

Case No:	2021-0242	Date of visit:	28/07/2021
Time spent on site:	5.5 hours	Main Inspector:	
Site No:	FS0465	Site Name:	Shuna Castle
Business No:	FB0134	Business Name:	Kames Fish Farming Ltd
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 SLI
	4 DIA	5 VMD	6
Water Temp (°C):	13.8	Thermometer No:	T172
		FHI 045 completed	
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-40
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.	
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.	
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.	
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>		

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

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection undertaken on 22/07/2021 by [REDACTED], observed by [REDACTED]. Physical inspection undertaken on 28/07/2021
RTR delivered onto site in Autumn 2020

Three sites shared the same ensiler which is placed on a shared pier, off site.

Salmosan treatment being undertaken at the time of the remote inspection. SLICE undertaken the week previous to remote inspection. Bioassays undertaken by MSD before the SLICE treatment.

Alphamax used in May 2021. Used fully enclosed tarp. Only use Alphamax in colder temperatures, never use it over 10 degrees.

Cages pushed to pier at harvest time. Fish are harvest dead.

All cages now have walkways around them, this was not the case in the last cycle.

Week 23 numbers exceeded notifiable criteria. Treated with Salmosan, clearance was reportedly almost 100%.

Hydrolicer, thermolicer and freshwater treatments used in last cycle due to lice issues. Very few caligus, the issue was with Leps.

At end of last cycle - high mortality recorded after a freshwater treatment. Up to 40% mortality observed due to suspected osmoregulatory issues, diagnosed by vet.

Sites in Co-GP management area are not treating synchronously. The site finds that lice fall off Mowi sites in the area and drift onto the two end cages at Shuna Castle, and two sites in Kames Bay.

Ace Aquatec, low frequency ADD's on site. These were described by the site representative as "cetacean friendly".

Five fish removed for full diagnostic sampling.

ADD on site, MS LOT and MS compliance contacted regarding this.

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

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="10"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="9"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="10"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="RTR"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="20"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="454,000"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="1.3kg"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Jun 2022"/>	Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Apr 2023"/>		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	<input type="text" value="N"/>		Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
If yes, detail:	<input type="text"/>				

Movement Records

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

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

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

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

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

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

Results of Surveillance

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

Records checked between: 23/07/2019 - 22/07/2021

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

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	P1							
Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	1-5	6						
Pool Group	P1	P1	P1	P1	P1								
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR						
Average weight	1.5000	1.5000	1.5000	1.5000	1.5000	1.5000	1.5000						
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW						
Stock Details		Kames Bay (west)	Kames Bay (west)	Kames Bay (west)	Kames Bay (west)	Kames Bay (west)	Kames Bay (west)	Kames Bay (west)					
	Stock Origin												
Facility No	1	1	2	4	4		8						

Case no: 2021-0242

Site No: FS0465

Method of killing: Percussive

Date of visit: 28/07/2021

Inspector(s):

Sheet Relevant: Y

S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence

Fish Number		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5					
Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes)		1.5H	1.5H	1.5H	1.5H	1.5H					
External Signs											
Behaviour	Moribund	S	S	S	S	S					
	Lethargic	M	M	M	M	M					
	Hanging vertical										
	Spiralling										
	Flashing										
	Loss of equilibrium										
Body	Dark	M									
	Distended abdomen										
	Anorexic										
	Scale Oedema										
Opercula	Shortened										
	Flared										
Haemorrhaging	Throat										
	Ventrum										
	Base of fins										
	Elsewhere										
Eyes	Exophthalmic										
	Enophthalmic (sunken)										
	Cataract										
	Haemorrhagic										
Gills	Pale										
	Zoned										
	Necrotic										
Lesions	Flank										
	Elsewhere		M			S					
Vent	Inflamed										
	Trailing faeces										
Lice Load	Estimate numbers		20		15						
Internal Signs											
Ascites	Clear										
	Bloody										
Oedema	In tissues										
Heart	Pale/anaemic										
	Granulomas										
	Deformed										
Liver	Petechial haem										
	Gross haem										
	Tissue breakdown										
	Enlarged										
	Colour number(s)										
	Granulomas										
	Lesions										
Pyloric caeca	Petechial haem										
	Tubules mauve										
	Lack of fat		M		M						
Spleen	Enlarged										
	Granulomas										
Gut	No food present	W	W	W	W	W					
	Yellow pseudo-faeces			S		S					
	External haem										
	Internal haem										
Body wall	Haemorrhaging										
Swim bladder	Haemorrhaging										
	Fluid filled										
Kidney	Swollen										
	Grey		M								
	Granular		M								
	Liquefied										
General	Parasites present										
	Anaemia										

Additional comments:

Most of the lice on F1 were Calimus stages of Leps. F1 and F4 exhibited tail erosion. F3 had deformity of one eye and opercular valve.

Case Number:	2021-0242	Site No:	FS0465	Insp:	
Date of Visit	28/07/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10
Exposure via water	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0			
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4	4
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8	
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 processing	0			0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1			
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4			
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8			
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10			
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0			
	Common processes with other farms	3			3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0			0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5			
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0			0
	No	1			1
CoGP/Regulator					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0			0
	No	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			
	No	2			0
				Total Rank	23 MEDIUM

Case No: **2021-0242**

Site No: **FS0465**

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?
- If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

Containment Inspection

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

Bird nets,
tensioned nets,
false bottoms,
ADD

If other, detail below:

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

Case No: 2021-0242

Site No: FS0465

Date of Visit: 28/07/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

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

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

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

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

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

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

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

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

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

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

Live Fish Movements

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

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

Harvesting

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

Fallowing

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

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

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

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

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

Management and operation

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

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0134	DATE OF VISIT	28/07/2021
SITE No	FS0465	SITE NAME	Shuna Castle
CASE No	20210242	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Section 1: Summary

During a routine fish health inspection, five moribund fish were removed for diagnostic purposes. Histopathology examination revealed mild gill pathology. *Vibrio* spp. were identified but were not implicated as primary pathogens. No other significant pathology was observed.

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

Section 2: Case Detail

Observations

The site was visited as part of a routine, risk based fish health inspection. During the four weeks leading up to the inspection, mortalities were relatively low at well under 0.5% across the site for this period. Lice have been an issue during the current cycle with Alphamax, Salmosan and SLICE being used. Bioassays were done before each treatment and each treatment was effective at removing a large proportion of the lice on site. Freshwater, hydrolicer and thermolicer treatments were also conducted successfully.

During the inspection of the site moribund fish were observed, approximately 10 - 20 across the site. Of these fish, 5 were removed for diagnostic sampling. The body of fish 1 appeared dark and had a lice load of approximately 20 parasites. Fish 2 and 5 also had lesions present on the body. None of the fish sampled had food present in the gut, fish 2 and fish 4 had a lack of fat on the pyloric caeca and fish 3 and 5 had yellow pseudo faeces present in the gut. The kidney of fish 2 was grey and granular.

Samples

Samples were collected from 5 fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Pool number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1 – F2	1	1	Rainbow Trout	Grower, approx. 1.5kg	Kames Bay (west)
F3	1	2	Rainbow Trout	Grower, approx. 1.5kg	Kames Bay (west)
F4 – F5	1	4	Rainbow Trout	Grower, approx. 1.5kg	Kames Bay (west)

Results

Bacteriology: Kidney and gill material from F1 - F5 and lesion material from F2 and F5 were inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

The following bacteria were isolated;

Four *Vibrio* spp. (Isolates A,C,D and E) from kidney (F4 and F5) and lesion (F5). Isolate A strongly prevalent in F5 lesion.

One *Vibrio* sp. (Isolate F) from gill (F2-F5) and lesion (F5).

Virology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (qPCR).

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV) and viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV).

Histology: Tissue samples of gill, skin and skeletal muscle, heart, pyloric caeca, pancreas, hind gut, liver, spleen, kidney and lesion were taken from F1 – F5. The tissue samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin.

Tissues from 5 fish were examined by light microscopy. The following histopathological changes were observed:

Gill: Mild multifocal hyperplasia and lamellar fusion (F1-F5), some lamellar epithelial lifting and few scatter lamellae displaying some inflammatory cell infiltration (F1). F3-F5 exhibited lamellar congestion (potentially associated with the stunning method). Some post-mortem artefacts.

Skin & Muscle: Within normal range

Heart: Mild focal pericarditis (F3).

Gut and pyloric caeca: F2 displayed reduce abdominal adipose tissue. Cell sloughing noted in F4 (potentially associated with post-mortem artefacts).

Pancreas: Within normal range.

Liver: Some vessel cuffing (F4), some diffuse hepatocellular vacuolation (macrovisicules) (F3), slightly congested sinusoids (F2, F5).

Kidney: Within normal range.

Spleen: Slightly red pulp congestion (F2, F3, F4, F5).

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 09/09/2021

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/>

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0134	DATE OF VISIT	28/07/2021
SITE No	FS0465	SITE NAME	Shuna Castle
CASE No	20210242	INSPECTOR	

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

This report replaces the fish health report R25 issued on 4/8/2021 by Andy Mayes. The previous report should be discarded.

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

All epidemiological units were inspected. Samples were taken for diagnostic purposes. A separate report will be issued detailing the results of these tests.

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.

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.

R25

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, containment and escapes.

On the original report the following recommendation was issued in relation to the Farm Management Agreement:

- In the case of a farm management agreement, arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement.

Documentation has been provided that is deemed satisfactory, no further action is required.

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: 20/05/2022

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/>

Annex - The Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

Section 4A of the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, introduces the requirement for a person carrying out the business of fish farming within a farm management area⁽¹⁾ to;

- (a) be party to a farm management agreement, or prepare and maintain a farm management statement, in relation to the fish farm, and
- (b) ensure that the fish farm is managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement.

To ensure compliance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, the following points must be addressed in the farm management agreement/statement.

- In the case of a farm management agreement, arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement.

A copy of this annex has been sent to Mowi Scotland Ltd as signatories to the farm management agreement for area M-40.

⁽¹⁾ Farm management area means an area specified as such in the Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture

⁽²⁾ Parasites as defined in The Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 which means *Caligus elongatus* and *Lepeophtheirus salmonis*



Image 1: Fish 1 - 5



Image 2: Fish 1, unknown dark tissue in PC



Image 3: Dark spots on fish 1