

Case No: Date of visit:

Time spent on site: Main Inspector:

Site No: Site Name:
Business No: Business Name:

Case Types: 1 2 3 4 5 6

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

Observations: Region: HI Water type: S CoGP MA M-25

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

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

Additional Case Information:

Fish graded and poorer doing fish in one cage, which has the majority of the mortality on site.

Discovery of escaped fish on the 7 September 2019. RTR observed at the jetty and divers were on site the same day and repaired holes. Two pens with holes but pen 2 only had small holes (1x1 mesh - so unlikely for fish to have escaped from that pen), pen 3 had one hole of approximately 40x60cm approximately 2-3 meters from the surface and several smaller holes (2x2 meshes along the waterline). Since it was a Saturday it was thought to be difficult to contact to ask for permission to deploy gill nets. DSFB and Marine Scotland notified on Monday 9 September 2019.

Seals regularly observed in the vicinity of the site. Large numbers of spurdogs in the area. All pens on site had a double mesh at the bottom of the net, except for the two pens with holes (pen 2 and pen 3). In the last cycle only two pens were used and they had double netting at the bottom the cage. As there had been no issues in the previous cycle with seals it was thought to not be an issue. Nets had been strength tested. Pen 3 and Pen 2 repaired on the 7 September 2019 by divers, pen 3 net changed to net bought second-hand from local fish farm on the 20 September 2019. Cage 2 net changed 26 September 2019 for band new net from Boris net services.

Net number 8106 pen 3: made 26/01/2014 , washed and strength tested 30/8/2015 and stored until 2019 at Knox. 26/04/2019 net put on cage 3 at Pooltiel.

Net number 8110 pen 2 came in at the same time from Knox as for pen 3.

Overall fish look very well. A few poor doing smaller fish observed that seem not to be feeding. The majority of these are actively swimming. A few of these poor doers were removed from pen 4 (lower grade fish) and opened up but no clinical signs of disease were observed so no samples collected. Poor doers removed from pens were remarkably clear of lice. Only one Caligus observed on approximately 15 fish removed from pen 4.

Net numbers correspond with records, no containment issues observed on site. However strong current flows were observed on the site.

Wellboat availability is a problem. Initially the site was supposed to be stocked in the autumn but then was stocked in May due to a well boat only being available then.

Not a lot of paperwork was available for inspection on site due to the site not having an office/shorebase. Additional paperwork reviewed via e-mail.

Recommendations and requirements addressed. Documents received 11/10/20 & 13/11/20.

Case No: **2019-0575** Site No: **FS1310**
 Date of Visit: **15/10/2019** Inspector(s): **[redacted]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details

Total No facilities	5	Facilities stocked	5	No facilities inspected	5
Species	RTR	RTR			
Age group	2019 Q2	2019 Q3			
No Fish	164,189	51,047			
Mean Fish Wt	982.5g	427g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	December 2020		Next Input Date (Site)	March/April 2021	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **N** Any escapes (since last visit)? **Y**
 If yes, detail: **see additional info**

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **20/03/2018**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
whole fish collected by Hasco (to Binn Farm, Perth) or Billy Bowie (to Dalkeith) collected from Grieg
- If other detail: **[redacted]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **2019 wk38 - 0.21%; 2019 wk39 - 0.07%; 2019 wk40 - 0.31%; 2019 wk41 - 0.17%**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
pen 4 and pen 5 slightly increased compared to the other pens
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**
 If yes, detail: **mortalities increased for the first two weeks post input (does not fall within reporting criteria)**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
 If yes, detail action: **[redacted]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **N/A**

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Records checked between:

Case No: 2019-0575 Site No: FS1310

Date of visit: 15/10/2019 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)				
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events ¹ been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		Y		
If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	N	AAAH Regs ⁴ 31D,E	Escape discover on 7/09/19, reported on 9/09/19 to both FHI & DSFB. reported to DSFB, not member of SSPO Hand net used at the pier to net out 3 fish to confirm they were Rainbow trout when they were discovered. Using gill nets was discussed with Skye DSFB but due to considerations for wild fish at this time of year it was considered to be inappropriate to use gill nets so no permission was sought. DSFB wanted to seine net but no seine net was available. Two second hand nets have been put on the affected pens (purchased from nearby sites). These nets have double netting at the waterline and at the mort sock. Completely new nets have been ordered from Boris net and are due on site by the end of October 2019. New nets have double netting at the waterline and at the mort sock, and a second predator net at the bottom of the net.
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO ² and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees?		N		
If yes give detail				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary																														
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site																																		
<p>General records</p> <p>2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-</p> <p>a) The name of the manufacturer</p> <p>b) Any special adaptations</p> <p>c) The name of the supplier</p> <p>d) The date of purchase</p> <p>e) Each inspection including</p> <p> i) the name of the person conducting the inspection</p> <p> ii) the date of each inspection</p> <p> iii) the place of each inspection</p> <p> iv) the outcome of each inspection</p> <p>f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out</p> <p>2.2. In relation to each net a record of:</p> <p> i) The mesh size</p> <p> ii) The code which appears on the identification tag</p> <p> iii) The place of use, storage and disposal</p> <p> iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring</p> <p>2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:</p> <p> i) The date of construction</p> <p> ii) The material used in construction</p> <p> iii) Its dimensions</p> <p>2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-</p> <p> i) The date of installation</p> <p> ii) The design and weight of the anchors</p> <p> iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains</p> <p>2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed</p> <p>2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters³</p> <p> a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place</p> <p> b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures</p>			<p>CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="934 341 1384 735"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="934 341 1095 373">Facilities</th> <th data-bbox="1102 341 1272 373">Moorings</th> <th data-bbox="1279 341 1384 373">Nets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 378 1095 410">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 378 1272 410">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 378 1384 410">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 414 1095 446">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1102 414 1272 446">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 414 1384 446">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 451 1095 483">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 451 1272 483">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 451 1384 483">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 488 1095 520">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 488 1272 520">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 488 1384 520">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 525 1095 557">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 525 1272 557">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 525 1384 557">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 561 1095 593">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 561 1272 593">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 561 1384 593">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 598 1095 630">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 598 1272 630">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 598 1384 630">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 635 1095 667">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1102 635 1272 667">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 635 1384 667">Y</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="934 671 1095 703">N/A</td> <td data-bbox="1102 671 1272 703">Y</td> <td data-bbox="1279 671 1384 703">Y</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>SSI, 2,2</p> <p>SSI, 2,3</p> <p>SSI, 2,4</p> <p>SSI, 2,5</p> <p>SSI, 2,6</p>	Facilities	Moorings	Nets	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	<p>Facilities no repairs required so far.</p>
Facilities	Moorings	Nets																																
Y	Y	Y																																
N/A	Y	Y																																
Y	Y	Y																																
Y	Y	Y																																
Y	Y	Y																																
Y	Y	Y																																
Y	Y	Y																																
Y	Y	Y																																
N/A	Y	Y																																

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low			
2.6 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)	Harsh weather experienced and records of weather kept in site diary but no damage experienced so far.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				
2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	Site staff and manager do both, site manager has been fish farming for 30 years. In house training record complete for daily site inspections and containment control. Majority of this work undertaken by Kames (with evidence available), however some mooring components installed in October 2017 by Seahorse Marine with no evidence available. Seahorse Marine was bought over by another business and have been unable to obtain any certification subsequently.
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	After every cycle. all nets tested by KNOX daily surface inspections, one a month divers check the nets and nets are always checked before any work on the pen is done i.e. handling, grading, stocking etc.
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	inspected daily
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Fish welfare course from FVG has been completed by all staff on site, this covers containment as well. In-house training for procedures for handling, grading harvesting etc. For all staff available.
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	Escapes contingency plan in place.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	No propeller guard fitted.
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		Until the escape no issues with predators on site.
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	Predator control plan includes risk assessment

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including: The type and location of each net, fence and scarcer deployed	Medium		SSI, 2,8,a	
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	
		N/A		
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.18	
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	top nets, ADD, tension nets, double mesh around the waterline and the mort sock
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y		
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.21	
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		Y		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA ⁵ 2010 P4, S21	2 required to be on site for the 12 cage site with the feed barge, however currently only 5 cages on site and no feed barge. 1 marker observed on site.
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	second marker supposed to be on the northern most grid which is not installed yet
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.31	No site specific procedures observed.
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

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

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

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

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

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

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

[REDACTED]
Kames Fish Farming Ltd
Kilmelford
Oban
Argyll
PA34 4XA
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0134	DATE OF VISIT	15/10/2019
SITE No	FS1310	SITE NAME	Loch Pooltiel
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20190575

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

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

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

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

The following recommendations are made for improvement.

It is recommended that to meet the requirements of part 4A, section 31D (1) of The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulation 2009 (as amended) that circumstances on, or in the vicinity of the fish farm which are believed by that person to have caused an escape or gave rise to a significant risk of an escape are immediately reported to Scottish Ministers. A documented review of the site-specific contingency plans that describe actions to be taken in the event of any escapes in accordance with chapter 4, point 4.34 of a Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) should be undertaken to ensure the regulatory requirement is met.

It is also recommended that this documented review should consider the availability of any necessary equipment as required by the recapture strategy, in consultation with local wild fishery interests, to ensure equipment is available should it be required for deployment.

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

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. The following recommendation is made for improvement.

It is recommended that a documented review be undertaken of the design, quality and standard of manufacture of nets to ensure that they can withstand the conditions experienced on the site in accordance with CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.20. This should implement improvements to ensure that predator interactions do not result in breaches in stock containment.

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

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

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. The following recommendation is made for improvement.

It is recommended that a documented review be undertaken of the site specific risk assessment ascertaining the risk of predator attack in accordance with CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.26. This should ensure that appropriate predator mitigations are deployed at the site for the prevention of predator interaction.

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

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

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

No site specific procedures were observed during the inspection.

Further Action

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by 16 October 2020. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Date: 16/07/2020

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

R10

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

[REDACTED]
Kames Fish Farming Ltd
Kilmelford
Oban
Argyll
PA34 4XA
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0134	DATE OF VISIT	15/10/2019
SITE No	FS1310	SITE NAME	Loch Pooltiel
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20190575

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 16 October 2020. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed:

[REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 01/12/2020

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

[REDACTED]
Kames Fish Farming Ltd
Kilmelford
Oban
Argyll
PA34 4XA
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0134	DATE OF VISIT	15/10/2019
SITE No	FS1310	SITE NAME	Loch Pooltiel
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20190575

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of an 1,300 Rainbow trout on 7th September 2019.

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

All epidemiological units were inspected.

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed: [REDACTED]
Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/06/2020

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

R27