FHI 059, Version 13	1	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0120			Date of visit: 27/04/2022
Time spent on site:	0 minutes	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: SS0613	Site Name:	Loch Eil (Fass Fern)	
Business No: SB0406	Business Name:	Fass Fern Mussels	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.2	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional ir	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	d?		nformation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional ir	formation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Site inspection carried out by on 27/04/2022. Site records inspected during site visit.

Of the two facilities not stocked, one is currently used for spat collection while the other is empty.

Mussels on site appeared in good condition with little fouling on them. A few open shells with no tissue present but numbers not above what to be expected.

During autumn of 2021, approx. 80% of natural spatfall lost due to starfish predation.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ıed by: FHI	_	Da	ate of issue:	12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0120		Site No:	SS0613				
Date of Visit:		27/04/2022]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author						_		
1. Business/site deta	_	checked by s	ite representa	ative?		Y		
2. Changes made to	details?					N		
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		9	Facilities sto	ocked	7	No facilities in	nspected 9	
Species	MED							
Age group	2020							
No Fish	80,520kg							
Mean Fish Wt	27 - 42mm							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Never fallow		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Natural spatfa	all	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last visi	t)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspe 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	Is available for ection: plete and corre- ecords available plete and corre- eates for introdes	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered? ductions (outwelt t by (or on be	th and waste?	able? usiness (not usi		08	B/11/2017	Y Y N/A N/A N/A
	·		·				_	
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalitie		•			Other (detail)	<u> </u>		14//
If other detail:		drop to seab	ed		other (detail)			
3. Mortality records								N/A
4. Recent mortality	•		No observed	d mortalities				
5. Evidence of recer	•	tvpical mortal					$\overline{}$	N/A
If yes, facility nos/no				//reason:			_	
, ,	71	-	, ,					
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N/A
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) ı	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' 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)?		
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?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	ng and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scott	tish 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 present	ce or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notifi	ed 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, visit		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place		N/A
aguaculture animals held on site?	' '	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	ted on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or or	n 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:	1/08/2017 - 27/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue: 12
Case Number:	2022-0120 Site No:	SS061	3		
Date of ∀isit	27/04/2022 Inspector:				
Number of Susceptib	ole species on site				
	ies present = <u>LOW</u> risk				
If susceptible species	present, score for each pathogen		No	Yes	
	Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED)		0	25	0
	Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED)		0	3	3
	Susceptible to OsHV (CGI)		0	3	0
Sites within a tidal e	xcursion	1	2-5	>6	
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal				
	excursion	0	2	10	2
Live shellfish moven	nents	0	1-2	>3	
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0
Movements off					=
Movements on	Frequency of movements off <u>within</u> MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	2
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas	0	3	6	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	3
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)	
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area	_	4	8	0
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5	1
			Yes	No	
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	ns etc	0	2	2
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	ns etc	0 Total Risk	2	14 LOW

Case No:	2022-0120	l		Date of visit	27/04/2022			
Site No:	SS0613	1		Inspector				
Cite 140.	000010	J		inspector.				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notifica	ition		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
	 							
	1							
	<u> </u>							
	-							
	1							
	 							
	1	Ì						
	╄							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
ECI	04/05/2022							
	+							
	+							
	1							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No SB0406 Date of Visit 27/04/2022

SITE No SS0613 SITE NAME Loch Eil (Fass Fern)

Case No 20220120 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 fourth 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.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

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

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

Signed:

Date: 04/05/2022

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2022-0121			Date of visit: 27/04/2022				
Time spent on site:) minutes	Main Ins	pector:				
Site No: SS0801	Site Name:	Garvan					
Business No: SB0406	Business Name:	Fass Fern Mussels					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 9	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?		information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed	d?		information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional	I information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Site inspection carried out by on 27/04/2022. Site records inspected during visit.

Of the two facilities not stocked, both are currently being used for spat collection.

Mussels on site appeared in good condition with little fouling on them. A few open shells with no tissue present but numbers not above what to be expected.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_	D	ate of issue:	12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0121		Site No:	SS0801				
Date of Visit:		27/04/2022]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils				_		
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?		Y		
2. Changes made to	details?					N		
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilities i	nspected 8	
Species	MED	MED						
Age group	2020	2021						
No Fish	53,900kg	19,600kg						
Mean Fish Wt	24 - 39mm	20 - 35mm				 	_	
Next Fallow Date (S		Never fallow		Next Input Da	te (Site)	Natural spatf	all	
Recent (last 4 wks)	•			•	_ ` '	(since last vis		N
If yes, detail:	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T				, any occuped	(on too last the	, .	.,
 Are records comp Are movement red Are records comp Are health certification Transport Records Are any movement If yes, is there a system 	cords available elete and corre ates for introd nts carried out	e for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outw t by (or on be	h and waste? vith GB) availah	able? usiness (not usi			E	Y N/A N/A N/A
Mortality Records							_	
Mortality records a		•						N/A
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail)			
If other detail:	Empty shells							
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente						N/A
4. Recent mortality (•		No observed	d mortalities				
5. Evidence of recen							L	N/A
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
	. 19		1 10					N 1/A
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	ескеа?					N/A
If yes, detail:								NI/A
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) i	nortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	antal haara	ported to FIII	2 If no sutou	dataila an marit	ality avente ele			NI/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FHI	enter	details on mort	ality events sh	ieet.		N/A

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 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Treatments and Medicines Records	
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 frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 4. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: 8. Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
If other, detail: 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: 8. 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? NA If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
2. Medicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? NIA 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? NA If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 9. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? NA Any significant results? If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 9. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Alsa any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
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? 1. Has any animal health surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No explored the procedure of the presence of a listed disease is detected disease in the event that the presence of suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected disease.	·	
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? Y If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		Y
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Yellow the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? N/A Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? N/A If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9 Y 1 If no, detail: 1 Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 1 If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? 1 If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Yellow the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Yellow the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Yellow the business? Yellow the business? No any significant results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? 9. If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 9. If yes, are results available for inspection? 1. Any significant results? 1. If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
health status, certification if required)? 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No in the procedure of	is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	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.)? 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? No in the procedure of	5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail: Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? No any significant results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
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? No. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
transmission of disease been 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? No. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
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).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
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? N 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		N/A
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).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
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).		Y
Results of Surveillance 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
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).		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	Results of Surveillance	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection? 3. Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		N
Any significant results? If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Records checked between: 09/08/2018 - 27/04/2022	if yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
	Records checked between: 09/08/2018 - 27/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue: 12
Case Number:	2022-0121 Site No:	SS080	1		
Date of ∀isit	27/04/2022 Inspector:				
Number of Susceptib	ole species on site				
	ies present = <u>LOW</u> risk				
If susceptible species	present, score for each pathogen		No	Yes	
	Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED)		0	25	0
	Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED)		0	3	3
	Susceptible to OsHV (CGI)		0	3	0
Sites within a tidal e	xcursion	1	2-5	>6	
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal				
	excursion	0	2	10	2
Live shellfish moven	nents	0	1-2	>3	
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0
Movements off					=
Movements on	Frequency of movements off <u>within</u> MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	2
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas	0	3	6	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	3
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)	
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area	0	4	8	0
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5	1
			Yes	No	
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	ns etc	0	2	2
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	ns etc	0 Total Risk	2	2 14 LOW

Case No: Site No: SS0801
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification
Results Summary Freq. Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp Insp
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp
Report Summary
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp
ECI 04/05/2022





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 SB0406
 DATE OF VISIT
 27/04/2022

 SITE NO
 SS0801
 SITE NAME
 Garvan

 CASE NO
 20220121
 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 fourth 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.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/05/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0122			Date of visit: 27/04/2022
Time spent on site:	5 minutes	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: SS0939	Site Name:	Eilean mo Shlinneag	
Business No: SB0406	Business Name:	Fass Fern Mussels	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.2	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	d?		nformation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional ir	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

FHI 059, Version 13 Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Additional Case Information:

Site inspection carried out 27/04/22 by and and Paperwork inspected during site visit.

Spat was moved on from Liddesdale in 2020.

2 lines currently empty

Mussels on site appeared in good condition with little fouling on them. A few open shells with no tissue present but numbers not above what to be expected.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0122		Site No:	SS0939	3			
Date of Visit:		27/04/2022	2]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	4	No facilitie	es inspected	6
Species	MED							
Age group	2020							
No Fish	186,664kg							
Mean Fish Wt	35 - 50mm							
Next Fallow Date (Si		Never fallow		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Natural sp	atfall	
Recent (last 4 wks)	*				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:						<u> </u>	,	
,								
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
							No previous	s inspections,
2. Date of last inspec	ction:						•	on 03/12/2020
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement red								N/A
5. Are records comp								N/A
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	sing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syst				•	_			
11 900, 10 11012 2 2,2	CIII III PILIL	Or maintain	oc or danspe	tation, rocci,				
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail)			
If other detail:		fall to seabed			Ctrici (detail)			
3. Mortality records of								N/A
4. Recent mortality (•	Correctly Crit	No mortalitie	- chaonied				167
5. Evidence of recen	,	at mical mortal		S Observed				N/A
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		drageon:				147
II yes, lacility hos/ho	mortality per	Tacility/110 Sto	ck per racinty/	reason.				
6. Any other peaks i	- mortality du	rring pariod of	alca d2					N/A
6. Any other peaks in	1 mortality du	ring period ci	lecked?					INA
If yes, detail:	i a ima al N	4 - 1141 In -		t FIIIO				NI/A
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to) vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		L						N1/6
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)?			
If yes, detail:			
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records available for inspe-			
3. Are records complete and correctly en	tered?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<u> </u>		
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?			
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?			
Biosecurity Records			
Biosecurity records available for inspect.		of discount has a social and 10	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mo	•	•	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which t	•	sters or veterinary professional of any	· ·
increased (unexplained) mortality at the			T
	•	spicion of the presence of a listed disease	V
is detected been included and how and			T
5. Has the health status of aquaculture a	nimals being stocked on the fa	arm site been covered (equal or nigher	Y
health status, certification if required)?			
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity n	easures implemented betwee	n each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (r	•		
7. Is documentation available regarding	•		N/A
aquaculture animals held on site?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures beer	adequately implemented on s	ite?	Y
If no, detail:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Results of Surveillance			
1. Has any animal health surveillance be	en carried out by, or on behalf	of, the business?	N
2. If yes, are results available for inspec	• •	,	
3. Any significant results?			
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent	disease problems).		
Records checked be	ween: 15/10/202	20 - 27/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue: 12
Case Number:	2022-0122 Site No:	SS093	9		
Date of ∀isit	27/04/2022 Inspector:				
Number of Susceptib	ole species on site				
	ies present = <u>LOW</u> risk				
If susceptible species	present, score for each pathogen		No	Yes	
	Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED)		0	25	0
	Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED)		0	3	3
	Susceptible to OsHV (CGI)		0	3	0
Sites within a tidal ex	xcursion	1	2-5	>6	
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal				
	excursion	0	2	10	10
Live shellfish movem	nents	0	1-2	>3	
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0
Movements off					=
Movements off	Frequency of movements off <u>within</u> MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	2
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas	0	3	6	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	3
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)	
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area		4	8	0
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5	1
			Yes	No	
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	0	2	2	
			Total Risk		22 MEDIUM

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0122			Date of visit:	27/04/2022			
Site No:	SS0939			Inspector:				
Populto Cummon	Eroa			Do	te of Notifica	tion		
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	and
		Database	шър	FIIONE	шър	willing	шэр	2 nd Insp
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
ECI	04/05/2022							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0406 DATE OF VISIT 27/04/2022

SITE NO SS0939 SITE NAME Eilean mo Shlinneag

CASE NO 20220122 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.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/05/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	!	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2022-0123			Date of visit: 27/04/2022			
Time spent on site:	5 minutes	Main Insp	pector:			
Site No: SS0832	Site Name:	Liddesdale				
Business No: SB0406	Business Name:	Fass Fern Mussels				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 9.2	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet.			
Clinical signs of disease observe	d?		information/clinical score sheet.			
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional	information/clinical score sheet.			
Diagnostic samples taken?		N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Site inspection carried out by on 27/04/2022. Site records inspected during visit.

Two lines are currently empty

Mussels on site appeared in good condition with little fouling on them. A few open shells with no tissue present but numbers not above what to be expected.

FHI 059, Version 13	3	_	Issu	ıed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0123		Site No:	SS0832				
Date of Visit:		27/04/2022]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Auth	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site de			ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made t	to details?						N	
Site Details (inclu	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		7	Facilities sto	ocked	5	No facilities	inspected	7
Species	MED							
Age group	2019					 		
No Fish	92,822kg					 		
Mean Fish Wt	49 - 59mm							
Next Fallow Date (Never fallow	•	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Natural spa	tfall	
Recent (last 4 wks)		ems?		. N	Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:				•	,	`	,	
Movement Record							-	V
Movement record Data of last incord		r inspection?					00/06/2016	
2. Date of last inspe		41. /417	,			L	09/06/2016	
3. Are records com	•	•		,			-	N/A
4. Are movement re				•			-	N/A
5. Are records com	•	•		abla?			-	N/A
6. Are health certific	cates for introd	iuctions (outw	vitii Gb) avalia	able?			L	IN/A
Transport Record	s							
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?		Г	
If yes, is there a sys								
Mortality Records								
Mortality records		nspection?					Г	N/A
2. How are mortalit		•			Other (detail)		
If other detail:		fall to sea be	ed		(3.2.2			
3. Mortality records								N/A
4. Recent mortality	•	•	No mortalitie	es observed				
5. Evidence of rece	•	typical mortal						N/A
If yes, facility nos/n				//reason:				
6 Any other pools	in montolity du	ring paried at	ookod2					NI/A
6. Any other peaks If yes, detail:	III mortanty du	nng penoa cr	iecked?					N/A
7. Have increased	(unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			, , ,					
8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sl	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Me			
1. Recent treatments	s (see comment)?		
If yes, detail:			
If other, detail:			
	s available for inspection?		
•	lete and correctly entered?		
4. Are fish in a withd	•		
5. If yes, what treatm	ient(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		
Biosecurity Record			
	s available for inspection?		Y
		ding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
	•	ottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ned) mortality at the site been included?		Y
	·	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	luded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no		Y
		d on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	ation if required)?		
			V
	•	ed between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	sitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	\$1/A
		ce to maintain the physical containment of	N/A
aquaculture animals			V
	rity procedures been adequately implement	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
D 11 (0 :11			
Results of Surveilla		h-h-lf-f 4h- h	NII.
	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or	on benait of, the business?	N
•	available for inspection?		
3. Any significant res			
ir yes, detail (ir not d	etailed under recent disease problems).		
	Records checked between:	09/06/2016 - 27/04/2022	
	ACCUIUS CHECKEU DELWEEH.	00/00/2010 - 21/04/2022	

rni 059, version 15	issued by. Frii			Date	or issue. 12
Case Number:	2022-0123 Site No:	SS083	2		
Date of ∀isit	27/04/2022 Inspector:				
Number of Susceptil	ole species on site				
	ies present = <u>LOW</u> risk				
If susceptible species	present, score for each pathogen		No	Yes	_
	Susceptible to Bonamia ostrea (OED)		0	25	0
	Susceptible to Marteilia refringens (OED, MED)		0	3	3
	Susceptible to OsHV (CGI)		0	3	0
Sites within a tidal e	xcursion	1	2-5	>6	
Site contacts	Number of sites holding susceptible species within a tidal excursion	0	2	10	2
Live shellfish moven	nents	0	1-2	>3	
Movements on	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	10	20	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	0
Mayamanta off	·				=
Movements off	Frequency of movements off <u>within</u> MSS Management Areas	0	1	2	2
	Frequency of movements off <u>outwith</u> MSS Management Areas	0	3	6	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	3
Management practices		None	Secure (effluent treatment)	Unsecure (no effluent treatment)	
Water contacts with depuration facilities	Depuration of stock from own sites within MSS management area	0	1	2	0
	Depuration of stock from other businesses sites within MSS management area	0	2	6	0
	Depuration of stock from sites outwith MSS management area	0	4	8	0
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	1
sites	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	5	1
			Yes	No	
	Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbath	s etc	0	2	2
			Total Risk		14 LOW

Case No:	2022-0123			Date of visit:	27/04/2022			
Cita Na	00000							
Site No:	SS0832			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
,		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Poport Cummon								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Inon	and Image					
ECI ECI	04/05/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp					
LOI	04/03/2022							





SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0406 DATE OF VISIT 27/04/2022 SITE NO SS0832 SITE NAME Liddesdale

CASE NO 20220123 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 fourth 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.

No mortality had been observed on site since the last inspection by Marine Scotland.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/05/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2022-0124			Date of visit: 25/04/2022			
Time spent on site:	rs	Main Ins	spector:			
Site No: FS0057 Business No: FB0447	Site Name: Business Name:	Corry Farm Wester Ross Fisheries L	td			
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 8.8	Thermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-12			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	uil reason below:				

Acts as nursery site for Salmon up to 1.5kg before they are moved to Ardessie and Ardmair. No harvests from this site.

Current stock from Loch Merkland and Loch Shin (Migdale smolt). Wild wrasse caught in Loch Broom.

The fish are currently on photoperiod, which seems to help diminish seal activity. Seal curtains also in place. The site experienced issues with heron predation in the winter so they have installed two bird scarers (long pole with moving fake bird attached), which appear to work well at deterring the animals.

The cloudy weather during the site inspection made it harder to see the stock, however good response was observed during hand feeding and the fish coming up to the surface appeared healthy. No moribunds or dead fish were observed on site. All fish sampled for the VMD looked healthy both internally and externally. No sea lice observed.

The site has never had to use therapeutic treatments to control sea lice and have managed to achieve a level of zero adult females throughout the production cycle using cleanerfish alone.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0124	j	Site No:	FS0057				
Date of Visit:		25/04/2022			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author								_
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	site representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						N]
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis					_		
Total No facilities		68	Facilities sto	cked	63	No facilitie	s inspected	68
Species	SAL	WRA						
Age group	2021 S0	Wild						
No Fish	533,817	2,317						
Mean Fish Wt	800g	Mix						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	13th July 202	22	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	1st October	er 2022	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	s							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							11/09/2019	•
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?				,	Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t hy (or on he	half) of the hi	isiness (not iis	ing a STR)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys		* '	*	· ·	· ·			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for i	nepoction?						V
· ·		•			Other (detail)			<u>'</u>
2. How are mortalities of their detail:			f	a a alsia famina	,			
				ase skip for inc	ineration.			
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente		2.040() 1.40	74 (0.040()	1 4 4 40 (0	040() 1.45	1
4. December on antality of	last 4lss\.		,	0.01%), wk 13:	, , , ,	,	.01%), wk 15	: 35 (0.01%).
4. Recent mortality (,	turninal manuta		tality: 1 fish in	the last 4 wee	KS.		NI NI
5. Evidence of recer		• •		1				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6 Any other peaks:	n mortality du	ring period at	nookod?					N.
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	ii iiiortality du	ning period cr	ieckeu?					N
7. Have increased (inevalained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	ariexpiairieu)	nortaines be	cir reported to	Vet Of T THE				14/7
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	norted to EUI	2 If no enter	details on mor	tality events sh	neet		N/A
o. Have mortality EV	CHIC DECITIE		. II IIO, CIIICI	actails off fillor	tuilly overile of	1001.		1 1// (

Treatments and Medicines Records	
Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
o. Allo modismos storod appropriatory.	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 11/09/2019 - 22/04/2022	

	ii 055, version 15												
	Case no:	2022-01	124	Site No		FS0057			Date of vis		25/0	4/2022	25/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling:	нГ			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:0	15:00:00		0:00	Inspector:			VMD No.				11
	Environmental conditions:	Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors			2			4		5	5		
	Summary samples	Summary samples HIST		ВА	ВА			VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
			-	3	4								
	Pool Group Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	1kg											
	Sex	N/A	1kg N/A	1kg N/A	1kg N/A						_		
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
	water Type	300	300	SVV	300								
			_										
		pu	P	pu	P P								
တ		돌	꽃	충	충								
tai		 		√e.	 e								
Details		č		ž	ř		J						
		och Merkland	Loch Merkland	och Merkland	Loch Merkland								
Stock	Facility No	CB7	CB7	CB5	CB5								

)4/2022	O4/2022 Additional Sample Information: Fish killed by percussive stun to the head.														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	Date of issue			
Case Number:	2022-0124		Site No:	FS0057		Insp:			
Date of Visit	25/04/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score		
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10			
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0		
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0		
ороскоо Станата и постава	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0			14	0		
Mayamanta off			1 0			10	2		
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3		
Exposure via water	1.10.11.00.01.00.00	Site contacts	5 0	1-5	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)	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 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	inpasteurised feed	l 0	1			0		
·	Feeding unpas	•	5						
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4				
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0		
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0		
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		8 LOW		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0124	Site No: FS	60057
3. Does the site have access to a range of	ems in the previous 4 years? or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanic	ing deltamethrin,
	nagement agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for	inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) red standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	I 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	during the period that Y
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L.</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the p	salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or aboveriod that records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
	sh Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. nich is considered to cause significant welfare problems	N/A N N
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ministered 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)? etions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels ried out in cooperation between participating farms? site, where fewer populations or part populations are hel	N/A
15. Is there a site specific written lice mar scenarios during the escalation of a sea li	nagement procedure with waypoints describing set actio ice 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 reason	ons. Y
	nmage due to predators in the current or previous productionst the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	ction cycles? N 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)	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: 2022-0124	Site No: FS0057		
Date of Visit: 25/04/2022	Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection located v	within a farm management	area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm 2. Has a current farm management agre			Y
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in			Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevan			Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish far			Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	•	eement or statement?	Y
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	review'?		Υ
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimu		stocks to be introduced to the	area or Y
farm?			V
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina	•		Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxin individual farm?	•		or the Y
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangerish farm in the area or the individual fa	-	d disposal of any dead fish fro	m any Y
Arrangements for The Management o	of Sea Lice		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangem		on sea lice numbers and trea	atments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availa of statement?	bility and the use of medici	nes on farms covered by the a	agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requinulate on farms in the area or individual fa		esting of available treatments	for sea Y
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circun		ngical controls and cleaner fish	are to be
used on farms in the area or individual f		gical controls and cicalici fish	Tare to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang		eatments on farms within the	are to be Y Y area?
Live Fish Movements			
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circun area or farm?	nstances when live fish ma	y be introduced or removed from	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangor individual farms?	gements for the movement	of live fish on and off sites in	the area Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	le harvest practices on farms in the area or individ	dual farms?
date when a farm or area may be resto	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow cked? one or more year classes may be stocked onto sit	
agreement or statement?	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag 24. Does the farm management agreer parties to the agreement?	gement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to become	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 stee of the FMAg/S? 01/05/2022	catement?

Site No: FS0057

Case No: 2022-0124

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

	2222 2424				05/04/04	200		
Case No:	2022-0124	J		Date of vi	sit: 25/04/20	022		
Site No:	FS0057]		Inspect	tor:			
Results Summary	Eroa	_			Date of Notin	fication		
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	_			7 110110		9	op	2 11139
	+							
Report Summary				7				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	20/05/2022							
	+							
	1							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0447 DATE OF VISIT 25/04/2022
SITE NO FS0057 SITE NAME Corry Farm

Case No 20220124 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.

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	Issu	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020							
Case No: 2022-0125			Date of visit: 26/04/2022							
Time spent on site:	irs	Main Inspecto	or:							
Site No: FS0549 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Tanera Scottish Sea Farms Ltd								
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6							
Water Temp (°C): 9	Thermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed N/A							
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-10							
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving f Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:										

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection done on 22/04/22.

Wild wrasse from Orkney.

No issues on site, the fish were feeding deep in the water column during the site inspection but from what could be observed they appeared healthy and with no signs of damage or fin erosion. The fish sampled for the VMD appeared healthy. No sea lice was observed.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0125		Site No:	FS0549	Ð			
Date of Visit:		26/04/2022	1		Inspector(s)			ı
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summarv	checked by si	ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•	Í	·				Y	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	12
Species	SAL	WRA	i dollitico oto	I		140 raomitic	Порсокса	
Age group								
No Fish	2021 S1	Wild caught				_		
Mean Fish Wt	294,338	11,244						
	4.2kg	150g		No the to	(0:10)	A - :1 0000		
Next Fallow Date (S		October 2022	2	Next Input Da	_ ` ′	April 2023		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	ems?		ľ	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
1. Movement record		r inspection?					04/00/0004	Y
2. Date of last inspe							01/06/2021	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement re				•				N/A
5. Are records comp								N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	ductions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records	;							
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on bel	nalf) of the bu	isiness (not us	sing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys					-			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nenaction?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	on site		'
If other detail:	s disposed c	'I :			incinerateu -	· OII SILE		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	orod?					
3. Wortailty records	complete and			00 (0 000()	1 40 0000	04 (0.000()	1 44 0000	1 1 1 (0 10()
				2: 88 (0.03%),		,		,
1 Pocont mortality (lact 4 wkc):		WK 15, 2022	: 68 (0.02%). \	лка топашу	2,609 fish s	since input 16	/06/21.
4. Recent mortality (utum iaal maa mtali	:t: O					N
5. Evidence of recer		* *		/·				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	racility/no sto	ck per facility.	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:		3						
7. Have increased (inexplained)	mortalities her	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	ioxpiairioa)		ooportou te	70.011111				,, ,
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' heen re	norted to FHI	2 If no enter	details on mor	tality events s	heet		N/A
o. Have mortality ev	Citto Decirite	portou to i i ii	. II IIO, CIIIGI	actails off fillor	tunty events s	noot.		14//1

Treatments and Medicines Records		
Recent treatments (see comment)?		Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.		
Optomease		
also used		
If other, detail: for		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recor	rding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify So	•	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the prese		
is detected been included and how and when that will be no	·	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocke		Y
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implement	red between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, vi	isitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place	ce to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or	r on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Records checked between:	01/06/2021 - 22/04/2022	

26/0
18
ples

04/2022 Additional Sample Information:														
	Fish killed by percussive blow to the head.													
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0125		Site No:	FS0549		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/04/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	C	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	C	9	18	26	0
	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Mariamanta aff	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			ļ		10	10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3
Exposure via water	Transor or door	Site contacts		ļ			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through	C				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line	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	C	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	C				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	C	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	inpasteurised feed	C	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	1			
Biosecurity	<u>'</u>	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	C	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		С				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1]			
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		C				0
code of practice	No		3	·			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total		17
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0125	Site No:	FS0549
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equi 3. Does the site have access to a range of licental azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as we can these be deployed in a reasonable period or	ivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year of the synchronously on a single year of the synchronously on a single year of the synchronously on a single year of the synchronously of t	cluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm managem Management Area (or equivalent)?		ite and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspect.6. Do records adequately reflect the required states		egal 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 Co	oGP during the period that Y
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Hea 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is	·	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administer suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elon</i> 11. Has any other action been taken (where apparance) 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions to 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where a lice?	ngatus is considered to have welfare implication plicable)? aken had a significant impact upon the lice levent in cooperation between participating farms?	vels recorded?
15. Is there a site specific written lice managemoscenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infe		actions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks re	flect sea lice count data? If no please detail re	easons. Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the Seal pro nets, top If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been exper 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 forth 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and lo	o question 10 rs? with (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escap	ees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agre Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimister be considered under satisfactory measures 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regard	se the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in so of the Act)	n code but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0125	Site No: FS0549	
Date of Visit: 26/04/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located w	vithin a farm management area?	Y
f N, no further questions require comple	tion.	<u> </u>
Points of Compliance for Both Farm N	Management Agreements and Statements	s
	ement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepare	ed?
 Is the current FMAg/S available for ins Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant 	·	Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	•	Y
	commencement of the agreement or statem	nent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of r	review?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage		
3. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimur farm?	m health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
	tion requirements for stocks held in the area	a or farm?
•	s of fish which may be stocked into the area	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim ndividual farm?	um stocking density of any pen on any farm	n in the area or the
	ements for the storage and disposal of any	dead fish from any
ish farm in the area or the individual far		
Arrangements for The Management of		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangeme	ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numl	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availab of statement?	oility and the use of medicines on farms cov	ered by the agreement Y
	ements for the sensitivity testing of available ms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	stances under which biological controls and arms?	d cleaner fish are to be Y Ins within the area? Y
	ements for synchronous treatments on farm	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circums area or farm?	stances when live fish may be introduced o	r removed from the
	ements for the movement of live fish on and	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoc 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s	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 becor	me, 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? 23/01/2021	statement? Y

Site No: FS0549

Case No: 2022-0125

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2022-0125			Date of visit:	26/04/2022	2		
Site No:	FS0549	1		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	ition		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
							-	
	-							
							-	
							-	
			=					
Report Summary				1				
	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	28/04/2022	шэр	z IIISP					
201, 0111, 021, 11112	20/0 1/2022							
	-							
	-							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business
 No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 26/04/2022

 Site No
 FS0549
 Site Name
 Tanera

 Case No
 20220125
 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.

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: 28/04/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0126			Date of visit: 26/04/2022
Time spent on site:	ır	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS0858 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Fada Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.9	Thermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-10
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	ason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection done on 22/04/2022.

Farmed wrasse from Otter Ferry, wild caught wrasse from Orkney. No longer importing cleanerfish from Ireland.

The nets had been washed the day before the inspection and therefore were very clean. The fish looked healthy, with a good feeding response. No moribunds or dead fish observed.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0126		Site No:	FS0858	3			
Date of Visit:		26/04/202	22		Inspector(s):		ı
Registration/Autho	risation Det	ails						
1. Business/site deta			site representa	itive?			Y	1
2. Changes made to		·	·				Υ	
Site Details (includ	o cloanor fic	h for all so	etions)					
Total No facilities	e cleaner ns	6	Facilities sto	ckad	6	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	SAL	WRA	i aciiiles sto	l l	0	NO facilitie	I IIIspecieu	O
Age group	2021 S1	Mix						
No Fish	114,449	5,842						
Mean Fish Wt	4.2kg	120g						
Next Fallow Date (Si		October 20	22	Next Input D	ate (Site)	April 2023		
Recent (last 4 wks)	,				N Any escape			N
If yes, detail:	alscase prob	101113 :			Trily Cocapc	3 (31100 1831	violi):	11
ii yes, actaii.								
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection	?					Y
2. Date of last inspec		·					01/06/2021	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	d?					Y
4. Are movement red								N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered	d?					N/A
6. Are health certification		•		ıble?				N/A
		·	·					
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	it by (or on b	ehalf) of the bu	siness (not us	sing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place	for maintena	nce of transpor	tation records	?			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated	- on site		
If other detail:	o disposed c	71 .			momerated	OH OILC		
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly en	ntered?					Y
o. Mortanty rooordo (correctly of		: 47 (0.04%),	wk 13· 45 (0	04%) wk 14	51 (0.04%)	wk 15: 31
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			A mortality 1,			. 01 (0.0470),	WK 10. 01
5. Evidence of recen		atypical morta	` '	or mortality 1,	00 1 000p	4. 20, 00, 211		N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		reason.				
, 55, 125/110								
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	uring period o	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 ev	ents' been re	ported to FF	II? If no, enter of	details on moi	tality events	sheet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
	V
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Ť
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	ī
aquaculture animals held on site?	V
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	1
ii iio, detaii.	
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).	- 10
ii yes, detaii (ii fiot detailed drider recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 01/06/2021 - 22/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0126		Site No:	FS0858		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/04/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	C	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	С	9	18	26	0
•	Number of sup	ocluding third country	C			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m			3		10	10
Movements on	Number of des		C			10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	C				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III 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	C	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	C				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	C	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	C	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	1			
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	C	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		С				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	<u> </u>			
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		C				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
alioini access to eages	No		2	-			0
	1.,,			1			
					Total Rank		20 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0126	Site No: FS	60858
3. Does the site have access to a range of	ms in the previous 4 years? r equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanic	ing deltamethrin,
	agement agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for i	nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) ed standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	I SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP	during the period that
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L.</i> s 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the pe	calmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or aboveriod that records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
	h Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. ch is considered to cause significant welfare problems	N/A N N
suggested criteria for treatment or where Council 11. Has any other action been taken (where 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carri	inistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis leve C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications e applicable)? It can taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels and out in cooperation between participating farms? The terms where fewer populations or part populations are hele	9? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) N/A Y Y Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice mana scenarios during the escalation of a sea lic	agement procedure with waypoints describing set actione infestation?	ns to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stoo	cks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reaso	ons. Y
	nage due to predators in the current or previous products the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	ction cycles? N Y
f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No s 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mi 5. Have these been reported to local DSFE		
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover e		4.4.07, 0.4.11)
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and make to be considered under satisfactory measure.	•	ode but could
io. is the site inspected as satisfactory with	h regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s	Y Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0126	Site No: FS0858	
Date of Visit: 26/04/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located w	vithin a farm management area?	Y
f N, no further questions require comple		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm I	Management Agreements and Statements	s
	eement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepare	ed?
 Is the current FMAg/S available for instance Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant 	•	Ϋ́
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	<u> </u>	Y
	commencement of the agreement or statem	nent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	review?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage		
B. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimulifarm?	m health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
	tion requirements for stocks held in the area	a or farm?
	es of fish which may be stocked into the area	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim ndividual farm?	num stocking density of any pen on any farm	n in the area or the
	pements for the storage and disposal of any	dead fish from any
ish farm in the area or the individual far		
Arrangements for The Management o		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numl	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	pility and the use of medicines on farms cov	ered by the agreement Y
	ements for the sensitivity testing of available	e treatments for sea
ice on farms in the area or individual far		
Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	nstances under which biological controls and arms?	d cleaner fish are to be Y Ins within the area? Y
	pements for synchronous treatments on farm	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum area or farm?	nstances when live fish may be introduced o	r removed from the
	pements for the movement of live fish on and	

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 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? e or more year classes may be stocked onto s odstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Managern 24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	nent Agreements Only nt include arrangements for persons to becon	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 set the FMAg/S? 23/01/2021	statement?

Case No:	2022-0126			Date of visit:	26/04/2022			
Site No:	FS0858	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
·		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
			-					
	1							
			_					
			-					
	+							
	_							
Report Summary				1				
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI	28/04/2022							
	+							
	†							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 DATE OF VISIT 26/04/2022
SITE NO FS0858 SITE NAME Fada

Case No 20220126 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.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 28/04/2022

Issued	by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
		Date of visit: 27/04/2022						
$\overline{}$	Main Inspecto	or:						
II 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
ermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed						
gion: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-6						
<u>.</u>	If yes, see additional infor If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								
بر بر	e Name: Siness Name: I 3 SLI ermometer No: gion: HI oresent?	E Name: Siness Name: Loch A Chairn Bhain Loch Duart Ltd 4 VMD 5 Ermometer No: T307 Water type: S Oresent? Y If yes, see additional infor N If yes, yes additional infor N If yes yes yes additional infor N If yes						

Additional Case Information:

Wrasse mix of wild caught (from GB) and farmed (Otter Ferry).

The site is composed by two pen groups: Reintraid and Torgawn. One dead runt was observed during the inspection and 6 fish with tail damage, possibly caused by seals as the farm manager explained they have been suffering from predation lately. They have tried to increase the tension of the predator netting to help mitigate the issue. These fish were swimming very actively within the pens. The main population displayed good feeding response and looked healthy, with minimal sea lice load. The fish sampled for the VMD were in healthy conditions and no sea lice was observed on them.

Sea lice counts (adult female/fish) in week 15 2022 were 1.6 so the site is currently being treated with Salmosan (weeks 16 & 17).

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0127]	Site No:	FS062	1			
Date of Visit:		27/04/202	2		Inspector(s	s):		
Registration/Autho	risation Det	tails						
1. Business/site deta			site representa	ative?			Y	7
2. Changes made to			one representation				Y	
Site Details (include	o cloanor fic	sh for all soc	etions)					_
Total No facilities	e cleaner na	28	Facilities sto	ckod	24	No facilitie	es inspected	28
Species	CAL		racilities sto	CKEU	24	NO facilitie	s inspected	20
Age group	SAL	WRA			_			
No Fish	2021 S1	Mix				_		
Mean Fish Wt	420,142	6,596						
	3kg	120g		Nova Innut F	Pata (Cita)	A == :1 0000		
Next Fallow Date (Si	•	Dec 2022		Next Input D		April 2023		
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease prob	ilems?			Any escape	es (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
1. Movement records		or inspection?	,					Y
2. Date of last inspec		or inspection:					04/11/2019	
3. Are records comp		rootly optored	12				04/11/2019	Y
4. Are movement red		•						ı v
								ı ı
5. Are records comp				-1-1-0				N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for intro	auctions (out	with GB) availa	adie?				IN/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		ut by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not u	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst								Y
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed o	of?			Other (deta	ail)		
If other detail:	DK Waste s	skip at Badcal	ll shorebase, th	nen to Greys	composting.			
3. Mortality records of				j				Y
			Wk 12, 2022	2: 1.485 (0.35	%). wk 13: 1.	746 (0.41%),	wk 14: 1.499	(0.35%), wk
						ties 2,652 fish		
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		2021.	'		,		,
5. Evidence of recen		atypical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		•		/reason:				
		,	1 7					
6. Any other peaks ir	n mortality du	uring period c	:hecked?					Y
If yes, detail:	Reported to	FHI.						
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	een reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	eported to FH	II? If no, enter	details on mo	rtality events	sheet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
T.M.S.,	
If yes, detail: Salmosan	
Optomease	
also used	
If other, detail: as	
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., Salmosan	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	\
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	·
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
	V
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	ī
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	I
aquaculture animals held on site?	V
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	I
ii no, detaii.	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 04/11/2019 - 21/04/2022	

Н	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	ued by: I	-HI			
	Case no:	2022-0°	127	Site No:		FS0621			Date of v		27/0	4/2022	27/(
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	11:0	0:00	12:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	. [25
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No			•									
	Fish nos	1	2	3									
	Pool Group	0.41	0.41	0.41									
	Species	SAL		SAL									
	Average weight	4kg		4kg									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
		=											
Detaile		och na Thuill	Duartmore	Loch na Tuill									
2	Stock Origin	၁၀] Pan	20-					ı				
Stock	Facility No	T9	R10	R12									

O4/2022 Additional Sample Information: Fish killed by percussive blow to head.												
0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	1						

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue:			: 12/05/2020	
Case Number:	2022-0127		Site No:	FS0621		Insp:		
Date of Visit	27/04/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or acluding third country	0	9	18	26	0	
•	Number of supp		0			14	0	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0	3	6	10	3	
Movements on	Number of dest		0			10	3	
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	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 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	
and raide of the another	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					
		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	1				
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3	
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5					
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	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		1	
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1					
CoGP/Regulator				_				
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0	
code of practice	No		3					
Platform access to cages	Yes			1				
Tallotti decess to cages	No		2				0	
				1				
					Total Rank		LOW	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0127	Site No:	FS0621
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous like the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) for the State of t	allowed synchronously on a single you and bath sea lice medications (inc	cluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agree Management Area (or equivalent)?	ment or statement relevant to the si	ite and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Lego. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specific.)	~	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggrecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ested criteria for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that N
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numb 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that record	•	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 considere		N/A N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or oth suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is a 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooper 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer sea lice?	considered to have welfare implicati a significant impact upon the lice lear eration between participating farms?	vels recorded? N/A N/A N/A
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedscenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	dure with waypoints describing set a	actions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea li	ice count data? If no please detail re	easons. Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to pre 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation Nylon nets, top If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (whe 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisher	10 re they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If ye	s give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with loom Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk be considered under satisfactory measures of the A 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to considered.	c of further escapes? (Not covered in	n code but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0127	Site No: FS0621	
Date of Visit: 27/04/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance	ill : (
Is the farm under inspection located w If None further questions require complete		Y
If N, no further questions require comple	EUOTI.	
•	Management Agreements and Statement	
Has a current farm management agreIs the current FMAg/S available for inst	eement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepar	ed? Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant	•	Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	n site(s) to which it applies?	Y
•	commencement of the agreement or staten	ment?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of	review?	
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage		
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimule farm?	m health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
	tion requirements for stocks held in the area	a or farm?
•	es of fish which may be stocked into the area	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim individual farm?	num stocking density of any pen on any farm	n in the area or the
	ements for the storage and disposal of any	dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual far		
Arrangements for The Management o	f Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	ents for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availab of statement?	pility and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement Y
	ements for the sensitivity testing of available	e treatments for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual far		
Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	nstances under which biological controls and arms?	d cleaner fish are to be
	ements for synchronous treatments on farn	d cleaner fish are to be Y ns within the area? Y
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum area or farm?	nstances when live fish may be introduced o	
	ements for the movement of live fish on and	

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	ridual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restock 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether on agreement or statement?	y which the area or individual farm will be fallo ed? e or more year classes may be stocked onto s bodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	ites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ment Agreements Only ent include arrangements for persons to becon	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and o 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	perated in accordance with the agreement or soft the FMAg/S? Mar-22	statement? Y

Site No: FS0621

Case No: 2022-0127

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2022-0127]		Date of visit:	27/04/2022			
Site No:	FS0621]		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
			-					
			-					
			-					
Report Summary				1				
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	28/04/2022							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0398 Date of Visit 27/04/2022

SITE NO FS0621 SITE NAME Loch A Chairn Bhain Case No 20220127 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.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 28/04/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2022-0128			Date of visit: 27/04/2022						
Time spent on site:	hr	Main Inspect	or:						
Site No: FS0671 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Outer Bay (Loch Droighniche) Loch Duart Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8.6	Thermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed N/A						
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-7						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? 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	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

Wrasse mix of wild caught (Skye, Dorset, Cornwall) and farmed (Otter Ferry).

Three pens stocked. The weather was calm and sunny and the fish were being hand fed during the site inspection so they could be observed well. The fish were in great condition with no signs of damage and very little sea lice could be seen. Not all of the fish are selected for broodstock so some of the population is currently being harvested.

Sea lice only assessed visually so no records available. No treatments have been necessary since the site has started stocking broodstock. The fish had sea lice issue last summer at Clashnessie Bay, so they were temporarily transferred to Sound of Harris before being moved to Outer Bay in December 2021. The movement had been risk assessed and the fish have not had sea lice issues since.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0128		Site No:	FS0671				
Date of Visit:		27/04/2022			Inspector(s)	:		ı
Registration/Author								_
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Y	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	s inspected	8
Species	SAL	WRA						
Age group	2020 S1	Mix						
No Fish	2,319	301						
Mean Fish Wt	9.5kg	120g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	August 2022		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	November	2022	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	•							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					20/03/2019	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	>				20/03/2013	Y
4. Are movement re				•				Y
5. Are records comp								Ÿ
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen					-			Y
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detai	I)		
If other detail:			shorebase, th	nen to Greys o	•	,		
3. Mortality records					1 1 2 2 3			Y
·	·	·	Wk 12, 2022	2: 31 (0.73%),	wk 13: 21 (0.	5%), wk 14: 2	28 (0.67%), w	ık 15: 16
4. Recent mortality (anerfish morta	alities 34 fish	since input ir	December 2	
5. Evidence of recer		* *						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility.	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:		<u> </u>						
7. Have increased (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 mor	tality events s	heet.		N/A

Tuestments and Madicines December	
Treatments and Medicines Records	V
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	- 1
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
Optomease	
also used	
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection?	V
Nedicines records available for inspection? 3. Are records complete and correctly entered?) V
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	\ \ \ \ \ \ \
	'
If other, detail: Optomease	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	- '
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
ricaliti status, certification ii 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:	
in no, dotain.	
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
you, actum (in not actumed and notice allocated problems).	
Records checked hetween: 20/03/2019 - 21/04/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0128		Site No:	FS0671		Insp:	
Date of Visit	27/04/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or acluding third country	0	9	18	26	0
•	Number of supp		0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0	3	6	10	3
Wovernerits on	Number of dest		0			10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	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)	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	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				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	e only processed.	0]			
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				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			1			
Tationi docess to cages	No		2				0
	•			•			
					Total Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0128	Site No: FS	60671
3. Does the site have access to a range of licen	uivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year onced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (includiell as access to suitable biological and/or mechani	ing deltamethrin,
	ment agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspe	ection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) andard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal	I SSI, CoGP Annex 6) N/A N/A
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	w the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP	during the period that N/A
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	onis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above that records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N/A
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish He θ . Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is	alth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. considered to cause significant welfare problems	? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
suggested criteria for treatment or where C. elo	ered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis level</i> ongatus is considered to have welfare implications	? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried o	plicable)? taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels ut in cooperation between participating farms? here fewer populations or part populations are hele	N/A
	nent procedure with waypoints describing set action estation?	ns to deal with recognised Y
	eflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasonecorded. At the time of the visit fish were in great	
	e due to predators in the current or previous produce predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	ction cycles? N Y
f other, detail below:		
f Yes proceed with questions $4 - 9$. If No skip t 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministe 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fort	•	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escap	pees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) D. What action was taken to prevent and minim be considered under satisfactory measure	eed with local wild fish interests and was permission ise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in constant of the Act) gards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s	de but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0128	Site No: FS0671	
Date of Visit: 27/04/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require complete	letion.	
2. Has a current farm management agr3. Is the current FMAg/S available for in4. 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 statemer	Y Y Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxis individual farm?	um health standards for the stocks to be introduction requirements for stocks held in the area of less of fish which may be stocked into the area of mum stocking density of any pen on any farm in gements for the storage and disposal of any de	r farm? Y Y T farm? Y The area or the
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement 13.	of Sea Lice nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
lice on farms in the area or individual fa	arms? mstances under which biological controls and c	
	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or regements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	ridual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoc 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s roodstock 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 becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or so of the FMAg/S? Mar-22	statement? Y

Site No: FS0671
Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp 2 nd Insp
Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Insp
Report Summary
Case Type Date Insp 2 nd Insp ECI, CNI, SLI 28/04/2022
ECI, CNI, SLI 28/04/2022





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0398 Date of Visit 27/04/2022

SITE NO FS0671 SITE NAME Outer Bay (Loch Droighniche)

Case No 20220128 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.

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:

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: 28/04/2022