FHI 059, Version 13	ļ	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0062			Date of visit: 26/04/2022
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main In	spector:
Site No: FS1259 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Stulaigh Mowi Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.6	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: W-20
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Salmon came on from Glenfinnan, Loch Lochy and Garry in October 21. Lumpfish came on from Anglesay in December 21. All fish are reported to be doing very well with low gill scores and good growth.

Site has experienced low lice levels since wk7 2022 and treatments have had good clearance. Caligus levels have increased slightly in recent weeks from 0.03 to 0.09. Slice treatment may be planned to reduce numbers of Caligus. Peroxide treatments were completed in December 21 and January 22. The Aqua Skye was on site in February for a FW treatment. Gills are showing stable condition when AGD scored (~0.25 since wk7, a drop from 1.2 prior to treatment).

Fish will be live harvested to Mallaig.

Fish were sitting deep in the water but appeared to be shoaling well and were responsive to feeding.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0062		Site No:	FS1259				
Date of Visit:		26/04/2022	1		Inspector(s)	:		1
Registration/Author	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta			ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•		·				Υ	
Site Details (include	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities	o olounor no	14	Facilities sto	cked	14	No facilitie	es inspected	14
	SAL	LUM	r dominos sto	I		Tto radinar		
•	2021 Q4	2022						
No Fish	1,219,390	13,198						
		,						
Next Fallow Date (Si	1.3kg	55g April 23		Next Input Da	ato (Sito)	October 2	2	
,				•	Any escapes			I NI
Recent (last 4 wks) of the last 4 wks) of the last 4 wks.	ilsease probl	ems:		IN	Arry escapes	s (Since last	VISIL) !	N
•								
Movement Records								
 Movement records 		r inspection?						Y
Date of last inspect							05/06/2018	
Are records compl		•						Y
Are movement red	cords availab	e for dead fis	h and waste?	•				Y
Are records compl	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	ts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst					-			Υ
M								
Mortality Records		0						
Mortality records a		•			IOIL / lata'	N.		Y
2. How are mortalitie	·				Other (detai	<u>′</u>		
16 11 1 11				common skip a	at the shoreba	ase and uplit	fted by MacDo	onald
			iteshore Cock	des.				• V
Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (I	act 1 wke).			9 (0.11%), Wk1	14: 1,932 (0.1	6%), Wk13:	1,944 (0.16%	b), Wk12:
 Kecent mortality (i Evidence of recen 		typical mortal	1,399 (0.119	(0)				N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				17
11 you, racinty 1100/110	mortality por	Taomity/110 oto	on por raomey	71000011.				
6. Any other peaks ir	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					Y
	•	• .		,594 (7.01%),	Wk34: 24 52	6 (4 97%) &	Wk35: 8 129	(2.83%)
7. Have increased (u					77.10 1. 2-7,020	0 (1.07 70) Q		N/A
If yes, detail action:		3.13.11.00 50						
8. Have 'mortality eve	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events s	heet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S. 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?	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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 05/06/2018 - 20/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0062		Site No:	FS1259		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/04/2022		No of movements/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	0	10	26	
opeoies	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
							40
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Tramber of desi	Site contacts			6-10		Ü
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V	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	İ			
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	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]			0
·	Feeding unpas		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 between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
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	1			0
	No		2				
					Total		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0062	Site No:	FS1259
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single ye enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (incl well as access to suitable biological and/or mech	luding deltamethrin,
	ement agreement or statement relevant to the sit	te and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels belerecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the Co	GP during the period that N
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salr</i> , 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the perio	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or a od that records are inspected?	bove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare proble	Y Y N N
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis le</i> longatus is considered to have welfare implication	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice level out in cooperation between participating farms? where fewer populations or part populations are	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice in	ement procedure with waypoints describing set an infestation?	ctions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail re	easons.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ge due to predators in the current or previous pro he predation experienced on site? (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 fo	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimbe considered under satisfactory measur		code but could
To. is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reaso	1

FHI 059, Version 13	logued by: EUI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
<u> </u>	Issued by: FHI	Date of Issue. 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0062	Site No: FS1259	
Date of Visit: 26/04/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
Is the farm under inspection located w	vithin a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comple		<u> </u>
•	Management Agreements and Statemen	
z. Has a current farm management agre 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ins	ement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepa	Y Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant	•	<u>·</u> Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	<u> </u>	Y
•	commencement of the agreement or state	ement?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of r	review?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage	ement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimur	m health standards for the stocks to be int	roduced to the area or Y
farm?		
•	tion requirements for stocks held in the are	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	s of fish which may be stocked into the are turn stocking density of any pen on any far	
individual farm?	an stocking density of any pen on any lar	
	ements for the storage and disposal of an	y dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual far	m?	
Arrangements for The Management of	f Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangeme	ents for the sharing of data on sea lice nun	mbers and treatments?
14 Doos the EMAG/S identify the availab	sility and the use of medicines on forms of	avered by the agreement
of statement?	pility and the use of medicines on farms co	overed by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require	ements for the sensitivity testing of availab	ole treatments for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual far		
Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	stances under which biological controls ar	nd cleaner fish are to be
	ements for synchronous treatments on far	rms within the area?
error in the second of the sec		
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum area or farm?	stances when live fish may be introduced	
	ements for the movement of live fish on a	nd off sites in the area
or individual farms?		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	idual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restock		
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether on agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s	ites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brocovered by the agreement or statement?	oodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	t on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ment Agreements Only ent include arrangements for persons to becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and of 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	operated in accordance with the agreement or so of the FMAg/S? 05/10/2021	statement? Y

• •	ii 000, version 10							100	ueu by. i				
	Case no:	2022-00)62	Site No:		FS1259			Date of		26/0	04/2022	26/(
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG	Samplin	g: HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:0	0:00	14:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. I	35
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	imples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	F1-4	F5-9	F10-14	F15-19	F20-F2	5						
	Pool Group			. 10 14	. 10 10	. 20 . 20							
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL							
	Average weight	1.3kg		1.3kg		1.3kg							
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW							
Stock Details		Loch Garry FS1104	Loch Garry FS1104	Loch Garry FS1104	Loch Garry FS1104	Loch Lochy FS0150							
S	raciity NO	2	4	6	8	10							

1711 009, Version 10									
04/2022 Additional Sample Information:									
Dispatched by percussive blow.									
Dispatched by percussive blow.									
0 Total Tests assigned 0									

Site No: FS1259

Case No: 2022-0062

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

	2000 2000	_			00/04/0	200			
Case No:	2022-0062	J		Date of vi	sit: 26/04/20)22			
Site No:	FS1259 Inspector:								
Results Summary	Eroa				Date of Noti	fication			
Results Summary	Freq.	Databas	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Inst	
	_					9	op	2 1113	
	1								
							_		
	+								
	+								
							_		
	+						_		
	+						_		
	+								
							_		
	+						_		
	+								
	+								
Report Summary			_	7					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	02/05/2022		Z IIISP						
-,-,-,									
	+								
	-								
	1								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0119Date of Visit26/04/2022Site NoFS1259Site NameStulaighCase No20220062Inspector

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.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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.

Signed:

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: 02/05/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of is	ssue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0093				Date of visit: 2	26/04/2022
Time spent on site:	.5hrs	_	Main Inspector:	:	
Site No: FS1341 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	An Camus Mowi Scotland L	_td		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD	5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 8.6	Thermometer No:	T152		FHI 045 complet	red
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type:	: S	CoGP MA:	W-20
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see a	additional inform	nation/clinical sco	re sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	d?			nation/clinical sco	
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see a	additional inform	nation/clinical sco	ore sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:			

Additional Case Information:

Fish came on from Loch Lochy. Successful transfer with low mortalities.

Slice treatment completed at the end of February and had good clearance. Visual gill scores were at ~0.05 in March.

Fish were sitting deep in the water but those that could be observed appeared to be in good condition and were shoaling nicely.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally.

FHI 059, Version 13	}		Issu	ed by: FHI		Date	e of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0093]	Site No:	FS1341			
Date of Visit:		26/04/2022]		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Author	orisation Det	ails					
1. Business/site det	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?		Y	
2. Changes made to	o details?					N	
Site Details (include	de cleaner fis	sh for all sect	ions)				
Total No facilities		7	Facilities sto	cked	4	No facilities insp	pected 7
Species	SAL						
Age group	2022 Q1						
No Fish	617,489						
Mean Fish Wt	430g						
Next Fallow Date (S		April 23		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	October 23	
Recent (last 4 wks)	•				_ ` '	(since last visit)?	? N
If yes, detail:				•	, ,	,	
Movement Record							
1. Movement record		or inspection?					Y
2. Date of last inspe						First	t Inspection
3. Are records comp		•					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availab	le for dead fis	h and waste?	•			Y
5. Are records comp	plete and corr	ectly entered?	•				Y
6. Are health certific	cates for intro	ductions (outw	rith GB) availa	able?			N/A
Transport Records	•						
1. Are any moveme		it by (or on be	half) of the bu	icinose (not us	ing a STR\2		
If yes, is there a sys							
ii yes, is there a sys	sterri iri piace	ioi mamenani	ce or transpor	rtation records	f		
Mortality Records							
1. Mortality records	available for i	inspection?					Y
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed d	of?			Other (detail)		
	Dead fish ar	nd waste is co	llected in com	nmon skips at t	he shorebase	and uplifted by N	/lacDonald Haulage
If other detail:		Whiteshore		·			
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?				Y
			Wk15: 122 (0.02%), Wk14	: 228 (0.04%)	, Wk13: 208 (0.03	3%), Wk12: 276
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		(0.04%)	,	` '	· ·	
5. Evidence of rece	nt increased/a	atypical mortal	ities?				N
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality per	r facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:			
6. Any other peaks		<u> </u>					Y
If yes, detail:			Wk33: 17,26	62 (3.7%), Wk3	34: 8,825 (1. 9 6	5%), Wk35: 6,323	3 (1.43%), Wk36:
	7,694 (1.77°		on romanta di t	Not or ELLIO			N/A
7. Have increased (•	mortalities be	en reported to	vecor FHI?			IN/A
If yes, detail action:		markad ta EU	0 16 ma	dataila au us ut	talitus aventa el	1	
8. Have 'mortality e	vents been re	portea to FHI	r it no, enter o	details on mort	iality events sh	ieet.	Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	· ·
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S. Slice	
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
Are records complete and correctly entered?	T V
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	V
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S. Slice	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
o. The medianice dicrea appropriatory.	
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.)?	N/
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	V
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?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 20/01/2020 - 20/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	Date of issue: 12/			
Case Number:	2022-0093		Site No:	FS1341					
Date of Visit	26/04/2022		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	0	4.0	26			
Species	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0		
					ļ		40		
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	3		
Exposure via water	ramber of desi	Site contacts	1		6-10				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through							
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	porehole)	0						
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III							
	•	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6				
		or in a coastal zone with category V	1	1	o				
	iairiis upstreair	or within 1 tidal excursion	!	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		
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1						
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2						
	Processing fish	from zone or compartment of							
	equivalent statu		4						
		from Category III farm	8						
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10						
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0						
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3		
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5						
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	T 0	1			0		
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5						
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4				
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1		
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1						
			<u> </u>	J					
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes		Τ .	1					
with regulator or industry	No		0				0		
code of practice	140		3						
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0		
	No		2						
			_	J					
					Total		20		
					Rank		MEDIUM		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0093	Site No: FS	S1341
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (includ well as access to suitable biological and/or mechan	ling deltamethrin,
 4. Is there a signed documented farm manag Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	al 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	o during the period that
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salı</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the perio	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or about that records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare problems	N/A N
•	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levelongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels out in cooperation between participating farms? where fewer populations or part populations are hel	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set action nfestation?	ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reason	ons. Y
	ge due to predators in the current or previous produ the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	ction cycles? N Y
f 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 fo	•)
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 minible considered under satisfactory measure.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ode but could
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s	S) Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by:	: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0093	Site No: FS1341		
Date of Visit: 26/04/2022	Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection located v	within a farm management	area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreement	s and Statements	
2. Has a current farm management agre			Y
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in			Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan	it farm management area?		Υ
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far	m site(s) to which it applies	; ?	Υ
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	commencement of the ag	reement or statement?	Υ
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	review?		Υ
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	ement		
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimufarm?	ım health standards for the	stocks to be introduced to the	area or Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina	ation requirements for stoc	ks held in the area or farm?	Υ
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie	es of fish which may be sto	cked into the area or farm?	Y
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxin individual farm?	num stocking density of an	y pen on any farm in the area	or the Y
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranglish farm in the area or the individual fa	_	d disposal of any dead fish fron	n any Y
Arrangements for The Management of	of Sea Lice		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangem	ents for the sharing of data	a on sea lice numbers and treat	ments? Y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availa of statement?	bility and the use of medic	nes on farms covered by the ac	greement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requi		esting of available treatments for	or sea Y
lice on farms in the area or individual fa			N.
Does the FMAg/S identify the circun used on farms in the area or individual f		gical controls and cleaner fish a	are to be Y Y Y
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	gements for synchronous t	reatments on farms within the a	area? Y
Live Fish Movements			
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circun area or farm?	nstances when live fish ma	y be introduced or removed fro	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangor individual farms?	gements for the movement	of live fish on and off sites in the	ne area Y

Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement? Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only 24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?	FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement? Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only 24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement? Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	idual farms?
agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement? Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only 24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement? Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	date when a farm or area may be restoc	ked?	
Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only 24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement? Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s	ites covered by the Y
24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement? Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?		ring we see the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms? ring we see the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earlies then a farm or area may be restocked? we see the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by ment or statement? we see the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site and by the agreement or statement? For Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only we see the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be to the agreement? In the first farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	
25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	D. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms? allowing 1. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest ate when a farm or area may be restocked? 2. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the greement or statement? 3. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site overed by the agreement or statement? oint of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only 4. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, arties to the agreement? lanagement and operation 5. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?		ne, or cease to be, N/A
			statement? Y

٠.	11 059, VEISIOII 13							155	ueu by. r	1 11			
	Case no:	2022-00)93	Site No		FS1341			Date of v		26/0	04/2022	26/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		, HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:3	0:00	13:0	0:00	l	Inspecto	or:			VMD No). [14
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	F1-4	F5-8	F9-11	F12-14								
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	430g	430g	430g	430g								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
Stock Details		Loch Lochy FS0150	Loch Lochy FS0150	د Loch Lochy FS0150	A Loch Lochy FS0150								
U)	T domey 140	•	_	J	7								

04/2022	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
	Dispato	hed by p	percussi	ive blow										
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

Site No: FS1341

Case No: 2022-0093

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2022-0093			Date of visit:	26/04/2022	2				
Site No:	FS1341			Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Insp	Da Phone	te of Notifica Insp	Writing Insp 2 nd Insp				
		Databasc	ШЭР	THORIC	шэр	vviitiiig	шэр	z insp		
							-			
							=			
Report Summary			nd							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	02/05/2022									





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 26/04/2022

 Site No
 FS1341
 Site Name
 An Camus

 Case No
 20220093
 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.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the site was authorised 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.

Signed:

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: 06/05/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0097			Date of visit: 28/04/2022
Time spent on site:	4.5 hours	Main Inspec	tor:
Site No: FS0616	Site Name:	Nevis B	
Business No: FB0125	Business Name:	Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 SLA 3 CNI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.4	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-23
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving			ormation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?		ormation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection carried out 21/04/2022 by supervised by

Site inspection carried out 28/04/2022 by and and

Fish in good condition with no moribund/lethargic fish observed while on site. Fish caught to carry out a sea lice count appeared in good health with the lice levels matching the counts being submitted in the previous weeks. The one fish selected for vmd sampling also appeared healthy upon internal examination with no gross pathology observed.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0097		Site No:	FS0616	3			
Date of Visit:		28/04/2022			Inspector(s)	:		ı
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ıils						
1. Business/site deta			ite represent	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	_	•	·				Υ	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fisl	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	ocked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12
Species	SAL	WRS	LUM				T	
Age group	21Q4	wild	2021					
No Fish	501,449	7,429	35,453			_		
Mean Fish Wt	1276g	104g	119g					
Next Fallow Date (S		April 2023	Tiog	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	approx Oc	rt 2023	
Recent (last 4 wks)	*	•			Any escape			l N
If yes, detail:	lisease proble	CIIIS:			Arry escapes	s (Sirice last	visit):	IN
1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement records comp 6. Are records comp 6. Are health certificat Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. How are mortalities	ction: lete and correctords available lete and corrected attention of the carried out the carr	ectly entered? e for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outw t by (or on be or maintenan	sh and waste ? vith GB) avail half) of the b	lable? usiness (not us		- on site	18/11/2020	Y N/A N/A Y
If other detail:					•			
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
			Wk 13 - 65 237 (0.66%	emote inspectio (0.01%), Wk 14), Wk 13 - 146 k 12 - 51 (0.68	4 - 71 (0.01% (0.41%), Wk) LUM: Wk 1 14 - 95 (0.27	11 - 149 (0.41 7%) WRS: WI	%), Wk 12 - k 11 - 61
Recent mortality (
Evidence of recen		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	y/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period of	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	Tilloriality du	ing penou cr	ieckeu!					I IN
7. Have increased (ι	ınexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported t	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	<u> </u>							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events s	heet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records		
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?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, red	•	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been include		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the pro-	·	
is detected been included and how and when that will be		Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stoo	cked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implementation of diagonal bean solvered (mayament of staff	•	<u> </u>
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in p	place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?	tl am aita 0	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately imple	emented on site?	<u> </u>
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by,	or on hehalf of the husiness?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	, of off bendin of, the business.	Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems	s).	_
	- J.	
Records checked between:	18/11/2020 - 21/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13							ISS	uea by: i				
Case no:	2022-00	97	Site No:		FS0616			Date of Samplin		28/0	04/2022	28/0
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	12:2	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. [5
Environmental conditions	: 1	Calm	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	imples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No		1		1				Т				
Fish nos	1					$\overline{}$		$\overline{}$				
Pool Group												
Species	SAL											
Average weight	1.3 kg											
Sex	N/A											
Water Type	SW											
						- 1						
						- 1						
						- 1						
Sig						- 1						
Details	X					- 1						
	Knock					I						
Stock Origin Facility No						_						
O I acility NO	10											

04/2022 Additional Sample Information:												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0											

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0097		Site No:	FS0616		Insp:	
Date of Visit	28/04/2022	No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS			5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country			9	18	26	q
	Number of supp		0			14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0			10	10
Movements on	Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	, 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V 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		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	•	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 ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3	1			
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	ĺ			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised feed	5	1			
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
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		32 HIGH

Case No:	2022-0097		Site No: FS0616	
 Is the CoGP Farm M Does the site have a 	nced sea lice problei lanagement Area (or access to a range of amectin benzoate)	ms in the previous 4 years? r equivalent) fallowed synchronously licenced in-feed and bath sea lice me as well as access to suitable biologica	edications (including deltamethri	
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or		agement agreement or statement rele	evant to the site and CoGP Farn	1
		nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex (ed standard specified in the SSI and the		nnex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	•	pelow the suggested criteria for treatn	nent in the CoGP during the per	iod that
		almonis) numbers per fish been at a eriod that records are inspected?	level of 3 or above (prior to w/b	10/6/19) or
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish	n Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see	comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level whi	ch is considered to cause significant v	welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.8	1, 5.3.50)
suggested criteria for to	reatment or where C	inistered or other actions taken when elements is considered to have we		
11. Has any other action	•		41 13 1	
•		ons taken had a significant impact up ed out in cooperation between particip		
		e, where fewer populations or part po	·	nent for
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		gement procedure with waypoints de e infestation?	scribing set actions to deal with	recognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stoc	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no pl	lease detail reasons.	
Containment Inspecti	ion			
1. Has the site experien	nced equipment dan	nage due to predators in the current o	r previous production cycles?	N
	ce to mitigate agains	st the predation experienced on site?	(Detail below)	Y
Seal Pro nets, If other, detail below:				
ii otilei, detail below.				
3. Have escape incide If Yes proceed with que		experienced on or in the vicinity of the kip to question 10	site since the last FHI inspection	on? N
4. Have these been rep				
		forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP and local fisheries trusts forthwith (wh		', 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover e	scapees? If yes give detail		
8 If all note were don!	oved was this action	agreed with local wild fish interests a	nd was permission given by Sc	ottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)			
What action was tak be considered under		inimise the risk of further escapes? (N	Not covered in code but could	
	•	n regards to containment? If no, pleas	se detail reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0097	Site No: FS0616	
Date of Visit: 28/04/202	22 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
 Is the farm under inspection located N, no further questions require com 	_	Y
ii iv, no futtiei questions require com	ipietion.	
 Has a current farm management at Is the current FMAg/S available for Does the FMAg/S identify the relev Does the FMAg/S identify the fish f 	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or staten	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minir farm?	agement mum health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	cination requirements for stocks held in the area ecies of fish which may be stocked into the area ximum stocking density of any pen on any farn	a or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrafish farm in the area or the individual	angements for the storage and disposal of any I farm?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemen 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	nt of Sea Lice ements for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the ava of statement?	ailability and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any reqlice on farms in the area or individual	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available farms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circ used on farms in the area or individual	cumstances under which biological controls and al farms?	d cleaner fish are to be
	angements for synchronous treatments on farm	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circ area or farm?	cumstances when live fish may be introduced o	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra or individual farms?	angements for the movement of live fish on an	d off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	ole harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	idual farms?
date when a farm or area may be resto 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto s broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	ites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag		ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issu	d operated in accordance with the agreement or see of the FMAg/S? 09/09/21 - 09/09/23	statement? Y

Site No: FS0616

Case No: 2022-0097

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No: 2022-0097 Site No: FS0616

Date of visit: 28/04/2022 Inspector(s):

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

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records				
1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2,	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in	Low & Medium	Υ	Annex 6	
the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ?			SSI 1,2,	
(Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date				
of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility				
number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed				
and correct stages recorded ⁴				
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated?	Low	Υ	SSI 1,2(g)	
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give	Low	Υ	1	
detail.				
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4		N	Detail if necessary:	
years?				
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea li	ce			
2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:				
a) L. salmonis record levels have been above the suggested criteria	High	Υ	CoGP Annex 6	
for treatment?				
b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	C. elongatus levels have never reached a level to cause significant
welfare problems	Medium	V	CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	welfare problems.
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required? 2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a	Medium	Ť		
record of :			VMD ¹² 19	
the name / identity of the product	High	V	SSI 1,3	
the date of administration	High	\ V	1	
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered	High	т У		
the method of administration of the product	High	Y	1	
the identification of the fish / facilities treated	High	Y	1	
name of the person administering the treatment	Low	N/A	1	Only medicinal treatment has been in the form of in feed (Slice)
, and the state of				treatment.
the withdrawal period	Medium	Υ		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:			VMD 18	
the name of the veterinary surgeon	High	Υ		
name of the product	High	Υ		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
batch number	High	Υ		
the date of administration	High	Υ	1	
amount administered	High	Υ	1	
identification of fish treated	High	Υ		
withdrawal period	Medium	Υ		
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significan impact upon the lice levels recorded?	t High	Y		
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	Υ	SSI, 1,4	Cleanerfish currently deployed on site. Impact recorded via weekly sea lice counts.
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	1	
the date of purchase	Medium	Υ	1	
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		SLICE used, doesn't need disposed of as only exact quantity required is ordered in and all used.
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 protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83	
Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments			1	
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	N/A	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?		Υ	Detail if necessary:	
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and	farm manager	nent agreements	or statements	
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?	Low	Υ	SSI 1,5,b CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	SSF only operator within the area. Site managers along with SSF health team/vet communicate and co-ordinate treatments for the area
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the provisions of the NTS ⁶ ?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider: -agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -coordinated monitoring and treatment -co-operation between participating farms	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	
This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine			1	
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?	Low	Υ	SSI 1, 5, c	
3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy?	Medium	Υ	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
For example, the principles of ISLM include: Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD.				
The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice)				
Appropriate discharge consent in place Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary				
Monitoring lice numbers				
Using an array of treatments where possible Treating all stocks on site at the same time				
Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients				
Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and certainly not on the same cohort of lice				

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	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	
within the defined area?	Link	V	O-OD 4 2 70 5 2 42	
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	2011	ľ	1.0.00, 0.0.10	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site	High	Υ	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	
performance against set criteria?				
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	No other APBs farming within the same disease management area
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	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
regarding a sea lice control strategy?				
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined, is there documented evidence	High ¹⁰	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?				
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.100	
synchronously on a single year class basis?	9		1.0.100	
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.101	
assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?				
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures				
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice	High	Υ	CoGP 7.1.8	
control for the site?				
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	V	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High	Y	5.3.53-55	
recording counts	High	Y	1	Once counts complete, data is entered into IT system and the original
	3			paper records are also kept.
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Υ		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Υ		

1111 000, 10101011 10		1000000		Date of 100de. 12/00/2020
Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6	
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this			CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	
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	Y	VMD schedule 5	
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High	Υ		
Refer to section e) of guidance notes			1	
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 fish randomly selected and counted each week from each stocked pen for sea lice count
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in	High	Y	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	peri foi sea lice count
lice recognition and recording?	riigii	ı'	4.0.04 00, 0.0.00 00	
(Cross reference to training records – Section d)			1	
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	Medium	Y	Annex 6	
suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)?				
N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the				
control and reduction of sea lice				
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information	High	Y	Annex 6	
including species and stages observed to be correct?			4	
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		V	4	
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?	Medium	Y		
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate	High	Υ		Slice is only treatment administered.
competent manner?			_	
Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per				
prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations, appropriate product used				
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary	Lligh	V	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	
surgeon for dosage calculation?	High	1	COGF 4.3.131, 5.3.85	
surgeon for dosage calculation:				

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

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
	Power granted under the Act	
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	– section 3 (2) (a)	
·	Power granted under the Act — section 3 (3) (a)	
j. Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)	

- [1] Scottish Statutory Instrument The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008
- [2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture
- [3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be s
- [4] Recording requirements:- for C. elongatus all identifiable stages and for L. salmonis mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)
- [5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately
- [6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS
- [7] FMA = Farm Management Area
- [8] FMS = Farm Management Statement
- [9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement
- [10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18
- [11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate for Caligus elongatus: mobiles; and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis: non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.

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

[12] VMD - The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)

[13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)

Case No:	2022-0097			Date of visit:	28/04/2022	2					
Site No:	FS0616	1		Inspector							
	. 55516			порсою.							
Results Summary	Freq.				Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
	+										
	1										
	+										
	 										
Report Summary				1							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
	06/05/2022										
ECI, CNI, VMD SLA	06/05/2022										
	+										
	+										





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0125Date of Visit28/04/2022Site NoFS0616Site NameNevis B

Case No 20220097 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. 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. There were 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.

q) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

An inspection of treatment administration procedures was carried out. The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No further recommendations 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/FHl/charter





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 28/04/2022

 Site No
 FS0616
 Site Name
 Nevis B

 Case No
 20220097
 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.

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 fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

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

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



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

Case No: 2022-0100			Date of visit: 25/04/2022
Time spent on site:) minutes	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1216 Business No: FB0537	Site Name: Business Name:	Strontian Hatchery Sunart Community Company	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 10.1	Thermometer No:	T310	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 additional inform	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail reas	son below:	

Additional Case Information:


Inspection carried out by supervised by on 25/04/2022. Records checked during site inspection

Eggs collected from wild broodstock, raised then released into Strontian River. Community run restoration project.

2 tanks plus hatchery (4 trays) - only tanks currently stocked. Fish appeared healthy and active.


Fish never treated so no treatment records to check and no medicine held on site.

0 9 V



00

0 9 V



00

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0100		Site No:	FS1216		Insp:	
Date of Visit	25/04/2022		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 supp	cluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3		10	10
IVIOVEITIETIIS OII	Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	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	•	0				0
	Processing owr	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				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpast	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	. 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				
footbaths etc	No		1				1
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		15 LOW

Case No:

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

- 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
- 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emame these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equiv
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspecte
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from

If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.

- 9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when L. salmonis levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

Containment Inspection

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

Site Indoors

If other, detail below:

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

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
2022-0100	Site No: FS1216	
ectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable	e biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can	
(Arada)		
valent)?		=
d? (CoGP Annex 6)		
w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records	are inspected?	
r treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is conside	ered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
the escalation of a sea lice infestation?		
		N Y
		N
		=
iP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
		Y

		_				_						
Case No:	2022-0100			Date of visit:	25/04/2022							
6'' N	E04040											
Site No:	FS1216			Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification								
results cultillary	r req.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp				
								2 11135				
Report Summary				1								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp									
ECI, CNI	04/05/2022	шэр	2 11150									
,												





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0537 DATE OF VISIT 25/04/2022

SITE NO FS1216 SITE NAME Strontian Hatchery

CASE NO 20220100 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 low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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.

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.



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: 2022-0115			Date of visit: 26/04/2022
Time spent on site:	nrs	Main	Inspector:
Site No: FS1280 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Carnan Loch Duart Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.5	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: W-17
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see addition	onal information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	!?		onal information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see addition	onal information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Wildcaught wrasse caught around Uist and Skye stocked at 2%. Mortality since input in September/October 2021 <1%.

Sealice levels have been low since input. Paramove treatments completed in December 2021, January and February 2022. Crop last cycle was harvested early due to persistant high sea lice burdens following consecutive treatments that failed to signflicantly reduce the loads.

Gill scores have been low to moderate and fish are reported to be performing well.

Deadhaul harvests will be done for the site.

Fish were sitting deep in the water but appared to be in good condition and were responsive to feed.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally.

FHI 059, Version 13	}		Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0115		Site No:	FS128	0			
Date of Visit:		26/04/2022]		Inspector(s)	:		
Registration/Author	orisation De	tails						
1. Business/site det	ails summar	y checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
							Υ]
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fi	sh for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities		18		ocked	11	No facilities	inspected	18
Species	SAL	WRA						
Age group								
No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (S				Next Input D	ate (Site)	October 23		•
`	,				_ ` ′			N
If yes, detail:	AGD						,	<u> </u>
Movement Pecard	e							
		or inspection?						
		or mapeonom:					26/11/2010	<u> </u>
·		rectly entered?					20/11/2019	
		•		2				·
				•				
		•		ablo2				N/A
o. Are nealth certific	cates for intit	ductions (outw	itii Ob) avaii	able:				1477
Transport Records	2							
•		ut by (or on bel	half) of the bu	usiness (not u	sing a STB)?			Y
					-			Ÿ
11 yes, 15 there a sys	nem in place	TOI IIIaiiitoilaii	oc or transpo	Tration records	,			
Mortality Records								
•								Y
How are mortaliti	es disposed	of?			Other (detai	l)		
If other detail:	Collected a	at the shorebase	e in bins, upli	ifted by Macdo	nald Haulage	and taken to	whiteshore	cockles.
3. Mortality records	complete an	d correctly ente	ered?					Y
or mortality records		ia corroony orna		(0.06%) Wk14	4· 120 (0 03%)) Wk13· 167	(0.05%) WI	(12· 179
Case No: 2022-0115 Site No: FS1280 Date of Visit: 26/04/2022 Inspector(s): Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? 2. Changes made to details? Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections) Total No facilities IB Facilities stocked IT No facilities inspected IT Species SAL WRA IN Sp		(12. 170						
•	•	/atypical mortal						I N
		• •		//reason:				
, ,	, ,	,	, ,					
6. Any other peaks	in mortality c	luring period ch	ecked?					Y
	Wk34 2020): 2.06%, wk35	: 1.32%, wk3	8: 1.48%. Attr	ibuted to poor	gill health/AG	D - Peroxid	e treatment
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been r	eported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mo	rtality events s	heet.		Y

1. Recent treatments (see comment)? If yes, 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? 8. His osecurity Records 1. Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Ye advantage of the detailed of the business? 9. Ye advantage of the surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Ye advantage of the surveillance of the surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Ye advantage of the surveillance of the surveilla	Treatments and Medicines Reco	rds	
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? 8. Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. Yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	1. Recent treatments (see comment	nt)?	Y
2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. Ye from the detailed of the business? 9. Ye goes a results available for inspection? 9. Ye goes a results available of the safe problems.	If yes, detail:	Г.M.S.	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 9. Yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 7. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	2. Medicines records available for i	nspection?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Y 1 If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. Y 1 If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	·	ctly entered?	Y
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Y 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Yesults of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9 If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9 Y 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	If other, detail:		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If you and the surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	6. Are medicines stored appropriat	ely?	Y
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If you and the surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. Yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).			
2. 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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Biosecurity Records		
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? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	1. Biosecurity records available for	inspection?	Y
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	2. Has the manner and frequency	of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 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? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	3. Has the manner and period in w	hich the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Yelf no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Yelf yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	increased (unexplained) mortality	at the site been included?	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)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	4. Has the action that will be taken	in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	is detected been included and how	and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	5. Has the health status of aquacul	ture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	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 aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	health status, certification if require	d)?	
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 aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).			
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance	6. Have the husbandry and biosect	urity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	transmission of disease been cove	red (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	7. Is documentation available rega	rding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	_		
Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	8. Have the biosecurity procedures	been adequately implemented on site?	Y
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	If no, detail:		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).			
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Results of Surveillance		
3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	1. Has any animal health surveillar	ce been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	2. If yes, are results available for in	spection?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	•		Y
	, ,	ecent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 26/11/2019 - 20/04/2022			
	Records check	ed between: 26/11/2019 - 20/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020	
Case Number:	2022-0115		Site No:	FS1280		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/04/2022		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	
1	Number of supp	ocluding third country pliers	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3		10	0
Wovernonts on	Number of dest		0			10	0
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			
and rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				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 wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		3 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0115	Site No:	S1280
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (includwell as access to suitable biological and/or mechan	ling deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm Y
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	al 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 CoGF	oduring the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salı</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the perio	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or about that records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare problems	Y S? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
•	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levelongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels out in cooperation between participating farms? where fewer populations or part populations are he	N/A
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set action festation?	ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reas	ons. Y
	ge due to predators in the current or previous produ the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	rction cycles? Y Y
f 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 fo	•)
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 be considered under satisfactory measul	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in corres of the Act) egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s	ode but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued b	oy: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/20)20
Case No: 2022-0115	Site No: FS128	5		
Date of Visit: 26/04/2022	Inspector:			
Point of Compliance				
1. Is the farm under inspection located v	within a farm manageme	nt area?	Υ	
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.			
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreeme	nts and Statements		
2. Has a current farm management agre			Y	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in			Y	
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan	it farm management are	a?	Υ	
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far	m site(s) to which it appl	es?	Υ	
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	commencement of the a	agreement or statement?	Y	
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	review?		Y	
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	ement			
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimufarm?	ım health standards for t	ne stocks to be introduced to	o the area or Y	
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina	ation requirements for sto	ocks held in the area or farm	n? Y	
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie	es of fish which may be s	stocked into the area or farm	1? Y	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxin individual farm?	num stocking density of	any pen on any farm in the a	area or the Y	
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang fish farm in the area or the individual fa	-	and disposal of any dead fis	h from any Y	
Arrangements for The Management of	of Sea Lice			
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangem	ents for the sharing of d	ata on sea lice numbers and	I treatments?	
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availa of statement?	bility and the use of med	icines on farms covered by	the agreement Y	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requir		y testing of available treatme	ents for sea	
lice on farms in the area or individual fa				
Does the FMAg/S identify the circun used on farms in the area or individual f		ological controls and cleaner	r fish are to be Y the area? Y	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	gements for synchronous	s treatments on farms within	the area?	
Live Fish Movements				
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circun area or farm?	nstances when live fish r	nay be introduced or remove		
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangor individual farms?	gements for the moveme	nt of live fish on and off site	s in the area	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	idual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoo		
agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s	
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement'	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ?	t on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or so of the FMAg/S?	statement? Y

•	ni 059, version 15							155	ueu by. r	1 11			
	Case no:	2022-0°	115	Site No:		FS1280			Date of v		26/0	04/2022	26/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		30:00	17:0	0:00	 a	Inspecto	or:		ے	VMD No). [12
	Environmental conditions:	'	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1-6	F7-12										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	706g	706g										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Clachbreach FS0892	Clachbreach FS0892										
Ů.	I acility No	1	7										

D4/2022 Additional Sample Information: Dispatched by percussive blow.													
0	l	Total To	ests ass	signed	0	1							

Site No: FS1280

Case No: 2022-0115

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

					0.0/0.1/0			
Case No:	2022-0115	J		Date of vis	sit: 26/04/20)22		
Site No:	FS1280]		Inspect	or:			
Results Summary	Freq.	1			Date of Noti	fication		
,		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd lı
	1							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	02/05/2022							
·								





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0398Date of Visit26/04/2022Site NoFS1280Site NameLoch CarnanCase No20220115Inspector

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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.

Signed:

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: 06/05/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0116			Date of visit: 26/04/2022
Time spent on site:	nrs	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: SS0655 Business No: SB0391	Site Name: Business Name:	Eilean Mhic Eachain Hebridean Oysters	
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	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 detail rea	son below:	

Site has been stocked previously but was fallowed and equipment removed from the water. Site remains fallow but the owner intends to deploy longlines later this year, potentially June 22.

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued	by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0116	Site No:	S0655	
Date of case: 26/	04/2022	Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no	update site summary she	eet)	N
Site Details			
Total No facilities:	0	No fac	cilities stocked: 0
Species N/A			
Age group No shellfish			
Mean fish Wt			
	ntly fallow	Next input date (site)	Summer 2022
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	First PSI		
Any recent increased or atypical m	ortalities? (last 4 weeks):		N/A
If yes, detail:			
e.g. site			
average, max			
per facility			
2. Any increased mortalities? (since la	ast inspection)		N/A
If yes, detail:			
3. How are mortalities disposed of?			Other (detail)
If other detail: Any mortalities would	drop to seabed.		, ,
4. Are there any diseases on your site	۵7		N/A
If yes, detail:			1071
E. Have you experienced prodution of	a cita?		N/A
5. Have you experienced predation of lf yes, detail:	i site!		IN/A
6. Has the site experienced increased	d or abnormal fouling?		N/A
If yes, detail:			
7. Have you observed any invasive sp	pecies on your site?		N
If yes, detail:			
8. Do you have an up to date BMP, a	nd are there any issues?		N
If yes, detail:	ia are there ary locates:		IN .
0. What quantity of anot fall have you	had in the last 12 months	2 (museal sites only):	
What quantity of spat fall have you Site fallow.	nau in the last 12 months	: (IIIussei siles Ulliy).	

					22/21/2						
Case No:	2022-0116	J		Date of vi	sit: 26/04/20	022					
Site No:	SS0655	1		Inspect	tor:						
		_									
Results Summary	Freq.	D ()	- I.		Date of Noti		1.				
		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
	+										
				_							
Report Summary	Dete	la sa	and .								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
PSI	02/05/2022										
	+										
	+										





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0391 Date of Visit 26/04/2022

SITE NO SS0655 SITE NAME Eilean Mhic Eachain
CASE NO 20220116 INSPECTOR

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow. The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated.

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

Signed: Date: 02/05/2022

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 13	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0117			Date of visit: 26/04/2022
Time spent on site:	nrs	Main Insp	ector:
Site No: SS0592 Business No: SB0391	Site Name: Business Name:	Polcrabhacaig Hebridean Oysters	
Case Types: 1 PSI 2	3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: S	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	·	If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail re	ason below:	

Site was stocked more than 6yrs ago. Oysters were moved off for human consumption and has been fallow during this time. All equipment was removed from the site and there are currently no intentions to restock the site in the near future. Site is to be inactivated at the request of the business.

Site may be reactivated in the future and re-puposed as a mussel site.

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued	by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0117	Site No:	SS0592	
Date of case: 26/0	4/2022	Inspector(s):	
Business/site contacts correct? (if no,	update site summary she	eet)	N
Site Details			
Total No facilities:	0	No fa	cilities stocked: 0
Species N/A Age group	-		
No shellfish			
Mean fish Wt			
Next fallow date (site) Current	ly fallow	Next input date (site)	No plans
Date of last inspection: (ECI or PSI):	First PSI		
Any recent increased or atypical mo	rtalities? (last 4 weeks):		N/A
If yes, detail:	(1001 : 110010)		, .
e.g. site			
average, max			
per facility			
2. Any increased mortalities? (since la	st inspection)		N/A
If yes, detail:	•		
3. How are mortalities disposed of?			Other (detail)
If other detail: No mortalities observe	d as site has been fallow	for many years.	Other (dotail)
4 Ana thana and diagram and an annual site.			NIA
4. Are there any diseases on your site of the site of	(N/A
ii yes, detaii.			
5. Have you experienced predation on	site?		N/A
If yes, detail:			
6. Has the site experienced increased	or abnormal fouling?		N/A
If yes, detail:	or abriormar rodning:		14/74
7. Have you observed any invasive sp	ecies on your site?		N
If yes, detail:			
8. Do you have an up to date BMP, an	d are there any issues?		N
If yes, detail:			
O Milest susselfit of the first fall in	and in the class 40 are the	0 (
What quantity of spat fall have you I Site fallow.	iad in the last 12 months	? (ITIUSSEI SITES ONIY):	
ono ranow.			

Case No:	2022-0117			Date of visit:	26/04/2022	2		
Site No:	SS0592	1		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Insp	Phone Da	te of Notifica Insp	tion Writing	Insp	and I
		Dalabase	шър	FIIOHE	шър	vviitiig	шър	2 nd Insp
			-				-	
							=	
							-	
							=	
-	•			•				
Report Summary	Date	Inon	ond I					
Case Type PSI	02/05/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp					





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0391 DATE OF VISIT 26/04/2022
SITE No SS0592 SITE NAME Polcrabhacaig
CASE No 20220117 INSPECTOR

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow. There are no plans to restock the site at this time therefore the status will be changed to inactive and it will be removed from the list of sites that the business is authorised to operate at. Please contact us if the site is to be restocked in the future or transferred to another business.

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

Signed: Date: 02/05/2022

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 13	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0118			Date of visit: 27/04/2022
Time spent on site:	15mins	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0195 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Geirean The Scottish Salmon Compar	ny
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~ .	If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	•		
		Site fallow.	

Site fallow and to be made inactive at the request of the business.

Case No:	2022-0118			Date of visit:	27/04/2022	2			
Site No:	FS0195]		Inspector:		ı			
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
resource Summary		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
								op	
							_		
	ĺ								
D C									
Report Summary	Doto	lnon	ond I						
Case Type REG	Date 02/05/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp						
KLO	02/03/2022								
	1								





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0169
 Date of Visit
 27/04/2022

 Site No
 FS0195
 Site Name
 Loch Geirean

 Case No
 20220118
 Inspector

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow. There are no plans to restock the site at this time therefore the status will be changed to inactive and it will be removed from the list of sites that the business is authorised to operate at. Please contact us if the site is to be restocked in the future or transferred to another business.

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

Signed: Date: 02/05/2022

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 13	!	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0119			Date of visit: 27/04/2022
Time spent on site:	15mins	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS0194 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Upper Loch Tormasad The Scottish Salmon Company	y
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detail	I reason below: Site fallow.	
		Oile failow.	

Site fallow and to be made inactive at the request of the business.

Case No:	2022-0119	1		Data of vi	sit: 27/04/20	22				
Case No.	2022-0119	J		Date of vi	SIL. 27704/20	022				
Site No:	FS0194	FS0194 Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification							
		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd I		
	_									
	+									
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
REG	02/05/2022	-								
	+									
	+									





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 27/04/2022

SITE NO FS0194 SITE NAME Upper Loch Tormasad

CASE NO 20220119 INSPECTOR

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

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow. There are no plans to restock the site at this time therefore the status will be changed to inactive and it will be removed from the list of sites that the business is authorised to operate at. Please contact us if the site is to be restocked in the future or transferred to another business.

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

Signed: Date: 02/05/2022

Fish Health Inspector