FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2022-0044			Date of visit: 10/03/2022						
Time spent on site:	3.5hours	Main	Inspector:						
Site No: FS0316	Site Name:	Setter Voe							
Business No: FB0440	Business Name:	SSF Shetland Ltd							
Case Types: 1 REG	2 VMD 3	4 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 7.1	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-11						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•		nal information/clinical score sheet.						
Clinical signs of disease observ	/ed?		nal information/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet.						
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN							
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit detai	I reason below:							
	Some fish have only been on site since less than 6 weeks.								

Pens 1,7,8 are Migdale stock Pens 4,5,6 are Kames stock

During the site inspection, fish were found to be swimming deep therefore were observed via camera.

Fish are harvested and transferred via deadhaul.

Fish only have been transferred onto site within last couple weeks. High mortality seen in the Kames stock, and attributed to reverse osmoregulatory issues/failed smolts. Pen 5 had the highest mortality on 16/02/2022 (1560, at 3.78%).

No cleanerfish forecast on site.

Remote paperwork inspection conducted by and supervised by on 03/03/2022.

Site inspection conducted on 10/03/2022 by and supervised by

VMD samples taken on 10/03/2022 by and supervised by . Fish sampled were seen to be healthy and exhibited no clinical signs of disease.

	ii 055, version 15					issued by. I Th							
	Case no:	2022-00)44	Site No:		FS0316			Date of Samplin		10/0	03/2022	10/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	11:1	5:00	12:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	15
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Г	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-7	8-12	13-21									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	160g	160g	160g									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
		rd H	hd	hd									
ails		am (5)	am 5)	am '5)									
Details		0 ر 337	0 ر 337	D ر 337									
		Loch Damph (FS0375)	Loch Damph (FS0375)	Loch Damph (FS0375)									
Stock	Facility No	7	ı	8 L									
S	I donity 110	1		U									

03/2022	03/2022 Additional Sample Information:												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020	
Case No:	2022-0044		Site No:	FS0316					
Date of Visit:		10/03/2022]		Inspector(s):			1	
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	iils							
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ		
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ		
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)						
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilitie	s inspected	8	
Species	SAL								
Age group	2022 S1								
No Fish	349,640								
Mean Fish Wt	176g								
Next Fallow Date (S		June/July 20	23	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	January 20	24		
Recent (last 4 wks)		•			Any escapes			N	
If yes, detail:					· ···y cccuped	(, .		
Mayamant Basards									
Movement Records		r inconstion?							
 Movement record Date of last inspec 		inspections					14/07/2021	'	
•		atly antorod?	,				14/07/2021		
3. Are records comp		•						1	
4. Are movement rec								1	
5. Are records comp								Y	
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	uctions (outw	ith GB) avalla	able?				N/A	
Transport Records									
1. Are any movemen					_			N	
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?				
Mortality Records									
1. Mortality records a	available for ii	nspection?						Y	
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)		
If other detail:	When there	are low mort	numbers, moi	rts are taken to	incinerator in	Lerwick			
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y	
4. December of the	lant Auden)			eks of stocking		(0.52%); WI	(7 - 1186 (0.4	9%); Wk6 -	
4. Recent mortality (; Wk5 - 709 (0.	.29%).			V	
5. Evidence of recen		• •		,				Y	
If yes, facility nos/no		facility/no sto	ck per facility	reason:					
Pen 5, 3.98%, 1568;									
	6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								
If yes, detail:				EUIO				N1 /A	
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) i	noπalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A	
If yes, detail action:			0.16					* 1/*	
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A	

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
T.M.S.,	
If yes, detail: Slice	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	<u>'</u>
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<u>'</u>
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
in no, detail.	
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). Reverse osmoregulation, failed smolts	
process summer and an arrangement of the summer and arrangement of the summer arrangement of the summer and arrangement of the summer ar	
Records checked between: 14/07/2021-03/03/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0044		Site No:	FS0316		Insp:	
Date of Visit	10/03/2022		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	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off			1 0			10	
Movements on	Frequency of m Number of dest		0		6	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)	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 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		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	•	0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status						
	Processing fish from Category III farm						
	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	i			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		1
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		5 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0044	Site No:	S0316
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the common of the comm	alent) fallowed synchronously on a single year d in-feed and bath sea lice medications (includ as access to suitable biological and/or mechan	ding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm managemen		and CoGP Farm
Management Area (or equivalent)? 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspecti	on? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
6. Do records adequately reflect the required stand		al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ne suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGF	P during the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period the		ove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health	n Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Y
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is co	nsidered to cause significant welfare problems	s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administere suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elong</i>		s? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable). Have therapeutic treatments or the actions take 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where a lice?	en had a significant impact upon the lice levels in cooperation between participating farms?	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice managemen scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infest		ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks refle	ct sea lice count data? If no please detail reas	sons. Y
Containment Inspection		
Has the site experienced equipment damage du		uction cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the pr	redation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
Double net with If other, detail below:		
other, detail below.		
3. Have escape incidents or events been experier f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to q	uestion 10	ast FHI inspection?
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers'		7
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwi		
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and loca	ar instremes trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	(COGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapee	s? If yes give detail	
3. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed	with local wild fish intercets and was normics	ion given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise		ode but could
be considered under satisfactory measures of 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regard	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	s) Y
10. 10 the site inspected as satisfactory with regard	to to containment: If no, please detail leason(<u>, </u>

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0044	Site No: FS0316	
Date of Visit: 10/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located If N, no further questions require compl	_	Y
ii iv, no further questions require compr	euon.	
2. Has a current farm management agr3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ir4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or staten	ed? Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimularm?	gement um health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci-	ation requirements for stocks held in the area es of fish which may be stocked into the area mum stocking density of any pen on any farn	a or farm?
	gements for the storage and disposal of any arm?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	of Sea Lice nents for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availar of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cov	rered by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requilice on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circur used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and farms?	d cleaner fish are to be
	gements for synchronous treatments on farn	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circur area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced o	r removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger individual farms?	gements 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 acceptable I	harvest practices on farms in the area or ind	lividual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restocked 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	which the area or individual farm will be fal ed? e or more year classes may be stocked onto odstock or potential broodstock are to be ke	sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Managen 24. Does the farm management agreemen parties to the agreement?	nent Agreements Only nt include arrangements for persons to beco	ome, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and op 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	perated in accordance with the agreement of the FMAg/S? Issu No. 3 - 23/11/2	

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0044			Date of visit:	10/03/2022			
6'' N	500040							
Site No:	FS0316			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
results cultillary	r req.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
						J		2 11135
	-							
Damant Communic								
Report Summary	Date	Inon	and Image					
Case Type REG, VMD	14/03/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp					
INEO, VIVID	14/03/2022							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0440
 DATE OF VISIT
 10/03/2022

 SITE NO
 FS0316
 SITE NAME
 Setter Voe

 CASE NO
 20220044
 INSPECTOR

CASE NO 20220044 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 second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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



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

FHI 059, Version 13	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020		
Case No: 2022-0046			Date of visit: 01/03/2022		
Time spent on site:	20mins	Main Inspec	etor:		
Site No: SS0785 Business No: SB0490	Site Name: Business Name:	Head of Banks, Orphir Sinclair Mussels			
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA:		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry					
	Site	e Fallow.			

Site has been fallow for several years and CE lease has been revoked. Site and business to be deregistered.

No movements on or off the site since authorisation. No mortalities or production from the site and no aquaculture equipment was visible on the site at the time of inspection.

Case No:	2022-0046			Date of visit:	01/03/2022						
Cita Na.		1									
Site No:	SS0785			Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notifica	otification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary	1			1							
Case Type REG	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
REG	01/03/2022										





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0490 Date of Visit 01/03/2022

SITE NO SS0785 SITE NAME Head of Banks, Orphir

CASE No 20220046 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 and no aquaculture equipment was visible on the site at the time of inspection. There are no plans to stock the site at this time and so the site is to be deregistered.

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

Signed: Date: 07/03/2022

•

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0050		Date of visit: 14/03/2022
Time spent on site:	Main Inspector:	
Site No: FS0877 Site Name: Business No: FB0379 Business Name:	Drimsallie Mill River Lochy Association	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3	5 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 6 Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations: Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N	ation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Wild restocking site. Wild smolts are trapped from three river catchments, then grown into adults with a marine diet in freshwater tanks. These are operated as captive broodstock and they are stripped two to three times before culling. The eyed ova are then released back into the wild.

Mowi vets are available for health surveillance if needed.

Some of the eggs from the batch currently on site were released two weeks ago, the remaining ova are held for possible future broodstock.

Occasional salt treatments for fungus post stripping. No treatments in the past 12 months.

Site inspection done on 14/03/22 by , observed by . Fish on site looked healthy, stocked in low densities.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0050		Site No:	FS0877				
Date of Visit:		14/03/2022]		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Autho			:4				V	
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	•	cnecked by s	ite representa	itive?			Y	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fie	h for all sect	ione)					•
Total No facilities	e cicalici lis	27	Facilities sto	cked	13	No facilitie	s inspected	27
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL			TTO TOOMING	I	
Age group	2022	2021	Broodstock					
No Fish	20,000	8,000	300					
Mean Fish Wt	0.1g	10g	2kg					
	ung	···g	g			No current	plans to inpu	t stock in
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	2022.		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? N/A N/A						Y N/A N/A N/A		
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	tation records?	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities					Other (detail)			
If other detail:		y small numb						
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (•		Eggs - 1,300)				
5. Evidence of recer								N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								
If yes, detail action:	antal base	n anta al ta Etil	215	data:la «	-liht-			N1/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ропеа то ЕНГ	r it no, enter o	uetails on mort	ality events sh	ieet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	V				
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y				
If yes, detail:					
Phenoxyeth					
anol used					
for					
If other, detail: anaesthesia 2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A				
Niedicines records available for inspection? Are records complete and correctly entered?	14//				
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N/A				
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	1				
If other, detail:					
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y				
o. Are medianes stored appropriately.					
Biosecurity Records					
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y				
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any					
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y				
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease					
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y				
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y				
health status, certification if required)?					
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y				
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?					
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y				
aquaculture animals held on site?					
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y				
If no, detail:					
Results of Surveillance					
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N				
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	1				
3. Any significant results?					
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).					
in yes, detail (ii flot detailed drider reserv disease presierite).					
Records checked between: 06/02/2019 - 09/03/2022					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0050		Site No:	FS0877		Insp:	
Date of Visit	14/03/2022		No of m	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	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0			14	
Movements off	Frequency of m	povements off	<u> </u>	3	6	10	3
Wovernerits on	Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		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 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 was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ī			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				
code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		10 LOW
Platform access to cages			2		Total Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0050	Site No:	FS0877
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only		
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problem	is in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	year class basis?
	cenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (is well as access to suitable biological and/or med of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	gement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins6. Do records adequately reflect the required	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) d standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L . sa 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the per	<i>Imonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 o iod that records are inspected?	r above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
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	h is considered to cause significant welfare prol	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
•	nistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonia</i> elongatus is considered to have welfare implications.	
11. Has any other action been taken (where	applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action	ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice	levels recorded?
	d out in cooperation between participating farm	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site sea lice?	, where fewer populations or part populations a	re held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manag scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	ement procedure with waypoints describing set infestation?	t actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
•	age due to predators in the current or previous p	production cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	Y Y
Bird netting,		
If other, detail below:		
•	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since t	the last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No sk	• •	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Min		4.47)
·	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5 and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they ex	•
o. have these been reported to the 33FO at	id local listielles dusts fordiwidi (where they ex	ist)? (COGP = 4.4.57, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail	
9 If all note were deployed was this action	agrood with local wild fish interests and was	mission given by Castlish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	agreed with local wild fish interests and was per	
	nimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	In code but could
be considered under satisfactory measu		(a)
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	rson(s)

-								
Case No:	2022-0050	J		Date of visit:	: 14/03/2022	2		
Site No:	FS0877	1		Inspector				
Cho Ho.		J		mopeotor.				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	+							
	 							
	1							
	+							
	+							
	+							
	+	-						
	_							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	17/03/2022							
	+							
	+							
	1							
	1							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0379

DATE OF VISIT 14/03/2022

SITE NO FS0877

SITE NAME Drimsallie Mill

Case No 20220050 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 Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Date: 17/03/2022

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/

59, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
No: 2022-0051		Date of visit: 11/03/2022
spent on site:		Main Inspector:
	lame: Linnhe ess Name: Mowi Scotland Li	td
Types: 1 REG 2	3 4	5 6
Temp (°C):	nometer No:	FHI 045 completed N/A
rvations: Reg	n: HI Water type:	S CoGP MA M-33
weak/abnormally behaving fish p al signs of disease observed? pathology observed? ostic samples taken?	If yes, see a	additional information/clinical score sheet. additional information/clinical score sheet. additional information/clinical score sheet.
REG only - if unable to carry out ir	nded visit detail reason below:	
	Site inspection not possible due to Co	vid-19
r Temp (°C): The requirement of	n: HI Water type: sent? If yes, see a If yes, see a If yes, see a	S CoGP MA M-33 additional information/clinical score sheet. additional information/clinical score sheet. additional information/clinical score sheet.

WRA wild and farmed from Anglesey

No mortality uplift this cycle.

The site can get a high freshwater influx during spate spells, salinity can drop to 18ppt in the first 3m. This does not seem to affect the cleanerfish as they can sit lower in the water column until the salinity condition improves.

Remote inspection done on 11/03/2022 by , observed by

Site inspection not possible due to Covid-19.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ıe: 12/05	5/2020
Case No:	2022-0051]	Site No:	FS0240	0				
Date of Visit:		11/03/2022	2		Inspector(s)):			
Registration/Autho			'	-ti2			N/	_	
Business/site deta Changes made to	_	checked by s	site representa	ative?			Y	4	
2. Changes made to	details?						Y		
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)						
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	N/A	
Species	SAL	WRA			1				
Age group	Q4 2021	Mixed							
No Fish	988,942	33,025			1				
Mean Fish Wt	1.1kg	80g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	July 2023		Next Input D	ate (Site)	Semptem	ber 2023		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?			Y Any escape	s (since last	visit)?		N
If yes, detail:	Furunculosis	in wrasse, tr	reating with Flo	orocol.					
Movement Records									NI/A
1. Movement record		r inspection?					00/04/0004		N/A
2. Date of last inspec							28/04/2021	_	81/0
3. Are records comp		•							N/A
4. Are movement re				?					N/A
5. Are records comp		•							N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?					N/A
Transport Records									
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?				N
If yes, is there a syst									
Mortality Records									
Mortality records a	available for i	nepection?							V
2. How are mortalities		•			Ensiled - on	cito		_	
If other detail:	s disposed o	1 :			Erisilea - ori	SILE			
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					_	Y
o. Mortanty records	somplete and	correctly error		Veek 6: 695 (0	07%) week	7· 805 (0 089	%) week 8: 0	02 (0.09	0/6)
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			47 (0.13%). W	* *	•	0), WEEK 0. 3	02 (0.03	70),
5. Evidence of recen	•	typical morta		17 (0.1070). **	TO Clast 4 Wee	, 1,200.		$\overline{}$	N
If yes, facility nos/no		* 1		//reason:				_	
,,,		,,,,,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period cl	necked?					T	N
If yes, detail:	,								
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				Т	N/A
If yes, detail action:									
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	rtality events s	sheet.		T	N/A

Treatments and Me	dicines Reco	Treatments and Medicines Records				
1. Recent treatments	s (see comme	ent)?	Y			
	`	Florfenicol,				
If yes, detail:		T.M.S.				
	Cleanerfish					
	treatment					
	Florocol -					
	furunculosis					
If other, detail:			· ·			
2. Medicines records			Y			
3. Are records comp			Y			
4. Are fish in a withdo			Y			
5. If yes, what treatm	ient(s)?	Florfenicol, T.M.S.				
If other, detail:						
6. Are medicines sto	red appropria	tely?				
Biosecurity Record						
Biosecurity record		·	Y			
		of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y			
	•	which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any				
	-	at the site been included?	Y			
		n in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease				
		w and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y			
	•	ulture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y			
health status, certific	ation if require	ed)?				
	•	curity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y			
transmission of disea	ase been cove	ered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?				
7. Is documentation	available rega	arding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y			
aquaculture animals	held on site?					
8. Have the biosecur	rity procedures	s been adequately implemented on site?	Y			
If no, detail:						
Results of Surveilla	ance					
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveilla	nce been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y			
2. If yes, are results	available for in	nspection?	Y			
3. Any significant res	sults?		Y			
If yes, detail (if not de	etailed under	recent disease problems).				
Furunculosis in wras	se.					
	Pacarde chack	ved hetween: 28/04/2021 - 11/03/2022				

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0051	Site No:	FS0240
3. Does the site have access to a range of licer	uivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single yenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (inc rell as access to suitable biological and/or mech	luding deltamethrin,
	ment agreement or statement relevant to the sit	te and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspe	ection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) tandard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels belo records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteria for treatment in the Co	GP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> . 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	onis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or a d that records are inspected?	bove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish He 9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. s considered to cause significant welfare proble	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
suggested criteria for treatment or where C. eld	tered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis leaded</i> is considered to have welfare implication	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried o	taken had a significant impact upon the lice level but in cooperation between participating farms? There fewer populations or part populations are	Y
	nent procedure with waypoints describing set actes festation?	ctions to deal with recognised Y
•	eflect sea lice count data? If no please detail re	easons.
	e due to predators in the current or previous pro e predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minister 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for the following states that the second states in the second states are second so that the second so that the second states are second so that the second states are second so that the second so that the second states are second so that the second states are second so that the second so the second so that the second so the second so the second so the second so the secon	•	17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	pees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minim be considered under satisfactory measure	reed with local wild fish interests and was perminise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in es of the Act) gards to containment? If no, please detail reaso	code but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0051	Site No: FS0240	
Date of Visit: 11/03/20	22 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance	duithir a famous ann an an an a	
 Is the farm under inspection locate N, no further questions require com 		Y
ii iv, no futurer questions require con	ipietion.	
2. Has a current farm management a3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish to	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statem	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Man 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum?	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 farm	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 Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	nt of Sea Lice ements for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	pers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the ava of statement?	ailability and the use of medicines on farms cover	ered by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any red lice on farms in the area or individual	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available farms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circused on farms in the area or individual	cumstances under which biological controls and al farms?	I 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 circurates or farm?	cumstances when live fish may be introduced o	r removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra or individual farms?	angements for the movement of live fish on and	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 acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	ividual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoci 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto roodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke	sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only ent include arrangements for persons to beco	me, 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	operated in accordance with the agreement or of the FMAg/S? 07/01/2022	statement?

		_				_			
Case No:	2022-0051			Date of visit:	11/03/2022				
Site No:	FS0240			Inspector:					
Results Summary	Eroa	Date of Notification							
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
		Database	шэр	1 Hone	шэр	vviiding	шэр	2 Insp	
Report Summary				1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
REG	17/03/2022								





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 11/03/2022

 SITE No
 FS0240
 SITE Name
 Linnhe

 Case No
 20220051
 Inspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The paperwork for the above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009. On this occasion, the site inspection could not be conducted. The site inspection will be rescheduled later in the year.

Records

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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



Signed: Date: 17/03/2022

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter
R10

FHI 059, Version 13	ls	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2022-0052			Date of visit: 08/03/2022				
Time spent on site:	N/A	Main Inspect	or:				
Site No: FS1317 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Rum Mowi Scotland Ltd					
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	5	6				
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed N/A				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA None				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	-	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							
Site visit not possible due to weather.							

Remote inspection done on 08/03/2022 by , observed by

Recent high mortalities due to CMS. Harvesting targeted for worst affected pens. All events reported to FHI.

Stock from Hellisay. Mowi made the decision to transfer the fish to Rum in order to fallow Hellisay to avoid stocking the site during winter/poor weather conditions. Risk assessment completed prior to transfer. Lumpfish farmed at Otterferry, input in October.

Some issues with Caligus in summer due to high numbers of wild fish, regular Alphamax treatments to keep it under control. Site avoids stocking smolts during this period.

The farm is not currently part of a CoGP management area, however they had prepared a satisfactory farm management statement and this was available for inspection.

Site inspection not possible due to weather.

FHI 059, Version 13		Issu	ued by: FHI		Date of	of issue: 12/0)5/2020
Case No: 202	22-0052	Site No:	FS1317]			
Date of Visit:	08/03/202	2		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authorisa	ation Details						
1. Business/site details	summary checked by	site representa	ative?		Y		
2. Changes made to det	tails?				Y		
Site Details (include cl	leaner fish for all sec	tions)					
Total No facilities	12	Facilities sto	ocked	3	No facilities inspe	ected N/A	
Species SA	L LUM		T				
Age group Q4	2020 2021	1					
No Fish 116	6,605 15,292						
Mean Fish Wt 4.9	,						
Next Fallow Date (Site)			Next Input Da	ite (Site)	August 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) dise	ase problems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:						_	
Movement Records							
Movement records av	vailable for inspection?	,					N/A
2. Date of last inspection	·				09/07/	/2019	
3. Are records complete		12				1	N/A
4. Are movement record	•		>				N/A
5. Are records complete							N/A
6. Are health certificates	•		able?				N/A
Town and Decoude							
Transport Records	wis deather (or on b	to also as the bu	in and the	CTD\2			NI
1. Are any movements of				_			N
If yes, is there a system	in place for maintenai	nce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records							
1. Mortality records avail	•						Y
2. How are mortalities di	isposed of?			Ensiled - on s	site		
If other detail:							
3. Mortality records com	plete and correctly en	tered?					Y
				* *	,680 (1.12%), weel the past 4 weeks: 6		38%),
4. Recent mortality (last	4 wks):	WOOK O 1,2.	0 (0.0470). 23	in thortainly in a	no paot 4 modici.	, IIOII.	
5. Evidence of recent inc	•	alities?					Y
If yes, facility nos/no mo	• •		//reason:				
CMS	, man, p 2	у пред таке					
6. Any other peaks in me	ortality during period o	hecked?					Y
	ortalities over the thres		MS throughout	the months of	December 2021 a	nd January-I	March
	22. All reported to the		vio anoughou.	the months of	December 252	na oanaar, .	Vicion
7. Have increased (unex			o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,						
-	s' been reported to FH	l? If no. enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.		
If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspection?		Y
Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S.		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and	•	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Mi	nisters 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 s		
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to S		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)?		
		V
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between		Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, ed	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to mai	ntain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on	site?	
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
	If of the business?	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on beha	ir or, the business?	'
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		T V
3. Any significant results?		1
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). CMS identified as main cause of mortality. Mild to moderate PGD.		
·	1 - 08/03/2022	
Necords checked between. 14/10/2	- 00/03/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0052	Site No:	S1317
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in to 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equival). Does the site have access to a range of licence.	alent) fallowed synchronously on a single year	
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well can these be deployed in a reasonable period of t	as access to suitable biological and/or mechan	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manageme Management Area (or equivalent)?	nt agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm N/A
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspect 6. Do records adequately reflect the required stan		al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below trecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	he suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGF	P during the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmoni</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period th		ove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Healt	h Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Υ
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is co	onsidered to cause significant welfare problems	s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N
 Have therapeutic treatments been administere suggested criteria for treatment or where C. elong 		
 Has any other action been taken (where applied) 	cable)?	N/A
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions tak	ken had a significant impact upon the lice levels	s recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out	in cooperation between participating farms?	N/A
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, whe sea lice?	re fewer populations or part populations are he	eld without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice management scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infes		ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks refle	ect sea lice count data? If no please detail reas	sons.
Containment Inspection		
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage d	ue to predators in the current or previous produ	uction cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the p	redation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
Tension nylon		
f other, detail below:		
 Have escape incidents or events been experie 	nced on or in the vicinity of the site since the la	ast FHI inspection?
f Yes proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to	question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers	?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthw	ith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17	7)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and loc	al fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	(CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escape	es? If yes give detail	
3. If gill nets were deployed was this action agree Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	d with local wild fish interests and was permissi	ion given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise	the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in co	ode but could
be considered under satisfactory measures	of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regar	ds to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0052	Site No: FS1317	
Date of Visit: 08/03/2022	2 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located If N, no further questions require comp		N
Points of Compliance for Both Farm 2. Has a current farm management agr 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	n Management Agreements and Statement reement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared inspection? Internet farm management area? Internet site(s) to which it applies? Internet for commencement of the agreement or state	red?
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	gement num health standards for the stocks to be intr	roduced to the area or
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	nation requirements for stocks held in the are sies of fish which may be stocked into the are imum stocking density of any pen on any far	ea or farm?
	ngements for the storage and disposal of any arm?	y dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	of Sea Lice ments for the sharing of data on sea lice num	nbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms co	vered by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of availab arms?	le treatments for sea
	ımstances under which biological controls ar	nd cleaner fish are to be
	ngements for synchronous treatments on far	ms within the area?
area or farm?	imstances when live fish may be introduced	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran or individual farms?	ngements for the movement of live fish on ar	nd 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 acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restock	by which the area or individual farm will be fallo ked? he or more year classes may be stocked onto s	
agreement or statement?	oodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	
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 becon	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and o 26. What is the version no/date of issue o	operated in accordance with the agreement or of the FMAg/S?	statement?

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0052			Date of visit:	08/03/2022			
Site No:	FS1317			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Eroa			Do	te of Notifica	tion		
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	and Image
		Database	шэр	1 Hone	шэр	vviiding	шэр	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	17/03/2022							
I								





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0119 DATE OF VISIT 08/03/2022
SITE NO FS1317 SITE NAME Rum

CASE NO 20220052 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The paperwork for the above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009. On this occasion, the site inspection could not be conducted. The site inspection will be rescheduled later in the year.

Records

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

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.

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



Signed: Date: 17/03/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

R10

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of iss	sue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0054			Date of visit: 22	2/03/2022
Time spent on site:	nrs	Mair	n Inspector:	
Site No: FS0696 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Fiunary Scottish Sea Farms I	Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 7.3	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 complete	d
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	CoGP MA:	M-35
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additi	ional information/clinical score ional information/clinical score ional information/clinical score	e sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Fish came on from Barcaldine Smolt Unit via Fishnish. Input at Fiunary in wk21 2021. Four treatments have been conducted since input: Salmonsan and Azasure in May/June 21, Alphamax and Paramove in September 21. Fish are performing better this year and have good gill scores and low lice numbers. CMS has been confirmed by PCR and histology samples taken in January 22, but not causing significant mortalities.

Wildcaught wrasse were input in June 21 and have been performing well to keep lice numbers low. Original input was 24,900 (6,150 mortalities since input (24%).

Site using Optomease this crop as anaesthetic for sea lice counts (alternative to Tricaine). Active ingredient is Benzocaine.

Site is doing live haul harvests. Harvesting is ongoing and fish are taken to South Shian for processing.

Fish were sitting deep in the cages but those that were observed appeared active and in good condition, with the exception of a few individuals who had lesions on their flank. These fish were also quite active and were not moribund, so no attempt was made to remove them with a handnet.

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:	2022-0054		Site No:	FS0696	5			
Date of Visit:		22/03/2022	3		Inspector(s):			ı
Registration/Autho								_
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	J
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis					_		
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	16
Species	SAL	WRA						
Age group	20S0	Wildcaught						
No Fish	389, 253	18,750						
Mean Fish Wt	3.2kg	150-200g						
Next Fallow Date (S	•	August 22		Next Input Da	_ ` ′	March/Apr		
Recent (last 4 wks)		ems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	CMS							
Movement Records	S							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							14/11/2019	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement red		•		•				Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried out	by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	f?			Biogas - Bark	кiр		
If other detail:			d uplifted by B	illy Bowie.				
3. Mortality records of				,				Y
	·		Wk7: 561 (0	.13%) Wk8: 1,	008 (0.23%), \	Nk9: 1,012	(0.24%), Wk	10:691
4. Recent mortality (,		(0.16%)					
5. Evidence of recen								N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	Thortainty du	g poriod of	10011001					
7. Have increased (u	unexplained) i	nortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2.1230 20	portou te					
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: Optomease	
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)? Optomease	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Diagonyiés Pagarda	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	V
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ý
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	<u> </u>
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?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). CMS detected by PCR and Histo in Ja	n 22.
Pocorde checked between: 14/11/2010 15/02/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0054		Site No:	FS0696		Insp:	
Date of Visit	22/03/2022		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	
·	Number of sup	ocluding third country pliers	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	10
Wovernents on	Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	5 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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0]			0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
		rfrom 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	s 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		Το	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator	<u> </u>			_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	1			
					Total Rank		16 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0054	Site No: FS	50696
3. Does the site have access to a range of	lems in the previous 4 years? (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (includ as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical	ling deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm ma Management Area (or equivalent)?	anagement agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for	r inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) ired standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	s below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP	o during the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L.</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the	. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above period that records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
	ish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. which is considered to cause significant welfare problems	N/A N
•	Iministered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis leve C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, car	ere applicable)? ctions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels rried out in cooperation between participating farms? site, where fewer populations or part populations are hel	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice mar scenarios during the escalation of a sea I	nagement procedure with waypoints describing set actio lice infestation?	ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on sto	ocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reaso	ons. Y
	amage due to predators in the current or previous produinst the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	ction cycles? Y Y
f Yes proceed with questions $4 - 9$. If No 4. Have these been reported to Scottish No 5. Have these been reported to local DSF	• •)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover	escapees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18 9. What action was taken to prevent and be considered under satisfactory mea	minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in co	ode but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0054	Site No: FS0696	
Date of Visit: 22/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located v	vithin a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.	
2. Has a current farm management agree 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for insumer 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimulation for Fish Health Managements for	t farm management area? m site(s) to which it applies? commencement of the agreement or state review? ement m health standards for the stocks to be intention requirements for stocks held in the are es of fish which may be stocked into the are num stocking density of any pen on any far	roduced to the area or ea or farm? ea or farm? em in the area or the
Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	of Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice nun	nbers and treatments?
of statement?	bility and the use of medicines on farms co	
Does the FMAg/S identify any requir lice on farms in the area or individual far	rements for the sensitivity testing of availab	ole treatments for sea
	nstances under which biological controls ar	rms within the area?
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	gements for synchronous treatments on far	rms within the area?
area or farm?	nstances when live fish may be introduced gements for the movement of live fish on a	
or individual farms?	,	

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 indivi	idual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoo		
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto si	ites covered by the
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement	roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept ?	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	e, 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 s of the FMAg/S? Nov-22	tatement? Y

	al 059, version 13		issued by: FHI										
	Case no:	2022-00	054	Site No:		FS0696			Date of vis		22/0	03/2022	22/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling:	ні			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		80:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No). [20
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	_	5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	3.2kg	3.2kg	3.2kg									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	ت Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328)	Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328)	Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328)									
Ű,	Tracinty No	J	U	14									

Additional Sample Information: Dispatched by percussive blow. Total Tests assigned Total Tests assigned Dispatched by percussive blow.	500, vc	1000, 10000 10													
Dispatched by percussive blow.	03/2022 Ad	3/2022 Additional Sample Information:													
Total Tests assigned 0	Dis	Dispatched by percussive blow.													
Total Tests assigned 0															
Total Tests assigned 0															
Total Tests assigned 0															
Total Tests assigned 0															
Total Tests assigned 0															
Total Tests assigned 0	_														
	0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													
		0 Total Tests assigned 0													
															1
															1
			l												

Case No:	2022-0054			Date of visit:	22/03/2022						
Site No:	FS0696]		Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	ition					
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
			-								
							-				
							-				
			-								
							-				
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	28/03/2022										





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 22/03/2022

 Site No
 FS0696
 Site Name
 Fiunary

 Case No
 20220054
 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.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 28/03/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0055			Date of visit: 22/03/2022
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: FS1320 Business No: FB0571	Site Name: Business Name:	Glenforsa Hatchery Benmore Estate Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	5	6
Water Temp (°C): 6.4	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	·	N If yes, see additional in	formation/clinical score sheet. formation/clinical score sheet. formation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Triploid trout fry came on from Ae fishery in September 21 @ 5.9g. A batch of trout ova also came onto the site from Ae in January 22. Site not currently authorised to hold Brown Trout.

Trout are ongrown and released into a nearby loch (Loch Bearnach) for angling as part of the estate. Loch is not currently registered as a fishery. Stocking consent will need to be sought. Transport records for the movements are also required to be recorded.

Salmon ova are stripped from adults caught on the river Forsa, ongrown in tanks and then released back into the same river catchment.

Fish on site were active in the tanks and no moribunds or mortalities were observed in any of the tanks.

Water through the site is sourced from the River Forsa. It is directed through a header tank before being distributed into the holding tanks. No treatment on intake or discharge

No medicines have been used on the site since it was authorised.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0055		Site No:	FS1320				
Date of Visit:		22/03/2022	3		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?	·					Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		21	Facilities sto	cked	5	No facilitie	s inspected	21
Species	SAL	TRO	TRO				<u> </u>	
Age group	22S1	2021	Fry					
No Fish	350	4,135	7,340					
Mean Fish Wt	25g	150g	<1g					
Next Fallow Date (S		No plan.	- · · g	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Next catch		
Recent (last 4 wks)		•			Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:	<u>'</u>				, ,		,	
Movement Records								V
1. Movement record		r inspection?					Cinat la anasat	Ť
2. Date of last inspe		() 10	_				First Inspect	
3. Are records comp								N NI/A
4. Are movement re								N/A
5. Are records comp		•		- h-1 O				N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vitn GB) avalla	adie?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records'	?			N
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Domestic wa	ste - <25kg		
If other detail:					•			
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	·		s observed in	the last month			
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	typical mortal						N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:			1	
	•	·	· · ·					
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					Y
16 1.6.2				nning of Augus	st 21. These w	ere attribute	ed to nearby f	orestry
If yes, detail:			creased run c					
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N/A
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N/A
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		N/A
Biosecurity Records	يو.	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, reco	•	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify S		
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the pres		V
is detected been included and how and when that will be n		Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stock	ted on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	T
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemen	oted between each enidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff,		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in pla	· · ·	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	200 to mamam the physical contaminent of	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implen	nented on site?	N
	authorisation. This species has not been included in the E	BMP.
Results of Surveillance	<u>_</u>	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or	or on behalf of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		
3. Any significant results?		
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems)		
Records checked between:	31/07/2018 - 22/03/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0055		Site No:	FS1320		Insp:	
Date of Visit	22/03/2022		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	18	26	
GP 60.65	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0			14	0
NA						10	6
Movements off	Frequency of m Number of dest		0			10	3
Exposure via water	Trainiser er deet	Site contacts	0				
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through					
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		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0				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				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		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
	No		2				0
				•			
					Total Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0055	Site No:	FS1320
	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or me d of time?	
Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins6. Do records adequately reflect the required	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? ((Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. sali</i> , 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or od that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish F 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare probability.	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
suggested criteria for treatment or where C. e	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> elongatus is considered to have welfare implications and the salmonis	
•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice I	
	out in cooperation between participating farms where fewer populations or part populations ar	
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set nfestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
	ge due to predators in the current or previous purched the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	•
Pest control Tanks covered If other, detail below:		
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since to to question 10	he last FHI inspection?
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis		4.47)
·	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5. d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action at Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was peri	mission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini be considered under satisfactory measured.	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered res of the Act)	in code but could
	egards to containment? If no, please detail rea	son(s) Y

Case No:	2022-0055			Date of visit:	22/03/2022						
Site No:	FS1320	1		Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
,	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
			-								
		-									
Report Summary				1							
Case Type ECI, CNI	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI	31/03/2022										
Case completion	08/04/2022										





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0571 Date of Visit 22/03/2022

SITE NO FS1320 SITE NAME Glenforsa Hatchery

Case No 20220055 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 found to be inadequately maintained.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were not available for inspection.

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 inadequately maintained and implemented.

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

- Site has stocked Brown trout without prior authorisation. An authorisation amendment application (found here: <u>Aquaculture Production Business (APB)</u>: forms and <u>quidance-gov.scot (www.gov.scot)</u>) should be submitted to the FHI requesting the addition of Brown trout as a species held on the site. This application should be accompanied by a revised biosecurity measures plan (BMP) for the site, taking into consideration the risks associated with stocking this species in terms of disease introduction and spread, and detail any biosecurity measures that will be implemented to mitigate these risks.
- Transport records for the transfer of Brown trout from Glenforsa Hatchery to Loch Bearnach were not available for inspection. Movements of fish from the site to the Loch must be recorded. Historic movements should be collated and submitted to the FHI.
- Loch Bearnach is currently being stocked with Brown trout from Glenforsa Hatchery for recreational fishing. As such, it is required to be registered as a stocked fishery and an application to register the loch (found here: Registration of a stocked fishery (FIS): forms and quidance - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)) should be submitted to the FHI. Additionally, stocking consent is required to be sought from Marine Scotland prior to the introduction of freshwater fish and ova to inland waters.
- Movement records for the movement onto site of Atlantic salmon broodstock for stripping, or ova that have been stripped on the riverbanks of the River Forss, must be recorded. Details should include the beat of the river where the broodstock were caught or a grid reference.

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Date: 31/03/2022

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/

R04





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0571 Date of Visit 22/03/2022

SITE NO FS1320 SITE NAME Glenforsa Hatchery

CASE NO 20220055 INSPECTOR

Case completion report

Issues were raised in relation to the above case, with a requirement for records unavailable for inspection to be submitted by 30 April 2022. The required records have now been provided to Marine Scotland.

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

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

Signed: Date: 08/04/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0056			Date of visit: 23/03/2022
Time spent on site:	rs	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0209 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Scallastle Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.2	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-35
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving for Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry of	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Fish came on in March 21 from Barcaldine Smolt Unit and have been performing well since input.

Wildcaught wrasse and lumpfish from Ireland are stocked in the cages and are reported to have been performing well in keeping lice numbers low on the Salmon stock. 2.9% mortality since input.

Only 2 sea lice treatments done on site since input. SLICE treatment in April 21 and Azasure treatment in June 21. A peroxide treatment was conducted in November 21 for gills.

Average adult female Leps across the site for the period 01/09/21 to 13/03/2022 was 0.06. Caligus across the site for the same period was 1.25.

Site does live haul harvests to South Shian. Harvesting is currently ongoing across the site to manage stocking density.

Seals are present around the site in high numbers, however the site hasn't experienced any damage from predators this cycle. Sealpro nets are on half the cages and STAR nets are on the other half of cages on the site. Site manager reported that the site intends to replace the STAR nets with Sealpros before next crop comes on.

Fish were sitting deep in the water so were difficult to observe. Fish that were observed appeared active and in good condition. A few individuals were noted across the site with physical damage. These fish were not moribund and so were not attempted to be caught using a handnet.

FHI 059, Version 13	1		Iss	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0056]	Site No:	FS0209				
Date of Visit:		23/03/2022	2		Inspector(s)):		ı
Registration/Author	orisation Det	tails						
1. Business/site det			site represen	tative?			Y	1
2. Changes made to	•	,	J.1.0 1.0 p.1.000	154			Y	j
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fi	sh for all sec	tions)					
Total No facilities		16	Facilities st	tocked	16	No facilitie	es inspected	16
Species	SAL	WRA	LUM			110 100		
Age group	20S0	Wildcaught						
No Fish	567,957	11,644	25,600					
Mean Fish Wt	3.5kg	87g	50g					
Next Fallow Date (S		September :		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Decembe	r 22	
Recent (last 4 wks)					Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						,	,	
5. Are records comp6. Are health certificTransport Records1. Are any movemeIf yes, is there a sys	cates for intro s nts carried or	oductions (outv	with GB) avai	ousiness (not us	•			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Biogas - Ba	-		
If other detail:				at the shorebase	e uplifted by l	oilly bowie ar	nd taken to ba	ırkip biogas.
3. Mortality records	complete and	a correctly ent		(0.000() \\	00 (0 000() 1	MI 0 005 (0	050() 14/1 40	1
4. Recent mortality	(last 1 wks):		VVK7: 140 ((0.02%), Wk8: 3	38 (0.06%),	WK9: 285 (0.	.05%), WK10:	313 (0.05%).
5. Evidence of recei		atypical morta	alities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		tv/reason·				
11 you, rading 1100/110	7 mortality po	1 Tability/110 Ott	sor por raome	1971040011.				
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality d	uring period c	hecked?					l N
If yes, detail:		31						
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	eported to FH	I? If no, ente	r details on mort	tality events	sheet.		N/A

1. Recent treatments (see comment)? If yes, detail: T.M.S. f 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)? f other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? T.M.S. Fisher of the content of t							
f 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)? 7 tother, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? 7 Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 7 Y 8 J 8 J 9 J 9 J 9 J 9 J 9 J 9 J							
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)? 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? 7. M.S. 8. 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							
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? 7. 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							
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? f other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Provided the stored appropriately? Siosecurity 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							
T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. Y T.M.S. T.M.S. T.M.S.							
f 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							
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? Y 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any							
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 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							
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? Y 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? Y 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any							
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 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							
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							
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any							
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?							
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?							
3. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?							
f no, detail:							
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).							
Records checked between: 22/09/2021 - 14/03/2021							

FHI 059, Version 13	059, Version 13 Issued by: FHI				Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0056		Site No:	FS0209		Insp:	
Date of Visit	23/03/2022		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		C	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or		C	9	18	26	
	compartment including third country Number of suppliers		C			14	5
Movements off	Frequency of movements off		C	3	6	10	10
Wovernents on	Number of destinations		C			10	3
Exposure via water Site contacts			0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	C				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream 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	С	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	С				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	3			
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by- products	Site's own wast	e only processed.	C				0
	Common proce	sses with other farms	3	5			
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	C				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	5			
Biosecurity	•	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	C	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes		C				0
	No		1	1			
CoGP/Regulator				,			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes		C				0
	No		3	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes			7			0
	No		2				
				4	_		
					Total Rank		HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0056	Site No:	FS0209
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fall 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	lowed synchronously on a single y and bath sea lice medications (inc	cluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreen Management Area (or equivalent)?	nent or statement relevant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Leg6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard spec	•	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the sugge records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	sted criteria for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that Y
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) number 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that recorder	•	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspect 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered		N/A N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is constant that any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a sum of	onsidered to have welfare implicat significant impact upon the lice le ation between participating farms?	vels recorded?
15. Is there a site specific written lice management proceduscenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	ure with waypoints describing set a	actions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice	e count data? If no please detail re	easons. Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to precedure to the precedure of th		
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or lift Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 14. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisherical fields).	e 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 Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of the considered under satisfactory measures of the Act	of further escapes? (Not covered into	n code but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0056 Site	No: FS0209	
Date of Visit: 23/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located within	n a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require completion		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Man	agement Agreements and Statements	
2. Has a current farm management agreeme		
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspec		Y
Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant far Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm sit	_	Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of com		ent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review	•	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manageme	nt	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum he	ealth standards for the stocks to be intro	duced to the area or Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	requirements for stocks held in the area	or farm?
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of	•	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum	stocking density of any pen on any farm	in the area or the
individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	ents for the storage and disposal of any	dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual farm?	sino for the otorage and diopodal of any t	acad non none any
Arrangements for The Management of Se	ea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements	for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability	and the use of medicines on farms cover	ered by the agreement
of statement?		
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requiremed lice on farms in the area or individual farms?		treatments for sea Y
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstar		cleaner fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual farms		
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangement	ents for synchronous treatments on farm	cleaner fish are to be Y s within the area? Y
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstar area or farm?	nces when live fish may be introduced or	removed from the Off sites in the area
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	ents for the movement of live fish on and	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 h	narvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restocked 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	which the area or individual farm will be fallo ed? or more year classes may be stocked onto so odstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Managen 24. Does the farm management agreemen parties to the agreement?	nent Agreements Only nt include arrangements for persons to becor	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and op 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	perated in accordance with the agreement or the FMAg/S? Nov-22	statement?

Case No:	2022-0056			Date of visit:	23/03/2022			
Site No:	FS0209]		Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp		Insp	2 nd Insp
	↓							
	 		-					
	+							
	†							
	 		-					
	+							
	1							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI	28/03/2022	Пор	2 IIISP					
	1							
	 							
	+							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 23/03/2022

 Site No
 FS0209
 Site Name
 Scallastle

 Case No
 20220056
 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 every year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, 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: Date: 28/03/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/202						
Case No: 2022-0057				Date of visit: 23/03/2022						
Time spent on site:	1hr		Main Inspector	r:						
Site No: SS0483 Business No: SB0251	Site Name: Business Name:	Soriby Bay Isle of Ulva Oyst	ters							
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4	5	6						
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:			FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA:						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see a	additional inforn	nation/clinical score sheet. nation/clinical score sheet. nation/clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below: Site fallow.										

Site has changed ownership in recent years and is now owned by the community of Ulva.

The site has been left in disrepair following the transfer of ownership. There are several empty trestles on the foreshore which are all heavily fouled with seaweed. No bags were observed on any of the trestles on the foreshore, however, not all trestles could be inspected due to the tide height.

The site contact was unsure whether the site would be redeveloped as planning permission needs to be sought. The option of deregistering the site was discussed and the manager will contact the FHI once a decision has been made about the future of the site.

The movement book for the site has been misplaced during the handover, however the site manager confirmed that no movements on or off the site have taken place since the last inspection. A new movement book was left with the site manager in the event the site becomes operational again.

FHI 059, Version 1	3		Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0057		Site No:	SS0483	3			
Date of Visit:		23/03/2022	2		Inspector(s)):		
Registration/Auth	orisation Det	tails						
1. Business/site de	tails summary	checked by s	site represent	ative?			Υ	7
2. Changes made	to details?						N]
Site Details (inclu	de cleaner fis	sh for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		85	Facilities sto	ocked	Unsure.	No faciliti	es inspected	~50
Species	N/A							
Age group	N/A							
No Fish	N/A							
Mean Fish Wt	N/A							
Next Fallow Date (Unsure.		Next Input D	ate (Site)	Unsure.		
Recent (last 4 wks		olems?			N Any escape	s (since last	: visit)?	N
If yes, detail:							,	
4. Are movement r 5. Are records com 6. Are health certifi Transport Record 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a sy	nplete and corricates for intro ls ents carried ou	rectly entered' ductions (outv ut by (or on be	? with GB) avail chalf) of the bu	able? usiness (not us	•			N/A N/A N/A
Mortality Records	;							
Mortality records How are mortality		•						N/A
If other detail:	late and	-						NI/A
Mortality records Percent mortality		a correctly ent	erea?					N/A
4. Recent mortality		ot mical marta	litica?					N/A
Evidence of rece If yes, facility nos/r		• •		//reason:				IN/A
11 yes, radiity 1103/1	io mortality po	1 Taomity/110 St	on per raomi,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
6. Any other peaks If yes, detail:	in mortality du	uring period cl	hecked?					N/A
7. Have increased	(unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported t	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action								
8. Have 'mortality e	events' been re	eported to FHI	1? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events s	sneet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
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?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 16/05/2018 - 23/03/2022	

Case No:	2022-0057			Date of visit:	23/03/2022	2				
Site No:	SS0483	1		Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	-	1		te of Notifica					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
	1									
							-			
	1									
							-			
							-			
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
REG	28/03/2022									





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0251
 Date of Visit
 23/03/2022

 Site No
 SS0483
 Site Name
 Soriby Bay

 Case No
 20220057
 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.

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: 28/03/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13	l:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2022-0063			Date of visit: 16/03/2022					
Time spent on site:	1	Main Inspec	etor:					
Site No: FS0237 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Gorsten Mowi Scotland Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 7.2	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed N/A					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-33					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:						

Wrasse mixed farmed from Anglesey and wild from Northern Ireland.

FHI 059, Version 13			Iss	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0063]	Site No:	FS0237				
Date of Visit:		16/03/20	22		Inspector(s):			ı
Registration/Author	orisation Det	ails						
1. Business/site det	ails summary	checked b	y site represent	tative?		Ī	Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?					į	N	1
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	sh for all se	ections)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities st	ocked	12	No facilities	inspected	12
Species	SAL	WRA	LUM					
Age group	2021 Q3/4	Mix	Mix					
No Fish	982,020	26,496	23,307					
Mean Fish Wt	1.15kg	100g	80g					
Next Fallow Date (S		April 2023		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	November 2	2023	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob			Y	Any escapes	s (since last vi	isit)?	N
If yes, detail:			ted on site, san	nples taken on		-	_	available.
Movement Record	s							
1. Movement record	ls available fo	or inspection	n?					N/A
2. Date of last inspe		•				T.	01/12/2021	
3. Are records comp		ectly entere	ed?			-		N/A
4. Are movement re		•		?				N/A
5. Are records comp								N/A
6. Are health certific		-		lable?				N/A
Transport Decords								
Transport Records			6\6 + -		in a CTD\2			NI/A
1. Are any moveme								N/A
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place	tor mainten	ance of transpo	ortation records) ?			N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti		•			Ensiled - on	site		•
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly e	entered?					Y
•	·	•		0.23%, wk9 0.3	34%, wk8 0.19	9%. wk7 0.339	%. Cleanerfi	sh mortality
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):			September 202				,
5. Evidence of recei	•	atypical mo						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		y/reason:				
,	71		•					
6. Any other peaks	in mortality di	ırina period	checked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities	been reported t	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		р.т.оч					
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to F	HI? If no. enter	details on mor	tality events s	heet.		N/A
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					,			

Treatments and Med	dicines Records	
1. Recent treatments	(see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
	available for inspection?	Y
•	ete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdra	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Y
5. If yes, what treatme	ent(s)? T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stor	ed appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records		
•	s available for inspection?	Y
	nd frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
	nd period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ed) mortality at the site been included?	Y
	will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	uded and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
	tus of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certifica	ation if required)?	
		V
	ry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	1
	se been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	V
	available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	1
aquaculture animals l	_	
If no, detail:	ty procedures been adequately implemented on site?	- 1
ii iio, detaii.		
Results of Surveilla	nca	
recounts of our contain	alth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
•	available for inspection?	
3. Any significant resu	•	·
	tailed under recent disease problems). Gill challenge in October 2021, seal dar	mage
ii jos, actaii (ii fiot ac	on change in october 2021, 3cardar	nago
R	ecords checked between: 01/12/2021 - 16/03/2022	

П	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	uea by: i	гпі			
	Case no:	2022-00	063	Site No:		FS0237			Date of Samplin		16/0	03/2022	16/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	_	₉ . HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	15
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Ш	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	1.8kg	1.8kg	1.5kg									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Loch Garry	N Loch Garry	ത Loch Garry									
S	l acility 140	I	2	U									

03/2022 Additional Sample Information:													
0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0063		Site No:	FS0237		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/03/2022		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	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0			14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0			10	10
iviovements 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		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		26 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0063	Site No:	S0237
3. Does the site have access to a range of licen	the previous 4 years? ivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year ced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (includ ll as access to suitable biological and/or mechan	ding deltamethrin,
can these be deployed in a reasonable period o	-	
 Is there a signed documented farm managem Management Area (or equivalent)? 	ent agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspe- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required sta	ction? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) andard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGF	P during the period that Y
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	nis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or abo that records are inspected?	ove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Hea	alth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is	considered to cause significant welfare problems	s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	ered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levengatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications	
11. Has any other action been taken (where app	licable)?	N/A
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions t	aken had a significant impact upon the lice levels	s recorded? N/A
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried ou	it in cooperation between participating farms?	N/A
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where site?	ere fewer populations or part populations are he	eld without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice managemescenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infe	ent procedure with waypoints describing set actions station?	ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks re	flect sea lice count data? If no please detail reas	sons. Y
2 t t		
Containment Inspection	dua ta mandatana in tha annount an annoisme mande	vetien evelee
	due to predators in the current or previous produ	iction cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the	predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
Top nets, tension		
f other, detail below:		
	innered on our in the visinity of the city cines the la	est Elli increstion?
	ienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the la	ast FHI inspection?
f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministe		7)
	with (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
b. Have these been reported to the SSPO and it	ocal fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	(COGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail	
If all note were deployed was this action agree	ed with local wild fish interests and was permissi	ion given by Scottish
5. If gill fiels were deployed was trils action agre Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	ed with local wild fish interests and was perfilless	ion given by Scottism
, ,	se the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in co	ode but could
be considered under satisfactory measures		
•	ards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s) Y
and the inepotion to outsidelery will regu		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0063	Site No: FS0237	
Date of Visit: 16/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance	within a form management area?	
 Is the farm under inspection located N, no further questions require comp 	_	Y
in it, no farator questione require comp	101011	
 Has a current farm management agr Is the current FMAg/S available for in Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far 	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or statem	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum farm?	gement um health standards for the stocks to be intro	duced to the area or
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	ation requirements for stocks held in the area ies of fish which may be stocked into the area mum stocking density of any pen on any farm	or farm?
	gements for the storage and disposal of any or arm?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	of Sea Lice nents for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	pers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cove	ered by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requilice on farms in the area or individual fa	irements for the sensitivity testing of available arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circulused on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and farms?	cleaner fish are to be
	gements for synchronous treatments on farm	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circularea or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or	r removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran or individual farms?	gements for the movement of live fish on and	I 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 acceptabl	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoo 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	sites covered by the
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 becon	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 of the FMAg/S? 26/08/2021	statement?

Case No:	2022-0063	J		Date of visit	16/03/2022	2				
Site No:	FS0237	1		Inspector						
	1 55251	J		mopeotor						
Results Summary	Freq.				Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
	+									
	-									
	+									
	1									
	+									
		<u> </u>								
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	17/03/2022									
	+									
	+									





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0119 Date of Visit 16/03/2022 Site No FS0237 Site Name Gorsten

Case No 20220063 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:

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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



Signed: Date: 17/03/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12	2/05/2020			
Case No: 2022-0064				Date of visit: 28/03/20	022			
Time spent on site:	1hr		Main Inspector	:				
Site No: SS0547 Business No: SB0358	Site Name: Business Name:	South Ardnaclach Creran Oysters	n Farm					
Case Types: 1 REG	2 3	4	5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 7	Thermometer No:	Site	_	FHI 045 completed	Y			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								
Height of the tide too high at the time of visit.								

Site was restocked in 2021. Currently 30% of the site is empty. Planning to restock with more stock if there is enough supply later in 2022.

Not all trestle tables were able to be inspected due to tide height. In addition, thermometer was not functioning so site thermome

FHI 059, Version 1	3		ls	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/0	5/2020
Case No:	2022-0064		Site No:	SS054	17				
Date of Visit:		28/03/2022]		Inspector(s):				
Registration/Auth	orisation Det	tails							
1. Business/site de			ite represe	ntative?			Υ	1	
2. Changes made	to details?						Υ	1	
Site Details (inclu	ide cleaner fi	sh for all sect	ions)						
Total No facilities	ide cicarior in	500	Facilities s	stocked	350	No facilitie	s inspected	6	
Species	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI	CGI	OED	<u> </u>	1	
	Aug-Sept	May & Sept		Mar-21	Graded	Sep-17			
	2017	2018			harvest				
Age group					stock				
No Fish	11,500	10,510	40,000	93,000	45,000	500			
Mean Fish Wt	85	80	55	25	100	50			
Next Fallow Date (ongoing cycl	е	Next Input I		July 2022			
Recent (last 4 wks) disease prob	olems?			N Any escapes	(since last	visit)?		N
If yes, detail:									
 Movement record Date of last insp Are records cond Are movement response cond Are records cond Are health certifit Transport Record	ection: nplete and correcords availal nplete and corrected icates for intro	rectly entered? ble for dead fis rectly entered? ductions (outw	h and wast vith GB) ava	ailable?	oring a OTDVO		27/04/2021	Ē	Y N/A N/A N/A
1. Are any movem If yes, is there a sy									
Mortality Records									
1. Mortality records		•							Y
2. How are mortali					Other (detail)				
If other detail:				or potholes and	l paths.				V
3. Mortality records	•	d correctly ente							Y
•	4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Since Jan 2022: 3180 dead shells CGI. No OED mortality.								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:									
if yes, facility nos/r	no mortality pe	r racility/no sto	ck per tacii	iity/reason:					
6. Any other peaks	in mortality d	uring pariod of	ookod2					_	N
If yes, detail:	III mortality d	uning period cr	icckeu!					-	10
7. Have increased	(unexplained)	mortalities he	en reported	to yet or FHI2				_	N/A
If yes, detail action		Thortainles be	сптеропес	a to vet of Till!					14//
8. Have 'mortality		eported to FHI	? If no, ente	er details on mo	ortality events sh	eet.			N/A

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Treatments and Me		
If yes, detail: If other, detail:		•

1. I COCITE d'Cadificille	3 (300 001111110	ine).						
If yes, detail:								
If other, detail:								
2. Medicines records		•						
Are records comp		•						
4. Are fish in a withd	•							
5. If yes, what treatn	nent(s)?							
If other, detail:								
6. Are medicines sto	red appropria	itely?						
Biosecurity Record 1. Biosecurity record 2. Has the manner as 3. Has the manner as increased (unexplain 4. Has the action that is detected been inc 5. Has the health stath health status, certific	Is available for and frequency and period in vined) mortality at will be taker luded and howatus of aquacus	of mortality removal which the APB will n y at the site been inc n in the event that th w and when that will ulture animals being	otify Scoluded? ne prese	ottish Ministers ence or suspici tified to Scottis	on of the presence h Ministers?	fessional of any e of a listed disease		Y
6. Have the husband transmission of dise 7. Is documentation aquaculture animals 8. Have the bioseculf no, detail:	dry and biosed ase been cov available rega held on site?	curity measures impered (movement of arding the measures	staff, vis s in plac	sitors, equipme e to maintain t	ent, live or dead fi	sh etc.)?		Y
Results of Surveilla 1. Has any animal ha 2. If yes, are results 3. Any significant results If yes, detail (if not details)	ealth surveilla available for i sults?	inspection?		on behalf of, t	he business?		E	N
-	Records check	ked hetween:		27/04/2021-28	3/03/2022			
	CCCOIGS CITEC	ACG DCLWCCII.		21/07/2021-20	3/00/2022			

Date of issue: 12/05/2020 FHI 059, Version 13 Issued by: FHI Case Number: 2022-0064 Site No: SS0547 Date of Visit 28/03/2022 Inspector: Number of Susceptible species on site If no susceptible species present = LOW risk Yes If susceptible species present, score for each pathogen No 25 Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED) 0 25 0 Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED) 3 3 Susceptible to OsHV (CGI) 0 3 1 2-5 >6 Sites within a tidal excursion Site contacts Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion 0 2 10 Live shellfish movements 0 1-2 >3 Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS 0 5 10 Movements on Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country 0 10 20 Number of suppliers 0 5 10 5 Movements off Frequency of movements off within MSS Management 2 0 2 1 Frequency of movements off outwith MSS Management 0 6 3 0 Number of destinations Secure Unsecure Management (effluent (no effluent None practices treatment) treatment) Water contacts with Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS depuration facilities management area 0 2 0 Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within 0 2 6 2 MSS management area Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management 0 4 8 0 area Number of sites 2 or 3 > 4 **Biosecurity** Contacts with other Sites operating from single shorebase Sites sharing staff and equipment sites

Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc

Yes

0

Total Risk No

0

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0064			Date of visit:	28/03/2022			
O'(N	000547	1						
Site No:	SS0547			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
,	· ·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
REG	04/04/2022							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0358 Date of Visit 28/03/2022

SITE NO SS0547 SITE NAME South Ardnaclach Farm

CASE NO 20220064 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The height of the tide prevented the inspection of all units on above site. The epidemiological units that were examined, were inspected in in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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.

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/04/2022

R14

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: 2022-0065			Date of visit: 30/03/2022					
Time spent on site:	1hr	Main Inspec	etor:					
Site No: FS0268	Site Name:	Tervine						
Business No: FB0456	Business Name:	Dawnfresh Farming Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ESC	2 3	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed N/A					
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	Y If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet.					
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		ormation/clinical score sheet.					
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet.					
Diagnostic samples taken?		N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Site visited to acquire some more information regarding the site and the potential escape of RTR in Loch Awe. The average weight of fish on site ranges from 350g to 3.5kg.

Site manager explained the harvest procedures on site. Fish are pumped onto a raft which features the stunner machinery. Fish are stunned and then collected in harvest bins. Any bloodwater is contained by a deep tray below the harvest machinery. Next harvest is scheduled for May/June 2022.

ROV has been on site looking at pens with fish of similar size to farmed fish caught in the loch. No holes were observed. Still up The procedure usually takes approximately 45 minutes per pen. The ROV is placed into the pen and dives down into the centre, hovering above the mort sock. The integrity of the mort sock is checked and it is ensured that the weight inside the mort sock is also attached. Subsequently, the ROV operator picks a point on one of the net panels and begins to move the ROV to the surface of the panel. In this manner the whole panel is covered multiple times as the ROV is required to scan the whole panel. The image quality of the ROV is good and holes in the net would easily be seen. In addition, the operator has highlighted that any previously sewn seams are checked to ensure no ruptures have occurred.

It has been highlighted that routine checking of the nets occurs prior to any grade or harvest, and the ROV is used every time these checks occur.

Grading is conducted when fish are 1kg. The pipes used during the grading process are cling filmed to increase stability of pipes, as well as reduce any change of escape. In addition, a net is attached to the hopper to ensure no fish are able to escape. Once the fish have been graded from one pen, the fish are transferred into their permanent holding pen via the swimthrough method. The swim-through is conducted by sewing a net into panels of the two pens. The panels are then release and the fish are able to swim from one pen to the other. This reduces handling and stress. No crowding occurs.

Mortality on site has been very low. PKD was identified in fish last summer in 2021.

The nets that are used on site are Dyneema, where the oldest nets are approximately 5 years old. Recently, there has been a large amount of nets that have been replaced within the last year. Net strength was reported as 108kg/square.

-								
Case No:	2022-0065	l		Date of visit:	30/03/2022	2		
Site No:	FS0268	1		Inchester:				
Site No.	1 30200	J		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	ition		
,	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	<u> </u>	.						
	 	-						
	+							
	Ì							
Damant Commercia								
Report Summary	Dete	la sa	ond .					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ESC	26/04/2022							
	<u> </u>							
	1							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0456
 Date of Visit
 30/03/2022

 SITE No
 FS0268
 SITE Name
 Tervine

 Case No
 20220065
 Inspector

Escape Investigation

The site was inspected following reports of farmed rainbow trout being observed in Loch Awe.

All epidemiological units were inspected.

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

The site has been recommended for an enhanced containment inspection and this will be conducted in due course.

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

Signed: Date: 26/04/2022
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2022-0066			Date of visit: 30/03/2022				
Time spent on site: 4h	irs	Main Inspecto	r:				
Site No: FS0875 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Walters (East Lismore) Scottish Sea Farms Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 VMD	4 SLI 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-36				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	son below:					

Additional Case Information:

A previous site inspection was scheduled for the 22/03/2022, but due to bad weather was cancelled. Therefore, a REG case was assigned (2022-0021). All the paperwork was collected for that case on 17/02/2022. A new date was set to reschedule the cancelled site inspection; paperwork dating back to the 17/02/2022 was collected prior to the new inspection date on the 30/03/2022. Therefore, case 2022-0066 depicts the data collected from the 17/02/2022 to the 22/03/2022.

The recent low level mortality has been attributed mostly to predation from seals. Indirect affects of seal predation are seen through mortality attributed to physical damage.

Wrasse mortality has been very low. Wrasse were input onto site prior to salmon in October 2021. The wrasse have been feeding and swimming deep. From week 7 to 11, no wrasse mortalities were recorded.

Site thermometer used as inspectors thermometer did not work.

Remote paperwork inspection conducted by on 22/03/2022 and supervised by Site inspection conducted by and on 30/03/2022.

VMD sampled by on 30/03/2022.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0066]	Site No:	FS0875]			
Date of Visit:		30/03/2022	3		Inspector(s):			i
Registration/Author								
 Business/site deta 	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	i
Site Details (include	e cleaner fis	h for all sect						
Total No facilities		9	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilities	s inspected	9
Species	SAL	WRS						
	2021 Q3	Wild caught						
Age group								
No Fish	299,596	7,567						
Mean Fish Wt	1.4kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	Dec/Jan 202	2	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	October 20)23	
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Mayamant Dagarda								
Movement Records							ĺ	V
Movement records		r inspection?					47/00/0000	I
2. Date of last inspec							17/02/2022	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement red								N/A
5. Are records comp		•						N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	its carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	em in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records?	?			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Incinerated -	on site		
	Ash to local							
3. Mortality records of			ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (I	•	concomy one		Vk11: 0.11%, 3	815: Wk10 0 1	11% 331. \\	/kg n 27% 8	03· Wk8
5. Evidence of recen		typical mortal		VK11. 0.1170, 3	113, WK 10, 0.1	1 70, 551, 77	K5, U.21 70, U	N
If yes, facility nos/no		••		/reason:				
ii yes, lacility 1105/110	mortality per	Tacility/110 Sto	ick per racility/	ricason.				
6. Any other peaks ir	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	• ′		·					
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
T.M.S.,	
If yes, detail: Slice	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S., Slice	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	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	1
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	1
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	'
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
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?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
in you, detail (in not detailed direct recent disease problems).	
Records checked hetween: 17/02/2022-22/03/2022	

Add Fish/Pools - click	
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling 11:00:00 11:30:00 Inspector: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total	22 30/0
starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Add Fish/Pools - click	
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Add Fish/Pools - click	10
Add Fish/Pools - click	
	Samples
Pool/Fish No	
Fish nos 1 2	
Pool Group	
Species SAL SAL	
Average weight 1.4kg 1.4kg	
Sex N/A N/A	
Water Type SW SW	
Stock Details Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328) Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328)	

03/2022	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0		Total To	ests ass	ianed	0	1					
	•			.5							

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0066		Site No:	FS0875		Insp:	
Date of Visit	30/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	٥	18	26	0
Species .	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
							40
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	3
Exposure via water	Ivalliber of des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	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					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
	iamis apstream	Tot within I take exception	'	7	<u> </u>		
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	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of					
	equivalent state	us n from Category III farm	4				
	_	r from Category ∀ farm	8	-			\vdash
			10]			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		16 MEDIUM
					Nank		MEDION

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of iss	sue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0066		Site No:	FS0875	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites On 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems.)				N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (n a single y	vear class basis?	Y
3. Does the site have access to a range of azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) can these be deployed in a reasonable po	of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice med as well as access to suitable biological	lications (in	cluding deltamethrin,	Υ
4. Is there a signed documented farm ma Management Area (or equivalent)?		ant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm	Y
5. Are sea lice count records available for	r inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		Υ
6. Do records adequately reflect the requ		•	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)		ent in the C	oGP during the period that	Υ
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L</i> . 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the		evel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	N
f yes, have these been reported to the Fi	•			N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level w	•		·	N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been ad suggested criteria for treatment or where	C. elongatus is considered to have welf			Υ
11. Has any other action been taken (who		4h Ii I		N/A
 Have therapeutic treatments or the action Are treatments, where conducted, car 				Y
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the sea lice?		_		Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice man scenarios during the escalation of a sea I	• •	cribing set a	actions to deal with recognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on sto	ocks reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ase detail r	easons.	Y
Containment Inspection				
Has the site experienced equipment da	amage due to predators in the current or	previous pr	roduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate agai	nst the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	·)	Υ
Bird nets, Seal				
oro nets, tension				
nets If other, detail below:				
Totalor, dotain polow.				
3. Have escape incidents or events been	experienced on or in the vicinity of the	site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No				
4. Have these been reported to Scottish N		4427 57	1 17)	
 Have these been reported to local DSF Have these been reported to the SSPC 				
o. Have these been reported to the Sor C	o and local lishenes trusts for this time (whe	ire triey exis	si): (COOF = 4.4.57, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover	escapees? If yes give detail			
3. If gill nets were deployed was this action Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18		id was perm	nission given by Scottish	
9. What action was taken to prevent and	minimise the risk of further escapes? (N	ot covered i	in code but could	
be considered under satisfactory mea				
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory w	ith regards to containment? If no, please	detail reas	on(s)	Υ

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued	by: FHI	Date of i	issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0066	Site No: FS087	5		
Date of Visit: 30/03/2022	Inspector:			
50/00/2022	mopeotor.			
Daint of Committee				
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located v	vithin a farm manageme	ent area?		V
If N, no further questions require comple	_	int area:		T
Points of Compliance for Both Farm I				V
Has a current farm management agreIs the current FMAg/S available for in	· ·	viAg/S) been prepared?		Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan	•	a?		Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm				Y
Does the FMAg/S identify the date ofDoes the FMAg/S identify the date of		agreement or statemen	t?	Y
7. Does the FMAg/3 identity the date of	Teview:			
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag				
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimu farm?	m health standards for t	he stocks to be introdu	ced to the area or	Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina	tion requirements for st	ocks held in the area or	farm?	Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie	•			Y
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxin individual farm?	num stocking density of	any pen on any farm in	the area or the	Y
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	•	and disposal of any dea	ad fish from any	Υ
fish farm in the area or the individual fa	r m ?			
Arrangements for The Management o				
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	ents for the sharing of d	ata on sea lice number	s and treatments?	Υ
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availal	bility and the use of med	dicines on farms covere	d by the agreement	Y
of statement?				V
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requir lice on farms in the area or individual far		ly testing of available tre	salments for sea	Y
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum		ological controls and cl	eaner fish are to be	Υ
used on farms in the area or individual f				
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	ements for synchronou	s treatments on farms v	vithin the area?	Υ
Live Fish Movements				
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum area or farm?	istances when live fish	may be introduced or re	moved from the	Υ
area or farm: 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	gements for the movement	ent of live fish on and of	ff sites in the area	Y
or individual farms?				

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 1	12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable ha	arvest practices on farms in the area or ir	ndividual farms?	
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by a date when a farm or area may be restocked 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brook covered by the agreement or statement?	d? or more year classes may be stocked on	to sites covered by the	
Point of Compliance for Farm Manageme 24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?		come, or cease to be, N/A	
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and ope 26. What is the version no/date of issue of t		or statement?	

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0066			Date of visit:	30/03/2022			
Site No:	EC0075	1		l				
Sile No.	FS0875	J		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.							
		Database	Insp		te of Notifica Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, VMD, CNI, SLI	04/04/2022							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0125 Date of Visit 30/03/2022

SITE NO FS0875 SITE NAME Walters (East Lismore)

CASE NO 20220066 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Marine Scotland website at https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the

Date: 04/04/2022

charter/