	Insp	2 nd Insp					
NEO	13/11/2013							





Orkney Trout Fishing Association
Old Pumping Station
Kirbister Loch
Orphir, Orkney
KW17 2RA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0089 SITE NO FS1126 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 12/11/2019
SITE NAME Old Pumping Station 20190690

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.

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow.

Records

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was 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:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 19/11/2019

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