

Case No:  Date of visit:

Time spent on site:  Main Inspector:

Site No:  Site Name:

Business No:  Business Name:

Case Types: 1  2  3  4  5  6

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

Observations: Region: WI Water type: S CoGP MA: W-8

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

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Investigation following report of escape of 12 fish on 4/2/18 (incident number MSe040218SAL1). No health issues on site at time of escape.

Staff were conducting a sea lice treatment with Salmosan using a fully enclosed tarpaulin. The weather conditions were very good, with good visibility in the water. The nets are 15m deep to the baseline and a total of 27m deep to the bottom of the cone where the uplift system sits. The nets are weighted using the Froya ring system.

The fish are treated for 3.5 hours and while one cage is being treated, staff will prepare the next cage. The net is lifted to the baseline and the centre of the net is also lifted slightly to allow the tarpaulin to be put in place. The uplifts are stitched into place and there is an extra net panel in the centre of the base of the net to provide further strength.

During the treatment a sled holding the oxygenation system is placed in the cage (approx 200Kg in weight) after the net has been raised. It is lowered into the cage from one of the boats and pulled across to the centre of the cage by ropes under tension so that it does not drag on the net. It is held in place by ropes, suspended in the centre of the cage.

Cage 7 was the fourth cage treated that day. Approximately 2.5 hours into the treatment the manager noticed 6 fish swimming between the net and the tarpaulin. The net was dropped and a camera was placed into the cage. A hole was seen at 23m depth on the base of net, approximately 2m out from the double mesh area in the centre of the base. Using the camera, the weighted brailer net was lowered over the hole to prevent further escapes in the interim.

Twelve fish were observed outside of the net before the hole was covered. Visibility was approx 8-9m. The manager also spent an hour at the top of the Gina Mary looking for signs of activity outside the cage, but nothing observed. Feeding response in the cage the following day was excellent.

Divers were unable to repair the net that day as they are not allowed to enter the water within 24 hours of a Salmosan treatment. The divers visited the site the following day and repaired the hole which was L shaped and 32 mesh x 32 mesh in size (18mm mesh net).

Due to the shape of the hole it is not thought to have been caused by a seal. The site manager thinks that the tear may have been caused either by the oxygenation sled or during net washing the previous day. The nets are usually checked before treatments, but the divers were not available between cleaning and treating at the weekend. The net was last checked by the divers on 23 January. The net will be replaced during next routine change when a larger mesh net is required. Net washing is carried out by a dedicated MH team based at Seaforth using kit installed on the boat. The manager checked the sled for any damage or sharp areas that may have caught on the net, but nothing obvious was observed.

Unable to conduct site inspection element of enhanced inspection due to weather.

Case No: **2018-0030** Site No: **FS0502**  
 Date of Visit: **14/02/2018** Inspector(s): **ALW**

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

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

**Site Details**

Total No facilities	<b>8</b>	Facilities stocked	<b>8</b>	No facilities inspected	<b>0</b>
Species	<b>SAL LUM</b>				
Age group	<b>2017 Q4</b>	<b>Adult</b>			
No Fish	<b>1,424,000</b>	<b>~100,000</b>			
Mean Fish Wt	<b>0.325-1.25Kg</b>	<b>Mixed</b>			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<b>Spring 2019</b>		Next Input Date (Site)	<b>Autumn 2019</b>	

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

**Movement Records**

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. Date of last inspection: **04/10/2016**  
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**  
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

**Transport Records**

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

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**  
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Ensiled - on site**  
 If other detail:   
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**  
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **w/b 15/1/18 - 2,902, w/b 22/1/18 - 1,508, w/b 29/1 - 1,664, w/b 5/2 - 1,357**  
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**  
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:   
  
 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**  
 If yes, detail:   
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**  
 If yes, detail action:   
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **N/A**

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?

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**

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?

2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?

3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any *increased (unexplained)* mortality at the site been included?

4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and *how* and *when* that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?

5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?

6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

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:

Case No:  Site No:

Date of visit:  Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
---------------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

**ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)**

**a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures**

1.1. Have escape incidents or events <sup>1</sup> been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? <b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b>		Y		MSe040218SAL1 on 4/2/18
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH Regs <sup>4</sup> 31D,E	Notified Outer Hebrides Trust
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO <sup>2</sup> and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail		N		
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9	

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

General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1		
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-					
			Facilities	Moorings	Nets
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Y	Y	HDPE nets
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A	N/A	Y	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y	
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	Y	Y	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
e) Each inspection including i) the name of the person conducting the inspection ii) the date of each inspection iii) the place of each inspection iv) the outcome of each inspection f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	Low Medium Low High High	Y Y Y Y N/A	Y Y Y Y N/A	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of: i) The mesh size ii) The code which appears on the identification tag iii) The place of use, storage and disposal iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Medium Medium Medium Low	Y Y Y Y	SSI, 2,2	
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of: i) The date of construction ii) The material used in construction iii) Its dimensions	Low Low Low	Y Y Y	SSI, 2,3	Rings on cages with details
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of- i) The date of installation ii) The design and weight of the anchors iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low Low Low	Y Y Y	SSI, 2,4	
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5	
2.6 A record of- a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	Medium High	N/A N/A	SSI, 2,7 SSI, 2,11 (a) SSI, 2,11 (b)	No incidents
Pen and mooring systems 2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings? 2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed? 2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines? 2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)? 2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High High High High High	Y Y Y Y Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13 CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14 CoGP 4.4.10 CoGP 4.4.11 CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	Mainly done by MH staff

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	Plastic coated
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	
<b>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Training on containment and escape at manager/assistant manager level, not all staff
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	N	SSI 2,7,a	
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place: a) a documented risk assessments b) standard operating procedures c) contingency plan	High High High	Y Y Y	CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	No guards  Seals in area regularly, but not heavy predation.
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of -The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		Y		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including: The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,8,a	
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N/A		Site not inspected due to weather
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.18	Not inspected



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	N/A	SSI 2,2 ii	Not inspected
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	N/A		Not inspected
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.21	Not inspected
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		Y		OTAQ system in place to deter seals, top nets over cages
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA <sup>5</sup> 2010 P4, S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5	

**d. Inspection of site specific procedures**

6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.31	
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

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

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

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

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

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

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010



██████████  
Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd  
Stob Ban House  
Glen Nevis Business Park  
Fort William  
PH33 6RX  
████████████████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	14/02/2018
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0502	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Scotasay
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	Andrea Warwick	<b>CASE No</b>	20180030

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training**

With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish, a record of all training of each person working on the site in relation to containment, prevention of escape of fish and recovery of escaped fish was not available. The following recommendation is made for improvement.

**Chapter 7, point 1.8 of A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) states that training should be an integral part of the operation of all finfish aquaculture businesses, with programmes and plans relevant to the various activities being documented.**

**It is recommended that all staff are trained in relation to fish handling and transfer procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping from pens (chapter 4, point 4.29) and all farm staff should be aware of factors affecting the potential breaches of containment and trained in actions to take in the event of an escape (chapter 4, point 4.35 of the CoGP). Once the training has been carried out a record of that training must**

R10

**maintained in accordance with schedule 2, paragraph 7a of The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008**

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

As the reported probable cause for the breach in containment was due to equipment snagging on the net, the following recommendation is made for improvement.

**Chapter 4, point 4.30 of the CoGP states that a documented risk assessment, a standard operating procedure and a contingency plan should be in place before any fish handling or transfer procedure is followed. Chapter 7, point 7.4.1.1.1 of A Technical Standard for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture states that secondary equipment that may be used within or in the vicinity of the nets and which has the potential to cause chafe or damage shall be designed and constructed to avoid chaffing the net**

**In accordance with Annex 4 section A4.17 of A Technical Standard for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture and to meet the requirements of chapter 4, point 4.30 of the CoGP it is recommended that a documented review of the risk assessment, standard operating procedure and contingency plan for fish handling procedures is conducted to ensure that no net damage due to snagging from secondary equipment occurs during such procedures. Once the review has been conducted, staff must be trained in any amended procedures and a record maintained of that training in accordance with schedule 2, paragraph 7a of The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008.**

**c) Inspection of site and site equipment**

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

**d) Inspection of site specific procedures**

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

**Further Action**

Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations detailed in this report have been implemented. Documentation should be submitted by **31<sup>st</sup> July 2018**. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Date: 23/04/2018

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

R10

██████████  
Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd  
Stob Ban House  
Glen Nevis Business Park  
Fort William  
PH33 6RX  
██████████

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	14/02/2018
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0502	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Scotasay
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	Andrea Warwick	<b>CASE No</b>	20180030

#### Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

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

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

Signed: ██████████

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 26/07/2018

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

██████████  
Marine Harvest (Scotland) Ltd  
Stob Ban House  
Glen Nevis Business Park  
Fort William  
PH33 6RX  
██

## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	14/02/2018
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0502	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Scotasay
<b>INSPECTOR</b>	Andrea Warwick	<b>CASE No</b>	20180030

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of 12 Atlantic salmon on 04/02/18 (escape incident number MSe040218SAL1).

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

The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed: ██████████

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 01/03/2018

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](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)