FHI 059, Version 13	I:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0145			Date of visit: 26/05/2021
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0336 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Druimyeon Bay The Scottish Salmon Compan	у
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	5 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.7	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-46
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		Y If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Case paperwork and physical inspection carried out by while shadowed by

A few lethargic fish noted but fewer than one per pen. Fish removed from pens for vmd sampling appeared in good health with no internal signs of disease. Lice loads reflecting the numbers that have been reported.

Pen 4 & 13 morts slightly higher than other pens but still below reporting level but has reduced recently. PD confirmed on site but levels decreasing. LUM mortalities from 01/04 - 26/05/21 = 1,340 (2%).

Seal Pro nets with a centre weight to maintain tension.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0145		Site No:	FS0336				
Date of Visit:		26/05/2021	ı		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by si	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	16	No facilitie	s inspected	16
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	2020 S0	2020						
No Fish	649,000	65,611						
Mean Fish Wt	1.78 kg	~30g						
Next Fallow Date (S		Feb. 2022		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Sep. 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks)	•				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:	·					`	,	
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 a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records		_						Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Wk 16-2296 (0.35%), wk17-2163 (0.33%), wk18-2346 (0.38), wk 19-2								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:	- mortality du	g poriod on	Januar.					
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities bee	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:				,				
	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		Y
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medi	cines Records		
1. Recent treatments (s	see comment)?		Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S.		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
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?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. 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
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 how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
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	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Ÿ
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
ii yoo, actaii (ii not actailea anaci recent alcease problems).	
Records checked between: 06/11/2019 - 28/05/2021	

П	11 059, Version 13							iss	ued by: Fi	П			
	Case no:	2021-01	145	Site No:		FS0336			Date of vi Sampling		26/0	05/2021	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Camping	н			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:3	0:00	16:3	0:00	1	Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	19
	Environmental conditions:	1	Sunny	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
	Pool Group												
Г	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	1.8000	1.8000	1.8000	1.8000								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
Stock Details		Gometra (FS1267)	12 Gometra (FS1267)	চ Gometra (FS1267)	Gometra (FS1267)								
V,	T Gomey 140	1	П	12	10								

	Additional Sample Information:												
	VMD samples collected by WJM, shadowed by LVK.												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	ot issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0145		Site No:	FS0336		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/05/2021		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	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	0
	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		I 0	3		10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of desi		0			10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	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	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 pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	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 point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	İ			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 st	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 with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		20 MEDIUM

Case No:	2021-0145	Site No: FS0336						
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only							
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problem	s in the previous 4 years?	Υ					
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ					
		cenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, swell as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and	Υ					
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		gement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Υ					
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for in	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ					
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. salm</i> records are inspected?	•	elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ					
8. Have average adult t	female sea lice (<i>L. sa</i>	Imonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	N					
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A					
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	h is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N					
		nistered 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)	Υ					
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where	applicable)?	Υ					
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actio	ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ					
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carrie	d out in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ					
14. Is there a harvesting	g strategy for the site	, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Υ					
15. Is there a site speci	ific written lice manag	ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised	Υ					
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ					
Containment Inspecti	on							
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment dama	age due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y					
Tensioned Nets, Top	,							
If other, detail below:								
2	-t t- b	an arism and are an in the critical to of the city since the least FULL in an artism O	N					
If Yes proceed with que		experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N					
4. Have these been rep								
•		forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
•		nd local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)						
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail						
O If will restaura								
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish						
9. What action was take	en to prevent and mir	nimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could						
be considered under	•	•						
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ					

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	D	ate of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0145	Site No: FS0336		
Date of Visit: 26/05/2021	Inspector:		
20/00/2021	mopeotor.		
n :			
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located with	thin a farm management area?		V
If N, no further questions require completi	_		Y
ir 14, 110 tuttier questions require completi	1011.		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm M			
Has a current farm management agreeIs the current FMAg/S available for inst		en prepared?	Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant			Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	_		Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of c	_	t or statement?	Y
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of re	eview?		Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manager	ment		
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum		to be introduced to the area	or Y
farm?			
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	•		Y
 Does the FMAg/S identify the species Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum 	•		Y
individual farm?	an occording dericity of any period	rany rannana area or are	
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrange		sal of any dead fish from any	Υ
fish farm in the area or the individual farn	n?		
Arrangements for The Management of	Sea Lice		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement		a lice numbers and treatments	s? Y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availabi	ility and the use of medicines on	farms povered by the agreem	oont V
of statement?	illy and the use of medicines on	laillis covered by the agreen	lent
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require	ments for the sensitivity testing of	of available treatments for sea	a Y
lice on farms in the area or individual farm			
Does the FMAg/S identify the circums used on farms in the area or individual far	_	introls and cleaner fish are to	be Y
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrange		nts on farms within the area?	Υ
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Live Fish Movements	Annual Control of the		V
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circums area or farm?	tances when live fish may be int	roduced or removed from the	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrange	ements for the movement of live t	rish on and off sites in the are	ea Y
or individual farms?			

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify accepta	able harvest practices on farms in the area or inc	dividual farms?
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the date	es by which the area or individual farm will be fal	llow and the earliest
date when a farm or area may be res	tocked?	
agreement or statement?	r one or more year classes may be stocked onto	o sites covered by the
 Does the FMAg/S identify whethe covered by the agreement or statement 	r broodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke ent?	ept on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Mana 24. Does the farm management agre- parties to the agreement?	agement Agreements Only ement include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed ar 26. What is the version no/date of iss	nd operated in accordance with the agreement of ue of the FMAg/S? 31.08.2020	or statement?

		_				_			
Case No:	2021-0145			Date of visit:	26/05/2021				
Site No:	FS0336	1		Inspector:					
				moposion.					
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary			nd						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	31/05/2021								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0169 DATE OF VISIT 26/05/2021
SITE NO FS0336 SITE NAME Druimyeon Bay
CASE NO 20210145 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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.



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/

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0146			Date of visit: 26/05/2021
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1010 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	East Tarbert Bay The Scottish Salmon Company	у
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.8	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-46
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed 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 detai	l reason below:	

Case paperwork and physical inspection carried out by while shadowed by

Fish removed from pens for vmd sampling appeared in good health with no internal signs of disease. Fins showing no damage. Lice loads reflecting the numbers that have been reported. Site has just begun feeding stock with SLICE.

LUM morts - wk16 326 (0.04%), wk17 533 (0.65%), wk 18 496 (0.61%), wk 19 (706 (0.88%). LUM stocked on site from wk 12.

Seal Pro nets with sinker tube to maintain tension.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ued by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0146		Site No:	FS1010				
Date of Visit:		26/05/2021]		Inspector(s)			ı
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails						_
1. Business/site det	ails summary	checked by s	site represent	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	o details?						Y]
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	ocked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	2020 S0	2020						
No Fish	744,661	88,114						
Mean Fish Wt	1.3 kg	50g						
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	Feb. 2022		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Sep. 2022	2	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any moveme	olete and corrected solutions of the corrected solutions of the corrected output to the corrected outp	ectly entered luctions (outv	? with GB) avail chalf) of the bu	able? usiness (not us	_			Y N/A
If yes, is there a sys	stem in place t	or maintenan	ice of transpo	rtation records	•			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records					NA/II E-I-	Daniel Ol-		Y
2. How are mortaliti If other detail:	es aisposea o	T?			Whole fish -	Dundas Ch	emicals	
	complete and	aarraathu ant	arad?					
3. Mortality records		correctly ent) (0 E20/)	7 4 4 0 4 (0 4 0 0	/ \\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\	7 (0 00)	0.560
4. Recent mortality		tunical morta		3 (0.53%), wk17	7-1421 (0.19%	6), WK18-64	7 (0.09), WK 1	
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
ii yes, iaciiity nos/no	mortality per	Tacility/110 Sit	ock per raciiity	//Teason.				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								l N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?							N/A	
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events s	heet.		Y
,								

Treatments and Medicines Records							
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y						
T.M.S.,							
If yes, detail: Slice							
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)? T.M.S., Slice							
If other, detail:							
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y						
Biosecurity Records							
Biosecurity records available for inspection?							
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?							
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any							
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	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 how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y						
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or hi	gher Y						
health status, certification if required)?							
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to min	imise 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	Υ						
aquaculture animals held on site?	V						
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?							
If yes, are results available for inspection? Any significant results?							
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).							
ii yes, detaii (ii not detailed dider recent disease problems).							
Records checked between: 01/05/2019 - 28/05/2021							

ii 000, version 13							155	ueu by. I	111			
Case no:	2021-01	46	Site No:		FS1010					26/0	5/2021	
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA				y. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	16:3	0:00	17:1	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No). 	<mark>1</mark> 2
Environmental conditions:	1	Sunny	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1	2	3									
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
Average weight	1.3000	1.3000	1.3000									
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
	Geasgill (FS0839)	Geasgill (FS0839)	Geasgill (FS0839)									
	Priority samples: Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples dd Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex Water Type	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST dd Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos I Pool Group Species Average weight Sex N/A Water Type 2021-01 16:3 16	Case no: Priority samples: VI Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST dd Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 2 Pool Group Species SAL SAL Average weight 1.3000 1.3000 Sex N/A N/A Water Type SW SW (66 880 SAL	Description	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: Priority samples: VI BA Time sampling starts/ends: 16:30:00 17:15:00 Environmental conditions: 1 Sunny 2 Summary samples HIST BA dd Fish/Pools - click BA BA Pool/Fish No 1 2 3 BA Pool Group Species SAL SAL SAL Average weight 1.3000 1.3000 1.3000 SX Water Type SW SW SW BA BA BA BA BA	Description	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: FS1010	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: FS1010	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: FS1010 Date of Samplin	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: FS1010 Date of visit/ Sampling: Priority samples: VI	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: FS1010 Date of visit/ Sampling: Dat	Case no: 2021-0146 Site No: FS1010 Date of visit/ Sampling: 26/05/2021

	Additional Sample Information:												
	VMD samples collected by WJM, shadowed by LVK.												
0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0146		Site No:	FS1010		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/05/2021		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		0	10	26	0
species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
						_	40
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6 6	10 10	3
Exposure via water	rtumber of des	Site contacts			6-10		
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	,	0				
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		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	iainis upstream	Tot within I tidal excursion	'		ŭ		
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
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of		1			
	equivalent statu	us ı from Category III farm	4				
		r from Category ∀ farm	8				
			10	J			
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			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			1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator			<u> </u>	J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		Τ ,	1			0
with regulator or industry	No		1	1			0
code of practice			3	J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2021-0146	Site No: FS1010				
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)					
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problems in t	the previous 4 years?	N			
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or equiv	/alent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ			
		ed in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, las access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and	Υ			
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or		ent agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Υ			
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspec	tion? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required star	ndard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ			
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ			
8. Have average adult	female sea lice (L. salmon	ois) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	N			
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish Heal	th Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A			
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is o	considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N			
		red or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the gatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	N/A			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where appl	icable)?	N/A			
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions ta	ken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	N/A			
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out	t in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ			
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for						
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised						
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.						
Containment Inspecti	ion					
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment damage d	due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N			
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the	predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ			
Tensioned Nets, Top	Nets					
If other, detail below:						
·	· ·	enced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N			
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to	•				
	ported to Scottish Ministers					
		with (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)				
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and loc	cal fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)				
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give detail				
8 If all nets were deal	oved was this action agree	ed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish				
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)					
		e the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could				
	r satisfactory measures					
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with rega	rds to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ			

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0146 S	ite No: FS1010	
00/05/0004	l-consections	
Date of Visit: 26/05/2021	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
 Is the farm under inspection located with 	hin a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require completion	on.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Ma	anagement Agreements and Statement	's
2. Has a current farm management agree		
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for insp	pection?	Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant f	_	Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	* * *	Y V
Does the FMAg/S identify the date of coDoes the FMAg/S identify the date of re	_	Y
7. Does the 1 Wing/o identity the date of te	wiew.	
Arrangements for Fish Health Managen		
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum	health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccinatio	on requirements for stocks held in the are	a or form?
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species	•	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum	•	
individual farm?		
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger		dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual farm	1?	
Arrangements for The Management of S	Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangemen		bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availabilities of statement?	ity and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requiren	ments for the sensitivity testing of available	e treatments for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual farm		
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumst	_	d cleaner fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual far		
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger	ments for synchronous treatments on farn	ms within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumst	tances when live fish may be introduced o	or removed from the
area or farm?		
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger or individual farms?	ments for the movement of live fish on an	d off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Dat	te of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest pra	actices on farms in the area or in	ndividual farms?	Y
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the date when a farm or area may be restocked?			
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more y agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or covered by the agreement or statement?	•		Y Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agree 24. Does the farm management agreement include a parties to the agreement?		come, or cease to be	e, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in a 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg		or statement?	Y

-										
Case No:	2021-0146	J		Date of visit	26/05/202	4				
Site No:	FS1010	1		Inspector						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	1									
	1									
	+									
	†									
	1									
	+									
	+									
Donort Current				1						
Report Summary	Date	lnon	ond 1							
Case Type ECI,CNI,SLI,VMD	31/05/2021	Insp	2 nd Insp							
LOI, OIVI, OLI, VIVID	01/00/2021									
	+									
	+									
	+									





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0169 DATE OF VISIT 26/05/2021
SITE NO FS1010 SITE NAME East Tarbert Bay
CASE NO 20210146 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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.



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/

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2021-0149		Date of visit: 27/05/2021					
Time spent on site: 0.5 hrs	Main Inspect	tor:					
Site No: SS0925 Site Name: Business No: SB0551 Business Na	Loch Craignish (AYC) Loch Craignish Native Oyster	Restoration					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	3 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 10.2 Thermometer	er No:	FHI 045 completed					
Observations: Region:	ST Water type: S	CoGP MA:					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	N If yes, see additional info	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Remote inspection carried out 18/05/2021 by shadowed by . Physical site inspection carried out 27/05/2021 by shadowed by .

Site is operating as a restoration project to increase the population of native oyster in Loch Craignish. Oysters are brought from nursery site and when ready are released at different locations of the sea bed within the loch.

No empty shells noted during physical inspection. Minimum fouling with saddle oysters and tube worms. Showing good growth.

FHI 059, Version 13	3		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0149		Site No:	SS0925				
Date of Visit:		27/05/2021]		Inspector(s)			
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site det	tails summary	checked by s	ite represent	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	o details?						N	
Site Details (include	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		30	Facilities sto	ocked	11	No facilitie	s inspected	11
Species	OED							
Age group	2 years							
No Fish	600							
Mean Fish Wt	5-15 g							
Next Fallow Date (S	•	never fallow		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	unsure (20)21)	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	le							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					13/11/2019	
3. Are records com		ectly entered?	•				10/11/2010	N
4. Are movement re	•	•		?				N/A
5. Are records com								N/A
6. Are health certific	•	•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	s							
Are any moveme		t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys		• •		•	_			
Markalika Baranda								
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti		•			Domestic wa	aste - <25kg		
If other detail:					Domostic iii	201.9		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality		•		ties noted on s	ite			
5. Evidence of rece	•	typical mortal						N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?							N/A	
If yes, detail action:	• •	nortainties be	en reported t	O VCC OF THE				14//
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								N/A
o. Have mortality events been reported to TTI. ITTO, effect details of mortality events sheet.								

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2 Medicines records available for inch	ection?	

Recent treatments (see comment)?				
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				
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y		
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?				
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		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or su	spicion of the presence of a listed disease			
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to S	cottish Ministers?	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)?				
Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between	en each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y		
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, eq				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to mair	•	Y		
aquaculture animals held on site?				
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on	site?	Y		
If no, detail:				
Results of Surveillance				
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behal	f of, the business?	N		
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: 13/11/20	19 - 18/05/2021			

rmi 059, version 13	issued by: Fri			Date	or issue: 12
Case Number:	2021-0149 Site No:	SS092	5		
Date of Visit	27/05/2021 Inspector:				
Number of Susceptil	ole species on site				
	ies present = <u>LOW</u> risk				
If susceptible species	present, score for each pathogen		No	Yes	
	Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED)		0	25	25
	Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) Susceptible to OsHV (CGI)		0	3	3
		0	3	0	
Sites within a tidal e	1	2-5	>6		
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion	0	2	10	2
Live shellfish mover	nents	0	1-2	>3	
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0
Movements off					
Movements on	Frequency of movements off <u>within</u> MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	1
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas Number of destinations	0	3	6	0
	0	3	6	6	
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)	
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area	0	4	8	0
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5	1
			Yes	No	
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	is etc	0	2	2
			Total Risk		41 HIGH

Case No:	2021-0149			Date of visit:	27/05/2021	J		
Site No:	SS0925	1		Inspector:				
Site No.	330923			inspector.				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	 							
Report Summary								
Case Type		Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI	31/05/2021							
	 							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0551 Date of Visit 27/05/2021

SITE NO SS0925 SITE NAME Loch Craignish (AYC)

CASE NO 20210149 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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 found to be inadequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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:

 Registration (SS number) not recorded on movement records. This was pointed out to site manager at time of inspection and will be recorded in future. No further action required. 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: Date: 31/05/2021
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020		
Case No: 2021-0150			Date of visit: 27/05/2021		
Time spent on site:	nr	Main Inspect	or:		
Site No: SS0935 Business No: SB0551	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Craignish Loch Craignish Native Oyster	Restoration		
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 10.6	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA:		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving a 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. N			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:					

Remote inspection carried out 18/05/2021 by shadowed by . Physical site inspection carried out 27/05/2021 by shadowed by .

Site is operating as a restoration project to increase the population of native oyster in Loch Craignish. Oyster spat are brought from Morecambe Bay, grown on before moving to Loch Craignish (AYC) (SS0925) and when ready are released at different locations of the sea bed within the loch.

Oysters looked in good condition with no empty shells noted and no fouling. Shells also showing good growth.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0150]	Site No:	SS0935	5			
Date of Visit:		27/05/2021]		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Autho			:4	-#: 2			V	
 Business/site det Changes made to 	•	спескеа by s	ite represent	ative?			Y N	
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)			_		
Total No facilities		1	Facilities sto	ocked	1	No facilitie	s inspected	1
Species	OED							
Age group	2020							
No Fish	100,000							
Mean Fish Wt	5-15g				(5):			
Next Fallow Date (S	•	never fallow		Next Input Da		June 2021		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		I N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
•								
Movement Record 1. Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					first inspection	on.
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?				mot moposti.	Y
4. Are movement re		•		?				N/A
5. Are records comp								N/A
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	,							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed o	f?			Domestic wa	iste - <25kg		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records		correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality	•			ties noted on s	ite			
5. Evidence of recei		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	//reason:				
6 Any other neaks	in mortality du	ring paried of	nookod2					N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	in mortality du	ning penoa cr	ieckeu?					IN
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?						N/A		
If yes, detail action:	anexplained)	nortainies pe	en reported t	O VOLOTTII:				14// (
•	/ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events s	heet.		N/A
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2 Medicines records available for inch	ection?	

1. Recent treatments (see comme	ent)?		
If yes, detail:			
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records available for	inspection?		
3. Are records complete and corre	ectly entered?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?			
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?			
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored appropria	itely?		
Biosecurity Records			
Biosecurity records available for	r inspection?		Y
•	•	ding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
	•	cottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality			Y
		ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how	•	•	Y
5. Has the health status of aquacu	ulture animals being stocke	ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if require		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
6 Have the husbandry and biosec	curity measures implement	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 on site?	•		
8. Have the biosecurity procedure		ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			•
Results of Surveillance			
1. Has any animal health surveilla	nce been carried out by, or	on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for it	nspection?		
3. Any significant results?			
If yes, detail (if not detailed under	recent disease problems).		
Pagarda ahaal	rad batusan:	first inspection	

Records checked between: first inspection

rmi 059, version 13	issued by. Frii			Date	or issue. 12			
Case Number:	2021-0150 Site No:	SS093	5					
Date of Visit	27/05/2021 Inspector:							
Number of Susceptible species on site								
	ies present = <u>LOW</u> risk							
If susceptible species	present, score for each pathogen		No	Yes				
	Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED)		0	25	25			
	Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED)		0	3	3			
	Susceptible to OsHV (CGI)		0	3	0			
Sites within a tidal e	xcursion	1	2-5	>6				
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion	0	2	10	2			
Live shellfish mover	nents	0	1-2	>3				
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0			
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0			
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0			
Movements off	Frequency of movements off within MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	1			
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas	0	3	6	0			
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	6			
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)				
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0			
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0			
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area	0	4	8	0			
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4				
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1			
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5				
			Yes	No				
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	s etc	0	2	2			
			Total		41			
			Risk		HIGH			

Case No:	2021-0150			Date of visit:	27/05/2021			
Site No:	SS0935]		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
,	· ·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
		<u> </u>						
	+							
	+							
	1							
	+							
	+							
	+							
	1							
				_				
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI	31/05/2021							
	_							
	+							
	+							
	1							
	1							
	†							
	1							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0551 DATE OF VISIT 27/05/2021
SITE NO SS0935 SITE NAME Loch Craignish
CASE NO 20210150 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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 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.

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: 31/05/2021

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/

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0151			Date of visit: 20/05/2021
Time spent on site:	.5 hrs	Main Inspector	r:
Site No: FS0091 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Meall Mhor Loch Fyne The Scottish Salmon Company	
Case Types: 1 REP	2SLA 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.7	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-42
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		Y If yes, see additional inform If yes, see additional inform If yes, see additional inform N	nation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Paperwork completed by remotely 19/5/2021, physical site inspection by shadowed by on 20/05/2021

All treatments 2021: 14 & 21 January (wk. 2 & 3) 2021 Hydrolicer treatment; 05 May & 12 May (wk. 18 & 19) 2021. 5 cages treated on the 5th May with the remaining 2 treated on 12th May. (2 additional pens treated that were scheduled to be harvested but weren't so were treated, half of one of the cages was harvested)

From 6-19 March 2021, 2020 S1's from Lamlash FS0243 (Arran) were moved onto the site. Risk assessment for the transfer inspected (dated 4/3/2021). At the same time a few cages of 2019 S0's were left when the 2020 S1's were moved on site. 2019 S0's were harvested out by 13 May 2021. 2020 S1's were SLICE treated at Lamlash prior to being moved to Meall Mhor.

2021 wk. 16 (19 - 25 April) lice count: 4 AF with eggs strings and 5 AF without egg strings = 9 Total AF (10 fish per cage and 9 cages counted = 90 fish) 0.1AF average for site

Site use a box net to select a random selection of fish for lice count.

Sea lice: From 09 March 2020 until current figures have been below CoGP for average AF until 2021 wk13 1.09 average AF. Down to 0.0 AF following week - harvests took place of the 2019S1 which predominantly had lice on them, the 2020 S1's from Lamlash had a SLICE treatment before they came and had 0 lice.

Planned treatment next week: hydrolicer

During physical inspection, sea lice count was observed. Numbers counted on the day of inspection consistent with the numbers that had been reported prior to inspection. Waterproof notepad used for count on site has pre-printed table format for recording pen no., fish no and each stage of lice. This data is then immediately transferred to IT system used by company with notepad then wiped clean to be re-used. IT system immediately returned an average count of each stage equal to total number counted/number of fish.

Weather conditions on day of inspection were rough so bulk of stock remained deep in the pen and were not coming to surface when feed was presented. This resulted in the fish removed to carry out count mainly consisting of poor doers. The physical condition of the fish appeared good with only a few fish showing signs of minor physical damage.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2	2021-0151		Site No:	FS0091				
Date of Visit:		20/05/2021			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authori	sation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site details	s summary o	checked by si	te representa	itive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to d							N	
Site Details (include	cleaner fish	n for all secti	ons)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilitie	s inspected	7
Species	SAL						·	
	2020 S1							
	3,974					_		
	6.4kg					 		
Next Fallow Date (Site		June 2021		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	September	r 2021	
Recent (last 4 wks) dis	,				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:	sease proble				Arry escapes	(Sirice last	visit):	IN
ii yes, detaii.								
Movement Records								
1. Movement records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspect		•					10/03/2020	
3. Are records comple		ctly entered?						Y
4. Are movement reco		•	and waste?					Y
5. Are records comple								Y
6. Are health certificat		•		hle?				N/A
o. Are nealth certificat	es for introd	uctions (outw	itii OD) avalla	ible:				14// (
Transport Records								
1. Are any movements	s carried out	by (or on beh	nalf) of the bu	siness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a system	m in place fo	or maintenand	e of transpor	tation records	?			
Mortality Records								
 Mortality records av 		•						Y
2. How are mortalities	disposed of	?			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records co	mplete and	correctly ente	red?					Y
4. Recent mortality (la	st 4 wks):		2021 wk 16:	0.27%, 290 m	orts; wk 17 27	'6 morts , 0.:	26%; wk18 1,	231 morts,
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
2021 wk18 cages 1, 3	, 9, 10 and 1	2 elevated du	ue to treatme	nt, wk 19 cage	es 1, 3, 5 and 1	12 elevated	due to treatm	ents
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								
2	2020 wk 35: 1.23%, 5,015 morts; 2020 wk 36: 2.32%, 7,296 morts; 2020 wk 37: 2.09%, 6,409 morts;						9 morts:	
	2020 wk 41: 1.36%, 4,038 morts; 2020 wk 42: 1.36%, 3,996 morts; 2021 wk 11 1.16%, 1445 morts							
If yes, detail:								
								N/A
If yes, detail action:								
B. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (see comment)? Y						
If yes, detail: If other, detail: TMS						
Medicines records available for inspection?		Y				

If yes, detail:		
If other, detail: TMS		
Medicines records available for inspection?		Y
Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail: TMS		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	•	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scotti	sh Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?		
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence		
is detected been included and how and when that will be notifie		
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked o	n the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented I		
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visito		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to	o maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented	ed on site?	
If no, detail:		
D. II. COIII		
Results of Surveillance	habati of the business?	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on	benait of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		
3. Any significant results?		
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
	100/0000 10/05/0004	
Records checked between: 10	0/03/2020 - 19/05/2021	

Case No: 2021-0151	Site No:	FS0091	
Date of visit: 20/05/2021	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	V	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2,	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ?	Low & Medium	Y	Annex 6 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 conducting the count stated?	Low	N/A	SSI 1,2(g)	no counts missed, counts generally done on a Monday
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail.	Low	N/A		
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?		Υ	Detail if necessary:	Infrastructure to deal with lice has been improved significantly from when lice where a problem in the past.
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea li	ce			
2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:				
a) L. salmonis record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	Υ	CoGP Annex 6	From 09 March 2020 until current: below CoGP for AF average until 2021 wk13 1.09 AF (down to 0.0 AF following week - harvests took place of the 2019 S1 which predominantly had lice on them, the 2020 S1's from Lamlash had a SLICE treatment before they came and had 0 lice)
 b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems 	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	
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	Υ		Last SLICE treatment 18-24 May 2020, since then just mechanical treatments.
the date of administration	High	Υ		
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered	High	Υ		
the method of administration of the product	High	Υ		
the identification of the fish / facilities treated	High	Υ		
name of the person administering the treatment	Low	Υ		
the withdrawal period	Medium	Υ		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:			VMD 18	
the name of the veterinary surgeon	High	N/A	1	
name of the product	High	N/A	1	
batch number	High	N/A	1	
the date of administration	High	N/A	1	
amount administered	High	N/A	1	
identification of fish treated	High	N/A	1	
withdrawal period	Medium	N/A	1	
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	High	N/A		No treatments required due to counts being below CoGP, see above. Harvest reduced numbers for the following week the one time it was above CoGP.
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 impact is there a record of:	Low	Y	SSI, 1,4	
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	Υ	VMD 17	
name of the product	High	Υ	1	
batch number	High	Υ		
the date of purchase	Medium	Υ		
the quantity purchased	High	Υ		
the name and address of the supplier	Medium	Υ		
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19	
the date of disposal	Medium	N/A		Only required amount is delivered.
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	Υ	CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	
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	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea		Υ	Detail if necessary:	Consent for: SLICE, Alphamax, Salmosan
lice?				
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and		nent agreements		
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of	Low	Υ	SSI 1,5,b	TSSC only company operating in the area.
contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?		V	CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the	Low	Y	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	N/A	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider:	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	
-agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -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	This is all done internally by the same company vet responsible for all sites.
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	Y	4.3.82, 5.3.51	2019 S0's have had 4 SLICE treatments in total. Nov 2019, Dec 2019, March 2020, May 2020 no other medicinal treatments administered to the 2019 S0's. SLICE treatments are synchronised in the CoGP area.
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 consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and				
certainly not on the same cohort of lice				

TTII 000, VEISIOII 10		issued by	7. 1 1 11	Date of 133de. 12/03/2020
Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	N/A	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	All company internal, as the only company operating in the area.
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
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	N/A	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	FMS is reviewed at the end of the cycle.
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or		Υ	AFSA ¹³ 4A	
farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm				
Management Area (or equivalent)?			Detail if necessary:	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	N/A	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	N/A	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	Υ	CoGP 4.3.100	5 sites currently fallow in Loch Fyne and 5 farms remain stocked all will be harvest out in the next 5-6 weeks (End of June 2021).
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	Risk assessment for fish transfer available and reviewed, 2020 S1 are being harvested in line with the 2019 S0's that were originally on site. Only largest fish were transferred from Lamlash.
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	Company internal course, everyone who does lice counts has done the training. One new member of staff has not completed it but will in due course. One member of staff for boat handling who wouldn't normally do lice checks but will complete course.
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		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Υ		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Υ	1	
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	Core of experienced staff will do bath treatments and less experienced staff will be inducted and taught by experienced staff during treatments. No bath treatments this cycle.
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	N/A	VMD schedule 5	No medicinal treatments used during current cycle.
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High	Υ		
Refer to section e) of guidance notes				
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating	High	Υ		
to sea lice infestation?				
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Υ	CoGP Annex 6,	10 random fish selected from each stocked pen.
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in	High	Υ	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
lice recognition and recording?				
(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	High	Υ	Annex 6	
including species and stages observed to be correct?				
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	Υ		
satisfactory?				
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate	High	N/A		
competent manner?				
Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per				
prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations,				
appropriate product used				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?		N/A		
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
h. FHI sea lice counts If necessary conduct a sea lice count in accordance with the protocol of the CoGP. Indicate where this procedure has been done and make a record of results within the comments box	Power granted under the Act – section 3 (2) (a)	
i. 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 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

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

[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:	2021-0151			Date of visit:	20/05/2021]		
Site No:	FS0091	1		Inspector:				
Site IVO.	1 30091			mspecior.				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
		Ì						
D 10								
Report Summary			- nd -					
Case Type		Insp	2 nd Insp					
SLA	03/06/2021							
	-							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 20/05/2021

SITE NO FS0091 SITE NAME Meall Mhor Loch Fyne

CASE NO 20210151 INSPECTOR

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 Aquaculture 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.

Further Action

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

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 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0164			Date of visit: 31/05/2021
Time spent on site:	3.5h	Main I	nspector:
Site No: FS0264 Business No: FB0132	Site Name: Business Name:	Inverpolly Fintish Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 11.6	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	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	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to care	ry out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection completed 26/05/2021 by supervised by Physical inspection completed 31/05/2021 by supervised by

Since last inspection the site has moved away from producing a combination of organic and non-organic fish and is now rearing solely organic fish.

Site now owned by MOWI Scotland Ltd.

Recent issues: PCR positives for Costia and SGPV in the Q4 fish and Flavobacterium sp. in the Q2 fish. Not causing mortalities, with Aquacen formaldehyde and Bronopol treatments being carried out under veterinary advice.

Peaks in mortality: Wb 19/08/2019 site mortality 2.22% due to high temperature and spate conditions and PKD positive fish reported to Marine Scotland on the 06/09/2019. Wb 17/08/2020 2.48% mortality in Q2 standard fish once again due to high temperature and spate conditions with fish PCR positive for PKD. Overall site mortality was 1.3%, therefore below reporting threshold.

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity measures.

No issues on site. Fish looked healthy.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0164		Site No:	FS0264				
Date of Visit:		31/05/2021]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho								
1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to		checked by s	ite representa	itive?			Y Y	
-								
Site Details (include	_		_			101 - C 100 -		
Total No facilities		129	Facilities sto	cked	34	No facilities	s inspected	34
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group	Q4	Q2						
No Fish		2,017,888						
		0.24g	204	the Married Da	(04-)	1	20 Marrola 20	00
Next Fallow Date (Si	,	December 20	021	Next Input Da			022, March 20	
Recent (last 4 wks) of					Any escapes	•	/ISIT) ?	N
If yes, detail:	Costia, SGP	√, Flavobacte	erium sp. See	additional infor	rmation for mo	re details.		
Movement Records 1. Movement records 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certificat Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records 1. Mortality records a	s available for ction: blete and correctords available blete and corrected ates for introducts carried out tem in place for available for in	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered? ductions (outw t by (or on bel for maintenance	sh and waste? ? vith GB) availa :half) of the bu	able? usiness (not usi	?		19/03/2019	Y Y Y Y
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail)			
				h Water Horizo	n (biogas prod	luction)		
3. Mortality records of	•	•						Y
4. Recent mortality (•			75 (0.79%), wk	: 18 - 20,931 (I	0.51%), wk	<u> 19 - 13,409 (</u> (
5. Evidence of recen		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in								Y
				lue to high tem		ibined with	spate condition	ons and PKD
				r more details.				81/2
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) r	nortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been rei	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	ieet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
Formalin,	
If yes, detail: Pyceze	
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)? Formalin, Pyceze	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
., , ,	
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. 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
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	se
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
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?	
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
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?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). 10/05/2021 PCR - Costia, SGPV (Control of the control of the c	(4) and
20/08/20 Q2 high mortality, histology - PKD and gill pathology. 12/08/2019 histology - Flavobacterium, PKD.	
Records checked between: 19/03/2019 - 26/05/2021	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue:	12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0164		Site No:	FS0264		Insp:	
Date of Visit	31/05/2021		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	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent zone or					
species		ncluding third country	0		18	26	
	Number of sup	pliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of n		0			10	10
	Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water	I= :tt	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or	led (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)		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			<u> </u>		
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters		I	Onsecure		
processors	,, processing	, prant alconarging into a space in waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0	1			0
the fules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	Δ	1			
	equivalent state	us n from Category III farm	8	-			\vdash
	_	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		,]			0
products		esses with other farms	2				
		t for waste from other farms	5				
				1			
Use of unpasteurised feeds		inpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpas		5	J			
Biosecurity	lo:tt:	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites		from single shorebase	0		2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
a.ioniii access to cages	No		2	-			
	1			J			
					Total		24
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0164	Site No:	FS0264
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as	s in the previous 4 years? quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (i well as access to suitable biological and/or me ement agreement or statement relevant to the	ncluding deltamethrin, echanical control measures,
Management Area (or equivalent)?		sic and eder i anni
Are sea lice count records available for ins Do records adequately reflect the required	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish F 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which 10. Have therapeutic treatments been admini suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. e</i> 11. Has any other action been taken (where a 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, 15. Is there a site specific written lice manage 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage	is considered to cause significant welfare probatered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmoniallongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implical applicable)? Is taken had a significant impact upon the lice of out in cooperation between participating farms where fewer populations or part populations are ment procedure with waypoints describing set a reflect sea lice count data? If no please details ge due to predators in the current or previous procedure of the current of the curren	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) s levels have exceeded the ations? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) levels recorded? s? re held without treatment for actions to deal with reasons.
Are measures in place to mitigate against to Top nets, tanks inside, pest control	the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	Y Y
If other, detail below:		
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for		.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and mini	greed with local wild fish interests and was per	
be considered under satisfactory measur 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	res of the Act) egards to containment? If no, please detail rea	ison(s) Y

					0.1/05/00	6.71			
Case No:	2021-0164	J		Date of visit	31/05/20	21			
Site No:	FS0264	1		Inspector					
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Inst	
	_								
	+								
	+								
	+								
Report Summary Case Type ECI, CNI									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI	17/06/2021								
	+								
	-								
	-								





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0132 DATE OF VISIT 31/05/2021
SITE NO FS0264 SITE NAME Inverpolly

Case No 20210164 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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.

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.



Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 04/06/2021

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	Date of issue: 12/05/2020							
Case No: 2021-0184			Date of visit: 26/05/2021						
Time spent on site:	ır	Main Inspecto	or:						
Site No: SS0732 Business No: SB0452	Site Name: Business Name:	Husky Rubha Nan Ron Seafoods							
Case Types: 1 REG 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 of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	· ·	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Additional Case Information:

Fallow inspection to deregister the site.

All trestles and bags have been removed from the foreshore, nothing remains on the site.

•						004				
Case No:	2021-0184	J		Date of vi	sit: 26/05/20	021				
Site No:	SS0732	7		Inspect	tor:					
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification								
		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	_									
	_									
	1									
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
REG	02/06/2021									
	_									
	_									
	+									





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0452
 Date of Visit
 26/05/2021

 Site No
 SS0732
 Site Name
 Husky

 Case No
 20210184
 Inspector

The above site was inspected as fallow, all equipment has been removed from the foreshore. The site will now be deregistered.

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

Signed: Date: 02/06/2021

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