FHI 059, Version 13	ls	ssued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0535			Date	of visit: 08/12/2020
Time spent on site:	5 hours	M	ain Inspector:	
Site No: FS0254 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Knock Scottish Sea Farm	s Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 11.2	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI (045 completed Y
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F C	ogp ma:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see add	ditional information	/clinical score sheet. /clinical score sheet. /clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:		

Additional Case Information:

Site used as overspill for Barcaldine.

Fish were vaccinated on the early November against IPN, PD,

3 stocks on site, Aquagen, Fanad - MH Ireland, - Aquagen - Rivastad Norway - Intra.no.2020.0000925v2

Eggs coming onto site disinfected using buffodein 1%

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0535		Site No:	FS0254				
Date of Visit:		08/12/202	0		Inspector(s):			I
Registration/Author	risation De	etails						
1. Business/site deta			site representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	details?						N]
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fi	ish for all sec	tions)					
Total No facilities		40	Facilities sto	ocked	17	No facilitie	es inspected	40
Species	SAL	SAL					T .	
Age group	OVA	2021 S1						
No Fish	800,000	550,000						
Mean Fish Wt	N/A	100g						
Next Fallow Date (S		No plans	•	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Unknown	•	•
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease pro	blems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	Post vaccir	nation fungus						
 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a sys 	cords availablete and contact and contact and contact are something to the contact are contact and contact are con	able for dead fi rrectly entered oductions (out	sh and waste? l? with GB) availa ehalf) of the bu	able? usiness (not us	-			Y Y Y Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed	of?			Whole fish -	Dundas Ch	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	•						Y
4. Recent mortality	,			% (4010) WK47	7 0.68% (376)	3) WK48 0.3	3% (1696) WI	
5. Evidence of recer		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality pe	er facility/no st	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i		• •						Y
If yes, detail:				the reporting	criteria March	& Arpril 202	20 were repor	
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities b	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	(-) .		10.16	I. C. H.	. 19			
8. Have 'mortality ev	/ents' been i	reported to FH	II? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		Y

Treatments and Medic	cines Records		
1. Recent treatments (s	******		Y
•	Formalin,		
If yes, detail:	T.M.S.		
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records a	•		Y
•	e and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdraw			Y
5. If yes, what treatmer	ıt(s)?	Formalin, T.M.S.	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored	d appropriately?		Y
Diagonality December			
Biosecurity Records	quailable for inequation?		Y
	available for inspection?	ording and acta disposal been considered?	Y
		ording and safe disposal been considered? cottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	'
	d) mortality at the site been included		Y
, ,	•	sence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	led and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no	·	Y
		ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certificati	•	ou on the farm one boom sovered (equal or migner	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,		
6. Have the husbandry	and biosecurity measures implemen	ted between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
		visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation ava	ailable regarding the measures in pla	ace to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals he	eld on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity	procedures been adequately implem	nented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilland			
•	th surveillance been carried out by, o	or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results ava	•		Y
3. Any significant result			N
if yes, detail (if not deta	ailed under recent disease problems).		
Por	cords checked between:	02/10/2019 - 08/12/2020	
Rec	JUIUS CHECKEU DELWEEH.	02/10/2013 - 00/12/2020	

	al 059, version 13							155	ued by.				
	Case no:	2020-05	35	Site No:		FS0254			Date of Samplin		08/	12/2020	08/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG	-	g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		0:00 Indoors		0:00]]	Inspecto	or:		5	VMD No). [11
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1-3	F4-6	F7-9	F10-12	F13-15	F16-18						
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL		SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL						
	Average weight	100 g	100 g	100 g	100 g	100 g	100 g						
	Sex	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW						
Stock Details		Kindrum Hatchery - Ireland	& Kindrum Hatchery - Ireland	용 Kindrum Hatchery - Ireland	Kindrum Hatchery - Ireland	& Kindrum Hatchery - Ireland	Y → Kindrum Hatchery - Ireland						

12/2020	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
0	1	Total To	acte acc	ianed	Ο					
0	ı	Total I	<i>c</i> 3 13 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	ngi ieu	U					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0535		Site No:	FS0254		Insp:	
Date of Visit	08/12/2020		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	10	26	
Species .	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	14	5
Management							10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Exposure via water	Trainibor or door	Site contact			6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		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 water	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	1			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	Ī			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity	!	Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				-			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2	1			
					Total Rank		32 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0535	Site No	p: FS0254
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or ed	•	le vear class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	-	
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as v		· ·
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the	ne site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP	? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the	e CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salr	nonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3	or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare pr	roblems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administrated criteria for treatment or where <i>C. e</i>		
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice	e levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating far	ms?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site,	where fewer populations or part populations	are held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage		
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please deta	ail reasons.
Containment Inspection		
Has the site experienced equipment damage	re due to predators in the current or previous	s production cycles?
Are measures in place to mitigate against the same sures in	•	
Site inside Top nets	to produce of one (Bottan Bo	i.
If other, detail below:		
Pest control contract, tanks outside covered		
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site since	e the last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	ters?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37,	5.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	l local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they	exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	reed with local wild fish interests and was p	ermission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and minim	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covere	ed in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measur		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail re	eason(s) Y

esults Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp A line of Notification Database Insp Date of Notification Database Insp Dat	0 N	2222 2525				00/40/0	200						
results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp	Case No:	2020-0535	J		Date of vi	sit: 08/12/20	020						
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp and the second summary are part of the second summary are Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp	Site No:	FS0254]		Inspect	or:							
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp and the second summary are the second summary are Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp	Poculte Summany	Erog											
eport Summary asse Type Date Insp 2nd Insp	Results Summary	rieq.	Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp										
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		_				op	g	op	2 1113				
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		1											
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		+											
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		+											
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		_											
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		+				_							
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp		+											
case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp													
CI, CNI, VMD 14/07/2021	Report Summary												
CI, CNI, VMD 14/07/2021				2 nd Insp									
	ECI, CNI, VMD	14/07/2021											
		+											
		+											





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 08/12/2020

 Site No
 FS0254
 Site Name
 Knock

 Case No
 20200535
 Inspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 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:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 14/07/2021