FHI 059, Version 13	Į:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0029			Date of visit: 02/03/2022
Time spent on site:	nrs	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: FS0823 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Noust Geo Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Busiliess No.	business Name.	Scottish Sea Famis Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 7.3	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA: O-2
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional ir	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	•		nformation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Mortality events reported:

wk28 - 10/07/2017 - 1.53% (2,345) post-transfer

wk36 - 04/09/2017 - 1.5% (879) maturation

wk39 - 25/09/2017 - 2.07% (120) maturation

wk48 - 29/11/2021 - 4.9% (25,773) gill health

wk49 - 06/12/2021 - 9.2% (46,268) gill health

wk50 - 13/12/2021 - 6.6% (30,186) gill health

wk51 - 20/12/2021 - 1.5% (6,230) gill health

wk2 - 10/01/2022 - 2.1% (8,586) gill health

Fish came on from Shapinsay in November 2021 which is used as a nursery site and have been doing well since the transfer. Paramove was used in January 22 as a profilactive treatment to maintain low levels of lice across the site.

FMA not fallowed synchronosly on single year class basis, but risk assessement is in place. This was inspected and found to be satisfactory.

Fish were sitting deep in the cages. A handful of fish were sitting higher up but these fish were not moribund and evaded a hand net and so were not sampled for diagnostics. No mortalities observed across the site.


Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally and demonstrated a good feed response.


Amendment made to surv freq. Risk category updated from low to medium by 12/01/23. FHR re-issued 12/01/23.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issue:			
Case No:	2022-0029		Site No:	FS0823						
Date of Visit:		02/03/2022			Inspector(s):					
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils								
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by si	ite representat	tive?			Υ			
2. Changes made to details?										
Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)										
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilities	sinspected			
Species	SAL									
Age group	2021 S0									
No Fish	390,981									
Mean Fish Wt	604g									
Next Fallow Date (Si		March 23		Next Input Da	te (Site)	September	23			
Recent (last 4 wks)	•	ems?		•	Any escapes	<u> </u>				
If yes, detail:	AGD				, ,	`	,			
 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement rec 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certification Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a system 	cords availabluete and corre ates for introductions	e for dead fisectly entered? luctions (outwood)	h and waste? with GB) availal half) of the bus	siness (not usir	•					
Mortality Records										
1. Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?								
2. How are mortalities	s disposed of	f?			Other (detail)					
If other detail:	Stored in sea	aled bins at th	e barge befor	e being transfe	rred to Orkne	y mainland f	or ensiling at			
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?							
			Wk7: 2,440 (0.62%), Wk6:	2,436 (0.62%)), Wk5: 3,95	6 (0.99%), W			
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		(0.92%)							
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical mortal	ities?							
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:						
6. Any other peaks in		•								
If yes, detail:		al information								
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?						
If yes, detail action:										
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter d	etails on morta	ality events sh	eet.				

12/05/2020

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





FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0029		Site No:	FS0823		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
·	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	10
Wovernents on	Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		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		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	1				
		from Category III farm	8				
		from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Ιο	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3]			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2]			
					Total Rank		18 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022	-0029	Site N	o: FS0823	\supset
 Is the CoGP Farm Manager Does the site have access t 	ea lice problems in the previous ment Area (or equivalent) fallow to a range of licenced in-feed and benzoate) as well as access t	wed synchronously on a sing nd bath sea lice medications	(including deltamethr	
• •	ed farm management agreeme	nt or statement relevant to th	e site and CoGP Farr	m Y
5. Are sea lice count records a	available for inspection? (Legal ect the required standard specifi	·	? (Legal SSI, CoGP A	Y nnex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) records are inspected? (CoGl	ecord levels below the suggestor	ed criteria for treatment in th	e CoGP during the pe	riod that Y
	sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers during the period that records a		or above (prior to w/b	0 10/6/19) or N
	ed to the Fish Health Inspectora at a level which is considered to			N/A N
•	nts been administered or other and or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is con			
13. Are treatments, where con	a taken (where applicable)? Into or the actions taken had a sinducted, carried out in cooperate The site, where fewer poperates.	ion between participating far	ms?	N/A N/A Y tment for
15. Is there a site specific writt scenarios during the escalatio	ten lice management procedure n of a sea lice infestation?	e with waypoints describing s	et actions to deal with	recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels obse	erved on stocks reflect sea lice	count data? If no please det	ail reasons.	Y
·	quipment damage due to predatiigate against the predation ex	•	•	N Y
3. Have escape incidents or e	events been experienced on or	in the vicinity of the site sinc	e the last FHI inspection	on? N
4. Have these been reported t 5. Have these been reported t	4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 o Scottish Ministers? o local DSFB forthwith (where to the SSPO and local fisheries		·	
7. Were methods (if any) used	to recover escapees? If yes gi	ve detail		
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4 9. What action was taken to po be considered under satisf	as this action agreed with local 4.38, 5.4.18) revent and minimise the risk of actory measures of the Act) tisfactory with regards to contain	further escapes? (Not cover	ed in code but could	ottish

THI 050 Marajan 12	looued by EUI	Data of igauga 42/05/2020
FHI 059, Version 13 Case No: 2022-0029	Issued by: FHI Site No: FS0823	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0029	Site No: FS0823	
Date of Visit: 02/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located w	vithin a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm N	Management Agreements and Statemen	ıts
2. Has a current farm management agre	eement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepa	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ins	·	Y
Does the FMAg/S identify the relevantDoes the FMAg/S identify the fish farn	•	Y
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	commencement of the agreement or state	ment?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of i	_	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage	ement	
	m health standards for the stocks to be intr	roduced to the area or
farm?		
•	tion requirements for stocks held in the are	
	es of fish which may be stocked into the are num stocking density of any pen on any fari	
individual farm?	idin dedicing denoty of any pointing any lan	
	gements for the storage and disposal of any	y dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual far	rm?	
Arrangements for The Management o		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	ents for the sharing of data on sea lice num	nbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availab	bility and the use of medicines on farms co	vered by the
agreement of statement?		
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require lice on farms in the area or individual fan	ements for the sensitivity testing of availab	le treatments for sea
	ms: nstances under which biological controls an	nd cleaner fish are to be Y
used on farms in the area or individual fa	•	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	gements for synchronous treatments on far	ms within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
•	nstances when live fish may be introduced	
area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang	gements for the movement of live fish on ar	nd off sites in the area
or individual farms?	one and the more more of the north of the	1. 2.1. 2.1. 2.1. 2.1. 2.1. 2.1. 2.1. 2

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable have	arvest practices on farms in the area or indi	ividual farms?
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	which the area or individual farm will be falle	ow and the earliest Y
•	or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by Y
-	odstock or potential broodstock are to be ke	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Managem 24. Does the farm management agreemen parties to the agreement?	ent Agreements Only t include arrangements for persons to become	me, or cease to be,
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and ope 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	erated in accordance with the agreement or the FMAg/S? Sep-21	statement? Y

Г	HI 059, Version 13							155	sued by: F				
	Case no:	2022-00)29	Site No:		FS0823			Date of v		02/0	03/2022	02/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	21
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	F1-5	F6-10	F11-15	F16-21								
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	604g	604g	604g	604g								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
Stock Details	Stock Origin	Shapinsay FS0860	Shapinsay FS0860	Shapinsay FS0860	Shapinsay FS0860								
Ċ,	Facility No	4	5	6	3								

03/2022 Additional Sample Information: Fish dispatched by percussive blow.													
Tien dispatched by perodoctive blow.													
0 Total Tests assigned 0													

Case No:	2022-0029			Date of visit:	02/03/2022			
Site No:	FS0823	1		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ite of Notifica	tion		
rtoodito Cummary	1 104.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
							-	
	1							
			-					
Poport Summer				1				
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	07/03/2022		Z INSP					
Re-issue report	12/01/2023							
	1							
	Ī							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 02/03/2022

 Site No
 FS0823
 Site Name
 Noust Geo

 Case No
 20220029
 Inspector

This report replaces the fish health report R25 issued on 7 March 2022, amending the section concerning surveillance frequency. The previous report should be discarded.

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.

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: Date: 12/01/2023
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0031			Date of visit: 01/03/2022
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0614 Business No: FB0572	Site Name: Business Name:	Holywood Breeding Centre AquaGen Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 10.6	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

No site wide fallows planned but individual holding units are emptied, cleaned and disinfected between cycles.

Site inspection done by observed by

No fish held currently for production purposes, but may have smolts in autumn 2023 for future broodstock. Some brood fish on site are landlocked and have been held only at Holywood. Other broodfish have come in from sea sites.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issi	ued by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020			
Case No:	2022-0031		Site No:	FS0614							
Date of Visit:		01/03/2022	2		Inspector(s):			l			
Registration/Author 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite represent	tative?			Y Y				
Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)											
Total No facilities	c cicanci na	15	Facilities st	ocked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	15			
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL		TTO TOOME	Inopostou				
Age group	2020	Brood	2019	2021 Ova							
No Fish	1,966	2,808	926	9,562,800							
Mean Fish Wt	5.8kg	8.7kg	11.8kg	0.1g							
Next Fallow Date (S		No fallow pla		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	July 2022 -	- Turness, Sh	etland			
Recent (last 4 wks)					Any escapes	_		N			
If yes, detail:						`	,				
 Are movement re Are records comp Are health certific Transport Records Are any movement If yes, is there a sys 	olete and corr ates for introd ints carried ou	ectly entered' ductions (outv	? vith GB) avail half) of the b	lable? usiness (not us				Y Y N/A			
Mortality Records							·				
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y			
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals				
If other detail:											
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y			
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		Month of Fe	ebruary 2022: 5	brood fish (0.	06%)					
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	atypical morta	lities?					N			
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	y/reason:							
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ıring period cl	necked?					N			
If yes, detail:											
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported t	to vet or FHI?				N/A			
If yes, detail action:											
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		N/A			

To the out Madiaina Danada		
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		V
If yes, detail: Formalin		
If other, detail:		
Medicines records available for inspection?		Y
Are records complete and correctly entered?		· V
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		·
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	Formalin	
If other, detail:	i omalin	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
o. Are medicines stored appropriately:		
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, rec	cording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify	•	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included	• •	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the pre		
is detected been included and how and when that will be i	·	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stock	ked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures impleme	ented 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 pl	lace to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately imple	mented 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	s).	
Records checked between:	03/03/2020 - 25/02/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0031		Site No:	FS0614		Insp:	
Date of Visit	01/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	٥	18	26	
species	compartment in Number of supp	cluding third country	0		10	14	
							10
Movements off	Frequency of m Number of dest		0		6	10 10	6
Exposure via water	INGITIDE OF GEST	Site contacts	_				
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or b	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
		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		
	iairiis upstreair	TOT WITHIN T HAD EXCUISION	<u>'</u>		Ü		$\overline{}$
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				
the fules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
	_	from Category III farm	. 8				
	_	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	<u>.</u>]			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
		for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	nnastourised food	0	1			0
Ose of unpusteurised reeds	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity	r county unipus	Number of sites	1] 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0		2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			
CoGP/Regulator				1			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
	lvaa			1			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2	1			
					Total		17
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2022-0031		Site No:	FS0614	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
•	nced sea lice problems in the pr	evious 4 years?			
•	lanagement Area (or equivalent	•	n a single y	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and ema	access to a range of licenced in- amectin benzoate) as well as ac byed in a reasonable period of ti	ccess to suitable biological a			s,
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or	cumented farm management ag equivalent)?	reement or statement releva	ant to the si	te and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard	specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the survivos (CoGP Annex 6)	uggested criteria for treatme	nt in the Co	GP during the period th	at
	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) no 0/6/19) during the period that re		vel of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6/	19) or
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Health Ins	pectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is consid	ered to cause significant we	elfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	.50)
•	reatments been administered or reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>				
•	on been taken (where applicable	•			
•	reatments or the actions taken h				
	ere conducted, carried out in co ng strategy for the site, where fe		_		ior
sea lice?	ig strategy for the site, where lev	wer populations of part popu	ilations are	neid without treatment i	IOI
•	ific written lice management pro during the escalation of a sea lic	• •	ribing set a	ctions to deal with	
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect se	ea lice count data? If no plea	ase detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	ion				
•	nced equipment damage due to	predators in the current or a	orevious pro	oduction cycles?	N
•	ce to mitigate against the preda	·	•	•	Y
Site inside, pest					
If other, detail below:					
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been experienced	on or in the vicinity of the si	ite since the	last FHI inspection?	N
•	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to quest	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ridot i i i inopoditori.	18
	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (v	where they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fis	heries trusts forthwith (wher	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.	17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If	yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed with	n local wild fish interests and	d was perm	ission given by Scottish	
, <u> </u>	en to prevent and minimise the	risk of further escapes? (No	t covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the				
	d as satisfactory with regards to		detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2022-0031			Date of visit:	01/03/2022					
Site No:	FS0614	1		Inspector:		l				
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
,	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
Report Summary										
Case Type ECI, CNI	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI	07/03/2022									
	 									





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0572 Date of Visit 01/03/2022

SITE No FS0614 SITE NAME Holywood Breeding Centre

Case No 20220031 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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

charter/

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-

Date: 07/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	Iss	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0033			Date of visit: 02/03/2022
Time spent on site:	ır	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0680 Business No: FB0067	Site Name: Business Name:	New Farm Selcoth Fisheries Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional info	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail re	eason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection on 23/02/2022 by supervised by

No site wide fallow planned but ponds can now be completely emptied and fallowed individually, thanks to the recently installed disc filter system. Filter fitted to prevent eye fluke issues on site.

Site inspection and VMD sampling done by , observed by . No issues on site, the fish had a good feed response when the ponds were approached. Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0033		Site No:	FS0680	0			
Date of Visit:		02/03/2022	2]		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Autho				0			87	
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	1
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		15	Facilities sto	ocked	15	No facilitie	es inspected	15
Species	RTR	RTR		T			T	
Age group	2020	2021						
No Fish	165,142	109,940						
Mean Fish Wt	400g	175g						
Next Fallow Date (S		No fallow pla	anned	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 202	22	
Recent (last 4 wks)					Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:						`		
Movement Records 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records compt 4. Are movement records 5. Are records compt 6. Are health certification Transport Records 1. Are any movement fyes, is there a system Mortality Records 1. Mortality records 2. House are a section.	Is available for ction: blete and correctords available blete and corrected ates for introduced ints carried out tem in place for	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outw t by (or on be or maintenan	? sh and waste? ? with GB) availa	able? usiness (not us	s?		18/11/2020	Y N/A N/A N/A Y Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								V
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality (5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	• •	(0.02%). lities?		ek 5: 97 (0.03%	6), week 6:	109 (0.03%),	week 7: 75
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	//reason:				
0 1		·	-1 10					. NI
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring perioa cr	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	unexplained) i	nortalities be	en reported to	o 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	rtality events s	heet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	N
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
Are records complete and correctly entered?	Ÿ
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
o. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	V
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ÿ
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)?	
Trouter Status, Sertification in 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?	
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
in no, actain	
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?	Ÿ
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
in you, dottain (in hist dottained directific disorded problems).	
Records checked between: 18/11/2020 - 23/02/2022	

Case no: 2022-0033 Site No: FS0680 Date of visit/ Sampling: Date of visit/ D	ы	11 059, Version 13							ISS	uea by: F	НΙ			
Priority samples: VI		Case no:	2022-00)33	Site No:		FS0680					02/	03/2022	02/0
starts/ends: Environmental conditions: Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species RTR Average weight Average weight Sex N/A Water Type Average Averag		Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG					
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 Pool Group Species Average weight 400g Sex N/A Water Type YO U Y YO U Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y			10:3	0:00	11:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	D.	1
Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Average weight Sex N/A Water Type Average Av		Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Pool/Fish No		Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Pool/Fish No														
Fish nos 1 Pool Group Species RTR Average weight 400g Sex N/A Water Type FW	A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Pool Group Species Average weight Sex N/A Water Type FW YO YO YO YO YO YO YO YO YO Y	Г	Pool/Fish No												
Species RTR Average weight 400g Sex N/A Water Type FW		Fish nos	1							$\overline{}$				
Average weight Sex N/A Water Type YO YO YO YO YO YO YO YO YO Y		Pool Group												
Sex N/A Water Type FW DY Area is a search, DK Water Type Is a search of the search of			RTR											
Water Type FW Yasearch, DK Tasearch, DK		Average weight	400g											
Jetails														
Stock Origin Pacility No N3 Stock Origin		Water Type	FW											
Stock Origin Pacility No N3														
Stock Origin Stock Origin Facility No N3			×							- 1				
Stock Origin Pacility No N3			ο,							- 1				
Stock Origin Pacility No N3	S		된							- 1				
Stock Origin Facility No N3	tai		ea							- 1				
Stock Origin දී Stock Origin N3	De		Jas							- 1				l
ಸ್ರ Facility No N3	상	Stock Origin	Aqu							- 1				.
	Sto	Facility No												

03/2022	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
	Fish kill	ed by pe	ercussiv	e blow t	o the he	ad.					
0	l	Total Te	ests ass	igned	0	l					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue:	12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0033		Site No:	FS0680		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent zone or					
species		ncluding third country	0		18	26	0
	Number of sup	pliers	0	5	10	14	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
	Number of desi		0			10	6
Exposure via water	Ir :	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V			<u> </u>		
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters		T	Onsecure		
processors	7 my processing	, plant alconarging into adjacont watere	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0	1			0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of	1				
	equivalent statu	ıs ı from Category III farm	8				
		from Category V farm	10				
Diamagal of figh and figh ha		<u> </u>] 1			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		te only processed.	0				
		esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5	j			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0				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	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			-
i lationii access to cages	No		2				0
	1.10			1			
					Total		23
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No: 2	022-0033]	Site No:	FS0680	
 Is the CoGP Farm Man Does the site have acceptable. 	ed sea lice problem nagement Area (or ess to a range of li ectin benzoate) as	ns in the previous 4 years? equivalent) fallowed synchrol cenced in-feed and bath seal s well as access to suitable bid	lice medications (in	cluding deltamethrin,	
4. Is there a signed docum Management Area (or equ		gement agreement or stateme	ent relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm	
		spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP / d standard specified in the SS		Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmoni</i> records are inspected? (0		elow the suggested criteria for	r treatment in the C	OGP during the period that	
_	•	almonis) numbers per fish beer riod that records are inspected		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r
		Health Inspectorate? If no, Fl			
9. Is C. elongatus infestat	tion at a level which	h is considered to cause signi	ificant welfare probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•		nistered or other actions taker elongatus is considered to he			
11. Has any other action b	•				
·		ns taken had a significant imp d out in cooperation between	•		
		, where fewer populations or			
15. Is there a site specific recognised scenarios duri		gement procedure with waypo of a sea lice infestation?	ints describing set	actions to deal with	
16. Do the sea lice levels	observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count data?	If no please detail r	reasons.	
Containment Inspection					
·	• •	age due to predators in the cu		•	N
Are measures in place Bird netting,	to mitigate against	the predation experienced or	n site? (Detail belov	v)	Υ
If other, detail below:					
Have escape incidentsIf Yes proceed with questi		perienced on or in the vicinity	y of the site since th	ne last FHI inspection?	N
4. Have these been report					
•		forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	
6. Have these been report	ted to the SSPO ar	nd local fisheries trusts forthw	vith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any)	used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deploye	ed was this action a	agreed with local wild fish inte	rests and was pern	nission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP -					
		nimise the risk of further esca	pes? (Not covered i	in code but could	
be considered under sa 10. Is the site inspected a	•	regards to containment? If no	o, please detail reas	son(s)	Υ
	- Indiana in the second in the	January Tolking Till	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

o 11					00/00/00			
Case No:	2022-0033			Date of visit	02/03/2022	4		
Site No:	FS0680	1		Inspector				
Results Summary	Freq.	D 1 1	Ti.	Da	te of Notifica	ation	l.	
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-	-						
		-						
	-							
		 						
D (0				,				
Report Summary	D 1		and .	4				
Case Type ECI, CNI, VMD	Date 07/03/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp					
LCI, CIVI, VIVID	01/03/2022							
	+							
	+							
	1							
	+							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0067Date of Visit02/03/2022Site NoFS0680Site NameNew Farm

Case No 20220033 Inspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 07/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0034			Date of visit: 02/03/2022
Time spent on site:	5hr	Main Inspecto	pr:
Site No: FS0102 Business No: FB0067	Site Name: Business Name:	Moffat Water Selcoth Fisheries Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.6	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional 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 on 23/02/2022 by supervised by

Site inspection done by supervised by Background mortalities observed, no clinical signs of disease.

Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons.

Mortality levels in MP1 and MP 2 have returned to normal following mortality incident in week 2.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0034		Site No:	FS0102				
Date of Visit:		02/03/2022]		Inspector(s):			ı
Registration/Autho								
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	•	checked by s	ite representa	itive?			Y	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		22	Facilities sto	cked	14	No facilities	s inspected	22
Species	RTR	RTR						
Age group	2022	2021						
No Fish	378,429	816,009						
Mean Fish Wt	0.5g	90g						
Next Fallow Date (S		No fallow pla	anned	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2022	- Troutlodge	USA
Recent (last 4 wks)					Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? Mortality Records 1. Mortality records available for inspection?								
How are mortalitiesIf other detail:	s disposed of				Incinerated -	Off Site		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		Week 4: 2,96 7: 780 (0.069	60 (0.24%), we %).	eek 5: 2,711 (0).22%), weel	k 6: 1,446 (0.	,
5. Evidence of recer		• •		/www.				N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per racility/	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	aceked?					Y
If yes, detail:				(47.00() MD2	O MD4			
•				(17.3%) MP2	& MP1			
7. Have increased (u								1
If yes, detail action:				s removed, oxy			s reviewed.	, and the second
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
Chloramine	
If yes, detail: T, Formalin	
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?	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, 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: 13/10/2021 - 23/02/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue:	12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0034		Site No:	FS0102		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent zone or					
species		ncluding third country	0		18	26	18
	Number of sup	pliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
	Number of desi		0			10	3
Exposure via water	I= :	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III	1	3	6		
		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V	<u>'</u>	3	0		
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Managament practices			None	Coouro	Lineseure		
Management practices Water contacts with	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	None	Secure	Unsecure		
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	4				
		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.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	<u> </u>	1			0
ose of unpusicurised reeds	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity	r eeding unpus	Number of sites] 2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase			2		1
		taff and equipment	0		2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1	-		
between sites, use of	No		0				0
footbaths etc	140		1	J			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry			0				0
code of practice	No		3	']			
Platform access to cages	Yes		1 0	1			0
a constant	No		2				
				J			
					Total		43
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2022-0034	Site No:	FS0102	
 Is the CoGP Farm M Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema 	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? lanagement Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously of access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice med amectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological byed in a reasonable period of time?	ications (in	cluding deltamethrin,	
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e	cumented farm management agreement or statement relevequivalent)?	ant to the s	site and CoGP Farm	
	ecords available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) ely reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the		Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment (CoGP Annex 6)	ent in the C	OGP during the period that	
	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a le 0/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	evel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see co	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered to cause significant w	elfare probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•	reatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L</i> reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfa			
•	on been taken (where applicable)?	41 11 1-		
•	eatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upor ere conducted, carried out in cooperation between participa			\vdash
	ng strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part pop	_		
•	ific written lice management procedure with waypoints desc during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	cribing set	actions to deal with	
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ase detail ı	reasons.	
2. Are measures in place	ion nced equipment damage due to predators in the current or ce to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (D		•	N Y
Hatchery located If other, detail below:				
· ·	nts or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the sestions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	site since th	ne last FHI inspection?	N
	ported to Scottish Ministers?			
•	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP –	4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (whe	re they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests an EP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	d was pern	nission given by Scottish	
	en to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (No	ot covered	in code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the Act)			V
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please	detail reas	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

2					00/00/00			
Case No:	2022-0034	J		Date of visit:	02/03/2022			
Site No:	FS0102	1		Inspector				
Results Summary	Freq.	Detek	Unan	Da	te of Notifica	tion	II	- nd -
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
	1							
D				1				
Report Summary	Dete	lana	ond I					
Case Type ECI, CNI	Date 07/03/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp					
LOI, OIVI	0110312022							
	+							
	1							
	+							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0067Date of Visit02/03/2022Site NoFS0102Site NameMoffat Water

Case No 20220034 Inspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 07/03/2022

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0035			Date of visit: 02/03/2022
Time spent on site:	1hr	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: FS0188	Site Name:	Yarrowford	
Business No: FB0353	Business Name:	The Yarrow Fishery	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.4	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: BO	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?		formation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		formation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional in	formation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detai	l reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection on 23/02/22 by supervised by

Site inspection and VMD sampling done by , observed by . Fish looked health and with a good feeding response when the ponds were approached. Some minor dorsal fin damage was observed in the brown trout population. Eye fluke main health issue on site but not causing mortality.

Prescription not available for Aquatet treatment in September 2021. Invoice from vet available.

Site manager unable to locate BMP. New one submitted after the inspection.

The movement records were available but fishery numbers were not recorded. A list of fishery numbers was sent for future reference and going forward these will be included in the movement records. Some of the fisheries were not clearly identifiable from those registered with Marine Scotland. We are currently working to establish if these sites require registration.

Downgraded fish are processed on site for dog treat business along with pheasants. Main business is supplying fisheries.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	led by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0035]	Site No:	FS0188				
Date of Visit:		02/03/2022			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	10	No facilities	s inspected	10
Species	TRT	RTR	RTR	RTR				
Age group	2020	2019	2020	2021				
No Fish	7,000	6,800	62,000	24,500				
Mean Fish Wt	800g	1.1kg	800g	250g				
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input Da	te (Site)	End of mar	ch 2022 - RT	R
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last v	/isit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Ensiled - on s	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (•			tween 1-23/02/2	22: 16 fish.			
5. Evidence of recer								N
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?								
If yes, detail action:								N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no. enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A
			,		,			

Treatments and Medicines Records	
Recent treatments (see comment)?	
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	
Are records complete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	·
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scott	ish 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 present	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked of	on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?	
Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	hetween each epidemiological unit to minimise
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visito	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to	
aquaculture animals held on site?	to maintain the physical community
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	ted on site?
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or or	n behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 20	0/05/2020 - 23/02/2022

FHI 059, Version 13							155	uea by: i	-111			
Case no:	2022-00)35	Site No:		FS0188			Date of Samplin		02/0	03/2022	
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	13:3	0:00	14:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	1
Environmental conditions	: 1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1											
Pool Group												
Species	RTR											
Average weight	500g											
Sex	N/A											
Water Type	FW											
S												
Details	m					l		l				
	Costa					l		l				
Stock Origin Facility No												
Facility No	D2											

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
	killed by	y blow to	head							
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0035		Site No:	FS0188		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26	0
opened .	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off			0			10	10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	10
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)	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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	•	0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
		rfrom Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10	1			
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	ĺ			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	0	Ī			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	1			
					Total		22
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2022-0035	Site No:	FS0188	
 Is the CoGP Farm M Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema 	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? flanagement Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice me amectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological in a reasonable period of time?	edications (ir	ncluding deltamethrin,	d
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e	cumented farm management agreement or statement rele equivalent)?	evant to the	site and CoGP Farm	
	ecords available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex ely reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and		Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treation (CoGP Annex 6)	ment in the C	CoGP during the period that	
	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a 0/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r
•	n reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see			
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered to cause significant	welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
suggested criteria for tr	reatments been administered or other actions taken wher reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have we on been taken (where applicable)?			
•	reatments or the actions taken had a significant impact up	on the lice le	evels recorded?	
	ere conducted, carried out in cooperation between partic			
14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part po	pulations ar	e held without treatment for	
	ific written lice management procedure with waypoints descalation of a sea lice infestation?	scribing set	actions to deal with recognise	d
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no p	lease detail	reasons.	
Containment Inspecti				
•	nced equipment damage due to predators in the current of		•	N
Bird netting,	ce to mitigate against the predation experienced on site?	(Detail belov	w)	1
If other, detail below:				
2 Have occano incido	ents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the	sito sinco ti	ho last EUI inspection?	N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	s site since ti	ne last i ili ilispection:	14
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Ministers?			
•	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP			
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (wh	nere they exi	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail			
8 If all note were deale	oyed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests a	and was norm	mission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		and was pell	mosion given by occursing	
	ten to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the Act) d as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please	se detail reas	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2022 0025			Data africita	02/02/2022						
Case No.	2022-0035			Date of visit.	02/03/2022	J					
Site No:	FS0188	l		Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
	+										
	1										
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, VMD	23/03/2022										
	+										





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0353Date of Visit02/03/2022Site NoFS0188Site NameYarrowford

Case No 20220035 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 found to be inadequately maintained.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was not available for inspection.

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

The biosecurity measures plan was not available at the time of inspection but has since been supplied by the site manager. No further action necessary.

The movement records were available but fishery numbers were not recorded. A list of fishery numbers was sent for future reference and going forward these will be included in the movement records. Some of the fisheries were not clearly identifiable from those registered with Marine Scotland. We are currently working to establish if these sites require registration.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 23/03/2022

charter/

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2022-0037			Date of visit: 01/03/2022						
Time spent on site:	nrs	Main Inspecto	r:						
Site No: FS0031 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Pegal Bay Cooke Aquaculture Scotland L	td						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 6.8	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA: O-3						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	· · · · · · · ·	Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Additional Case Information:

Fish came on from Yetts O' Muckart in October 2021 and have been doing well since the transfer. Company vet visited the site in November and December for post-transfer health checks and reported that the fish were in good physical condition and demonstrated an excellent feeding response. Gills were also in good health.

Site is used as a nursery site where fish can be on-grown before transfer to other sea sites where they are grown to harvest size

No disease issues on site, but site manager has reported an increase in the observation of lice on the site. Fish were treated with Slice and Salmosan in January 22 to reduce loads. Site manager reported that both treatments had good clearance rates, but expected further treatments would be necessary throughout the cycle to maintain low levels.

Seals and cormorants are present in high numbers in the vicinity around the site. Cages are equipped with sapphire nets and tensioned top nets to deter predators.

FMA is not fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis, however there is a risk assessment in place for this which was inspected and found to be satisfactory.


Fish were sitting deep in the water so were difficult to observe. A handful of moribunds were observed across the site but didn't display any clinical signs of disease so were not sampled for diagnostics. 2 mortalities were also noted across the site. The population of fish in the cages otherwise appeared healthy and in good condition.


Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally and demonstrated a good feed response.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	Date of issue						
Case No:	2022-0037		Site No:	FS0031						
Date of Visit:		01/03/2022			Inspector(s):					
Registration/Author	risation Dota	ile	_							
Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? Y										
2. Changes made to details?										
Site Details (include	e cleaner fis	h for all secti	ons)							
Total No facilities		8	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilities inspected				
Species	SAL									
Age group	21S0									
No Fish	294,945									
Mean Fish Wt	291g									
Next Fallow Date (Si		August 22		Next Input Da	te (Site)	October 22				
Recent (last 4 wks) of				•	_ ` ′	(since last visit)?				
If yes, detail:		-			,	(
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?										
Transport Records 1. Are any movemen If yes, is there a syst										
Mortality Records										
1. Mortality records a	vailable for ir	nspection?								
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail)					
	Mortalities au	e stored in se	ealed bins on	the site barge l	pefore being t	ransferred to Pelagia for f				
If other detail:	processing.	0 010.00 00		o go .		andrened to relagia to r				
3. Mortality records of		correctly ente	ered?							
4. Recent mortality (I	ast 4 wks):	Ť	Wk7: 98 (0.0	3%), wk6: 470	(0.16%), wk5	: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0				
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Wk7: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk4: 98 (0.03%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk5: 444 (0.15%), wk6: 470 (0.16%), wk6:										
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:										
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?										
If yes, detail:										
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?										
If yes, detail action:										
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.										

12/05/2020

Treatments and Medicines Records										
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?										
`	M.S.,									
	Imosan,									
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)?	T.M.S.									
If other, detail:										
6. Are medicines stored appropriately	?									
Biosecurity Records										
1. Biosecurity records available for ins	·									
	mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?									
3. Has the manner and period in whice increased (unexplained) mortality at	th the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any									
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease									
	nd <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?									
	re animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher									
health status, certification if required)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,										
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurit	y measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise									
	d (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?									
	ng the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of									
aquaculture animals held on site?	grant and provide the second s									
8. Have the biosecurity procedures be	een 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 insp	ection?									
3. Any significant results?										
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).										
Records checked	hetween: 19/03/2019 - 25/02/2022									





FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 1							
Case Number:	2022-0037		Insp:					
Date of Visit	01/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	C	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	C	9	18	26		
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	C			14	0	
Movements off				<u> </u>		10	3	
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		C			10	3	
Exposure via water	1	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through	C)				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I						
diseases)		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2	
		or in a coastal zone with category III nor within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		or in a coastal zone with category V		4	0			
	tarms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8			
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	С	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	С				0	
and raide of the amount	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of	4					
		n from Category III farm	8	3				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10					
	Site's own was	te only processed.	C	<u>-</u>			0	
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed					0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	C	1	2		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					
CoGP/Regulator				_				
Practices in accordance	Yes		C				0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		C				0	
	No		2					
					Total Rank		10 LOW	
					TUIT			

Case No:	2022-0037		Site No:	FS0031				
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Socuetor Sitos Only	1						
•	•) as in the previous 4 years?			N			
·	·	equivalent) fallowed synchrono	usly on a single ve	ear class basis?	N			
	,	cenced in-feed and bath sea lic	•		Y			
	amectin benzoate) as	s well as access to suitable biolo	•	,	<u> </u>			
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		gement agreement or statemen	t relevant to the sit	te and CoGP Farm	Υ			
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for in	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP An	nex 6)		Υ			
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)								
		Ilmonis) numbers per fish been riod that records are inspected?	at a level of 3 or a	bove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r N			
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI	see comment.		N/A			
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level whic	h is considered to cause signific	ant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N			
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)								
11. Has any other actio			•	, ,	N/A			
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?								
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carrie	d out in cooperation between pa	articipating farms?		Υ			
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?								
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?								
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count data? If	no please detail re	easons.	Υ			
Containment Inspecti	on							
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment dama	age due to predators in the curr	ent or previous pro	oduction cycles?	N			
		the predation experienced on s	ite? (Detail below)		Υ			
Sapphire nets If other, detail below:	Top nets							
ii otilei, detail below.								
3. Have escape incide	nts or events been ex	perienced on or in the vicinity o	f the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N			
If Yes proceed with que								
4. Have these been rep								
•		forthwith (where they exist)? (Co		·				
6. Have these been rep	oorted to the SSPO a	nd local fisheries trusts forthwith	ı (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)				
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail						
8. If aill nets were depla	oved was this action a	agreed with local wild fish intere	sts and was permi	ission given by Scottish				
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		January Control of the Control of th		J. J. L. L. C. Comon				
9. What action was take	en to prevent and mir	nimise the risk of further escape	s? (Not covered in	code but could				
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)								
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, p	olease detail reaso	on(s)	Υ			

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0037	Site No: FS0031	
Date of Visit: 01/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located w		Y
If N, no further questions require comple	edori.	
2. Has a current farm management agre3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ins4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	farm management area? n site(s) to which it applies? commencement of the agreement or statem	Pd? Y Y Y Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim individual farm?	m health standards for the stocks to be intro- tion requirements for stocks held in the area is of fish which may be stocked into the area num stocking density of any pen on any farm ements for the storage and disposal of any of	or farm? or farm? In the area or the
Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	f Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	pers and treatments?
agreement of statement?	collity and the use of medicines on farms cover	
lice on farms in the area or individual far	ms? Istances under which biological controls and	
	ements for synchronous treatments on farm	s within the area?
area or farm?	estances when live fish may be introduced or 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 indi	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restor 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of the agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto so	sites covered by Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag 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,
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? Jan-21	statement? Y

٠.	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	ued by: I	-111			
	Case no:	2022-00)37	Site No:		FS0031			Date of v		01/	03/2022	01/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampiin	g. HI		ı	
	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		0:00 Dry	11:3	0:00 Windy	3	Inspecto	or: 4		5	VMD No	o. 	12
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	ımples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1-5	F6-10										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	291g	291g										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Yetts O' Muckart FS0371	ص Yetts O' Muckart FS0371										

03/2022	03/2022 Additional Sample Information:												
	Fish dispatched by percussive blow.												
0		Total T	ests ass	igned	0								
				,									

Casa Na	2022 2027			D	04/00/000					
Case No:	2022-0037	J		Date of visit	t: 01/03/202	4				
Site No:	FS0031	1		Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
,	'	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
							_			
			-		-					
			_							
			-		-					
	↓		_							
	 				-		_			
			-		-					
			_							
Report Summary										
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	Date 07/03/2022	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CINI, SLI, VIVID	01/03/2022									
	 									
	 									





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0095
 Date of Visit
 01/03/2022

 Site No
 FS0031
 Site Name
 Pegal Bay

 Case No
 20220037
 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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 07/03/2022
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2022-0038			Date of visit: 01/03/2022					
Time spent on site:	ırs	Main Inspecto	or:					
Site No: FS0993 Business No: FB0095	Site Name: Business Name:	Chalmers Hope Cooke Aquaculture Scotland L	td					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 7	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA: O-3					
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 out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

Fish came on from Lyrawa Bay (FS0054) and after slightly elevated mortality following transfer, the fish are reported to have performed very well on the site with low mortality levels since. AGD scores have also been very low.

Site has only used Tricaine for sealice counts since input. Site manager shared his observation that leps are becoming more prevalent in the water so a hydrolicer treatment has been scheduled for next month (March), alongside harvesting the site which is currently ongoing.

All harvests are deadhaul.

Majority of population appeared healthy and in good condition. A few individuals were noted across the site that displayed physical damage as a result from a hydrolicer treatment that was conducted at the end of 2021.


No moribund fish or mortalities were observed in any of the cages.


Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally and demonstrated a good feed response.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issue	ed by: FHI	_	Date of issue		
Case No:	2022-0038		Site No:	FS0993]			
Date of Visit:		01/03/2022]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils						
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	ails summary		ite representa	tive?		Y Y		
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fisl	h for all secti	ions)			_		
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilities inspected		
Species	SAL							
Age group	20S0							
No Fish	215,264							
Mean Fish Wt	4.3kg	A maril OO		Newt Innut De	to (Cito)	Contomb or 00		
Next Fallow Date (Si Recent (last 4 wks)		April 22		Next Input Da	_ ` `	September 22 (since last visit)?		
If yes, detail:		51119 :			Arry escapes	(Since last visit):		
ii yes, detaii.								
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record		inspection?						
2. Date of last inspec		·				24/11/2020		
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?						
4. Are movement red	cords availabl	e for dead fis	h and waste?					
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	•					
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	uctions (outw	rith GB) availa	ble?				
Transport Records		. h / a a a a la a l	If) - f + l	-:	OTD\0			
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst		• '		,	~			
ii yes, is there a syst	lem in place it	or maintenant	ce or transpor	ialion records :				
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for ir	nspection?						
2. How are mortalities					Other (detail)			
16 (1 1 6 2)			ne site barge l	pefore being tr	` ′	Pelagia for further process		
3. Mortality records of				<u> </u>				
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		Wk7: 150 (0.	07%), Wk6: 23	34 (0.11%), W	/k5: 0, Wk4: 346 (0.15%)		
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality dui	ring period ch	ecked?					
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	inexplained) r	nortalities bed	en reported to	vet or FHI?				
If yes, detail action:	antal bases	orted to FLU	Olf no coto	lotoilo en ment	olitu oventa al-	oot		
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been rep	onted to FHI	r ii no, enter d	ietalis on mort	anty events sh	ieet.		

12/05/2020

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?
If yes, detail: T.M.S.
If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?
If no, detail:
Results of Surveillance
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
3. Any significant results?
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).
Records checked between: 24/11/2020 - 25/02/2022





FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0038	FS0993	S0993 Insp:				
Date of Visit	01/03/2022		No of me	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements	s on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		s on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
00000	compartment including the Number of suppliers	nird country	0		10	14	0
Movements off		o off	l 0	3	6	10	0
wovernerits on	Frequency of movements Number of destinations	5 011	0		6	10	0
Exposure via water	Training of Gradultanonic	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other	Farm is protected (secur disinfection or borehole)	e water supply through	0				
farms (holding species susceptible to same	,	astal zone with category I	, and the second				
diseases)	farms upstream or within	1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a co	astal zone with category III 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a co	astal zone with category V					
	farms upstream or within	1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant dis	charging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within	No on farm processing		0				
the rules of the directive	Processing own fish (re-	cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS	of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zon	e or compartment of					
	equivalent status		4				
	Processing fish from Cat	<u> </u>	8				
	Processing fish from Cat	egory v rami	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by- products	Site's own waste only pro	ocessed.	0				0
products	Common processes with	other farms	3				
	Collection point for waste	e from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteuri	sed feed	0	Ī			0
	Feeding unpasteurised for	eed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from sing	le shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and e	quipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry	No		3				
code of practice							
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		R

Case No:	2022-0038		Site No:	FS0993	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only	v)			
	_	ns in the previous 4 years?			N
·	•	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on	a single ye	ear class basis?	Υ
	•	icenced in-feed and bath sea lice medic	•	•	Υ
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed		s well as access to suitable biological a od of time?	ınd/or mech	nanical control measure	s, and
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		agement agreement or statement releva	ant to the si	te and CoGP Farm	Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ir	nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the require	d standard specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex (6) Y
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		pelow the suggested criteria for treatment	nt in the Co	GP during the period th	at N
		almonis) numbers per fish been at a leveriod that records are inspected?	vel of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6/	19) or Y
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.		Υ
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	ch is considered to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	.50) N
		nistered or other actions taken when <i>L.</i> . <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfa			
11. Has any other actio			ic implicati	0113: (0001 4.0.02, 0.0	N/A
-	·	ons taken had a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?	Y
		ed out in cooperation between participa			Y
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	g strategy for the site	e, where fewer populations or part popu	lations are	held without treatment t	for Y
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		gement procedure with waypoints descentification?	ribing set a	ctions to deal with recog	gnised Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stock	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no plea	ase detail re	easons.	Y
Containment Inspection					
·		nage due to predators in the current or p	-	•	N
Seal pro nets	Top nets	t the predation experienced on site? (D	etali below)	Y
If other, detail below:	Top fiets				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
3. Have escape incider	nts or events been e	xperienced on or in the vicinity of the si	te since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que					
4. Have these been rep					
·		forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP –		•	4.7)
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO a	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where	e iney exisi	I)? (COGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.	17)
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover es	scapees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo	oyed was this action	agreed with local wild fish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG					
9. What action was take	en to prevent and mi	nimise the risk of further escapes? (No	t covered in	n code but could	
be considered under	satisfactory meas	sures of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0038	Site No: FS0993	
Date of Visit: 01/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located w		Y
If N, no further questions require comple	etion.	
2. Has a current farm management agree3. Is the current FMAg/S available for instance4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	farm management area? n site(s) to which it applies? commencement of the agreement or statem	Y Y Y Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccina 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim individual farm?	m health standards for the stocks to be intro- tion requirements for stocks held in the area as of fish which may be stocked into the area num stocking density of any pen on any farm dements for the storage and disposal of any	a or farm? A or farm? Y In in the area or the
Arrangements for The Management o 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	f Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	pers and treatments?
agreement of statement?	collity and the use of medicines on farms covered ements for the sensitivity testing of available	
lice on farms in the area or individual far	ms? istances under which biological controls and	
	arms : ements for synchronous treatments on farm	ns within the area?
area or farm?	estances when live fish may be introduced 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	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restor 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of the agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto so	sites covered by Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag 24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to becon	ne, or cease to be,
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 softhe FMAg/S? Jan-21	statement? Y

Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No	
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling starts/ends: 12:00:00 12:30:00 Inspector: VMD No. Environmental conditions: 1 Dry 2 Windy 3 Cloudy 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total S Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1 F2 F2 F1 F2 F2 F2 F2 F3 F4	01/0
starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Dry 2 Windy 3 Cloudy 4 5 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total S Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos F1 F2 F2 F0 F0 Group Species SAL SAL Average weight 4.3kg 4.3kg Sex N/A N/A N/A	
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total S Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Image: Control of the control	15
Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No	
Pool/Fish No <t< td=""><td>Samples</td></t<>	Samples
Fish nos F1 F2 Pool Group Species SAL Species SAL SAL Average weight 4.3kg 4.3kg Sex N/A N/A	
Pool Group Species Species SAL Average weight 4.3kg Sex N/A	
Species SAL SAL Average weight 4.3kg 4.3kg Sex N/A N/A	
Average weight 4.3kg 4.3kg Sex N/A N/A	
Sex N/A N/A	
Water Type SW SW	
Stock Origin Facility No Stock Origin Facility No Facility No Stock Origin Facility No Fac	

03/2022	Addition	nal Sam	ple Info	rmation:									
D3/2022 Additional Sample Information: Fish dispatched by percussive blow.													
0 Total Tests assigned 0													

Case No:	2022-0038			Date of visit:	: 01/03/2022	2		
Site No:	FS0993]		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	l		Da	ate of Notifica	ation		
rtocallo Carrinary	1 104.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
			-1		-1		-	2 11135
					-			
	Î							
		<u> </u>						
Report Summary		Г		1				
	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	07/03/2022	ПОР	2 11100					





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0095
 Date of Visit
 01/03/2022

 Site No
 FS0993
 Site Name
 Chalmers Hope

 Case No
 20220038
 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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 07/03/2022
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13	I:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2022-0040			Date of visit: 07/03/2022					
Time spent on site:	Bhrs	Main Inspecto	or:					
Site No: FS0504	Site Name:	Girlsta Hatchery						
Business No: FB0557	Business Name:	SSF Shetland Ltd (Hatchery)						
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 12.5	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: F	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?		mation/clinical score sheet.					
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?	Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed?		Y If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet.					
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

Additional Case Information:

Hatchery experiences low mortality across all 4 units (incubation, first feeding, parr and smolt). Most recent ova input from Aquagen observed an accumulated mortality of 3% specifically due to stress hatching.

Site still having issues with hydrogen sulphide spikes in the system. Issues occurred during Autumn 2021, with an accumulated mortality of 30,000 over three separate incidents.

Site has not treated since 2014 with medicines, therefore no recent treatment records to inspect. Salt is used on site if there are spike in nitrates.

The one smolt tank was observed and noted to exhibit different swimming behaviour than other tanks. This tank was seen to go with the flow within the tank, rather than against it.

In addition, upon removal and inspection of some fish, slight red vents were observed. This was attributed to the fact that fish has

Site inspected on 07/03/2022 by supervised by

VMD samples taken on 07/03/2022 by and supervised by Fish sampled were seen to be in good health.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issue	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0040		Site No:	FS0504				
Date of Visit:		07/03/2022			Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	site representa	tive?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		39	Facilities sto	cked	39	No facilities	s inspected	39
Species	Ova	Fry	Parr/Smolts					
Age group	2022	2022	Q2 2022					
No Fish	181,576	1,127,119	1,308,101					
Mean Fish Wt	ova	2.4g	70.1g					
Next Fallow Date (S		Ongoing	rang	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	June 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks)	*			•	Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:					· ···y coccipes	(5.1.155 1.1.151	, .	
•								
Movement Records								
1. Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							19/07/2021	
Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement re	cords availab	e for dead fis	sh and waste?					Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outv	vith GB) availa	ble?				Y
Transport Records	•							
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	siness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys								
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	Shetland W	aste to Energ	IV
If other detail:	_		ted in Lerwick	. Bulk waste ei				,,
3. Mortality records				. Daik waste ci	TIONEG III ECI W	ion (ioiiiian)	11010071	Y
or mortality records	oomprote and	component of the		50202; Wk7,	0.26% 11466	: Wk6 0.08	% 1986· Wk	5 0 06%
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks)·		1638	, 30202, VVK1,	0.2070, 11400	, vvko, 0.00	70, 1300, VVK	5, 0.0070,
5. Evidence of recer	•	typical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		reason:				- 11
ii yes, lacility 1105/110	Thortainty per	racility/110 St	ock per racility/	Teason.				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period cl	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	Thortanty du	ing period ci	iconcu:					1
7. Have increased (inevalained)	mortalities he	en reported to	vet or FHI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	unexplained)	Tortaines be	ci reported to	700011111:				1074
	ents' been re	ported to EUI	2 If no enter	details on mort	ality events of	neet.		N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	cillo neeli le	ported to FIII	r: ir no, enter (uetalis on mort	anty events sr	icci.		IN/A

To describe a LM distance Bossel	
Treatments and Medicines Records	N
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	IN
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	NI/A
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N/A
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, 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	e
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: 19/07/2021- 01/03/2022	

٠.	11 059, Version 15							155	su c u by.	1 1 11			
	Case no:	2022-00	040	Site No:		FS0504			Date of Samplir		07/	03/2022	07/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG		ig. HI		1	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	01:4	5:00	02:4	5:00		Inspect	or:			VMD N	0.	25
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5		l	
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No	4.0	40.45	40.00	04.05	00.00	04.00	04.07	00.40	10.10	47.50	54.54	55.50
	Fish nos	1-9	10-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-33	34-37	38-42	43-46	47-50	51-54	55-58
	Pool Group	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL		SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL
	Average weight	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g	70g
	Sex	N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A FW	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FVV	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	O Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	চ Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	54 Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	9 Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	6 Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	Stofnfiskur (Iceland)	21 Stofnfiskur (Iceland)

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0040		Site No:	FS0504	I	Insp:	
Date of Visit	07/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or notuding third country	0	9	18	26	9
	Number of sup		0			14	5
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	I 0	3	6	10	10
	Number of des		0		6	10	10
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g 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 raids of the unconve	Processing ow	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	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		О	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2]			
					Total Rank		34 HIGH

Case No:	2022-0040]	Site No: FS0504	
2. Is the CoGP Farm M 3. Does the site have a	nced sea lice probler lanagement Area (or access to a range of l amectin benzoate)	ms in the previous 4 years? requivalent) fallowed synchronously olicenced in-feed and bath sea lice med s well as access to suitable biological	dications (including deltamethrin,	and
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		agement agreement or statement relev	vant to the site and CoGP Farm	
		nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6 ed standard specified in the SSI and th	•	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		pelow the suggested criteria for treatme	ent in the CoGP during the period that	
		almonis) numbers per fish been at a leriod that records are inspected?	evel of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19	9) or
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish	n Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see c	comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	ch is considered to cause significant w	velfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.5	0)
suggested criteria for tr	reatment or where C	inistered or other actions taken when <i>l</i> . elongatus is considered to have welf		
11. Has any other action	•			
•		ons taken had a significant impact upo		
		ed out in cooperation between participa e, where fewer populations or part pop	_	,
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		gement procedure with waypoints des e infestation?	cribing set actions to deal with recogn	ised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stoc	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ease detail reasons.	
Containment Inspecti	on			
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment dam	nage due to predators in the current or	previous production cycles?	N
	ce to mitigate agains	t the predation experienced on site? (I	Detail below)	Υ
Rentokil, Site If other, detail below:				
il other, detail below.				
Have escape incide If Yes proceed with que		experienced on or in the vicinity of the skip to question 10	site since the last FHI inspection?	N
4. Have these been rep	oorted to Scottish Mir	nisters?		
		forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP -	•	
6. Have these been rep	oorted to the SSPO a	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (whe	ere they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17	7)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover e	scapees? If yes give detail		
9. If all noto ware dank	aved was this satis-	agrood with lead wild fich interests an	nd was normission given by Coatti-t	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	SP - 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	agreed with local wild fish interests an		
		inimise the risk of further escapes? (No	ot covered in code but could	
be considered under 10. Is the site inspected	•	sures of the Act) regards to containment? If no, please	e detail reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0040			Date of visit:	07/03/2022			
Cita Na	EC0504	1						
Site No:	FS0504	J		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
,	· ·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
ECI, CNI, VMD	14/03/2022	·						





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0557 DATE OF VISIT 07/03/2022
SITE NO FS0504 SITE NAME Girlsta Hatchery

CASE NO 20220040 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Site has not conducted any treatments since 2014, therefore no treatments records were inspected.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed: Date: 07/04/2022
Fish Health Inspector

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0041			Date of visit: 08/03/2022
Time spent on site:	3hrs	Main I	Inspector:
Site No: FS0946	Site Name:	North Voe	
Business No: FB0440	Business Name:	SSF Shetland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 7.5	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-5
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•		nal information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?		nal information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	ry out intended visit detai	I reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

During the site inspection, fish were seen to be swimming deep and occasionally seen shoaling.

Fish at harvest are transferred off site through deadhaul.

Remote inspection conducted by on 01/03/2022 while shadowed by


Site inspection confucted by on 08/03/2022 and supervised by


VMD samples taken on 08/03/2022 by and supervised by

Sampled fish were observed to be in good health and exhibited no clinical signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of is	ssue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0041	Site No:	FS0946		
Date of Visit: 08/03/202	22		Inspector(s):	
Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary checked by site rep 2. Changes made to details?	presentative?			
Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)				
Total No facilities 8 Species SAL Age group 2021 S0 No Fish 201,525 Mean Fish Wt 1.7 kg Next Fallow Date (Site) March/April 202	Facilities stocked	Next Input Date (Site)	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		N	Any escapes (sinc	
If yes, detail:				
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith Giller) Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the properties of the propert	B) available? of the business (not transportation recor		Incinerated - Shet	
Mortality records complete and correctly entered?Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		(0.61%): wk 6: 20	01 (0.73%); wk 7: 1	
 Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? 		(0.0170), WK 0.20	01 (0.7570), WK 7. 1	
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock pe	r facility/reason:			
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checker If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported by the second of the second	ported to vet or FHI			
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no	o, enter details on m	ortality events she	et.	

Treatments and	Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatme	ents (see comment)?	
If yes, detail:	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
·	rds available for inspection?	
3. Are records cor	mplete and correctly entered?	
4. Are fish in a wit	•	
5. If yes, what trea	•	T.M.S.
If other, detail:		
· ·	stored appropriately?	
	,	
Biosecurity Reco	ords	
1. Biosecurity reco	ords available for inspection?	
•	•	moval, recording and safe disposal been considered?
3. Has the manne	er and period in which the APB	will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any
at the site been in		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
4. Has the action	that will be taken in the event t	hat the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disea
	at will be notified to Scottish M	
5. Has the health	status of aquaculture animals	being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
required)?		
6. Have the husba	andry and biosecurity measure	s implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise
covered (moveme	ent of staff, visitors, equipment	live or dead fish etc.)?
7. Is documentation	on available regarding the mea	sures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquacu
8. Have the biose	curity procedures been adequa	ately implemented on site?
If no, detail:		
'		
Results of Surve	eillance	
1. Has any anima	l health surveillance been carri	ed out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are result	Its available for inspection?	
3. Any significant		
If yes, detail (if no	t detailed under recent disease	problems).
	Popards abanked bot	04/12/2010 01/03/2022





٠.	ii 055, version 15							155	ucu by.				
	Case no:	2022-00	041	Site No:		FS0946			Date of Samplin		08/	03/2022	08/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	-	g. HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:1	12:15:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	20
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Н	Fish nos	1	2	3									
Н	Pool Group	1		3									
Н	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
			1.7kg										
	Average weight Sex	1.7kg N/A	N/A	1.7kg N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
	water Type	SVV	300	300									
tock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	Girlsta Hatchery (FS0504)	Girlsta Hatchery (FS0504)	ယ Loch Tralaig (FS0468)									
S	I donky 140	1	1	9									

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	Date of issue: 12/05/20			
Case Number:	2022-0041		Site No:	FS0946		Insp:			
Date of Visit	08/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score		
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10			
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0		
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0		
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	0		
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	6		
Movements on	Number of desi		0		6	10	3		
Exposure via water		Site contacts	. 0	1-5	6-10				
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0						
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1		
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6				
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8				
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						
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1		
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1					
	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	te only processed.	0	1			0		
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1					
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5						
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ĺ			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	0	1	2		0		
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		T 0	1			0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1						
CoGP/Regulator				,					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0		
code of practice	No		3						
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0		
	No		2	1					
					Total		11		
					Rank		LOW		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0041	Site No:	FS0946	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fall 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	owed synchronously on a single y and bath sea lice medications (in	cluding deltamethrin,	N Y Y
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreem Management Area (or equivalent)?	nent or statement relevant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm	Υ
 Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legaline Countries of the sea lice countries of the sea		egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y Y
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggerecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	sted criteria for treatment in the C	oGP during the period that	Υ
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) number 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectors. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered			N/A N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or othe suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is contained to the contain		tions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Y
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooper 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer posea lice?	ation between participating farms	evels recorded? ?	N/A Y Y Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedus scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	re with waypoints describing set a	actions to deal with recognised	Υ
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice	e count data? If no please detail r	easons.	Υ
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to pred 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation of Top Nets, If other, detail below:		•	N Y
Scarecrow 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on c	w in the visinity of the cite cines th	a last EUI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 14. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries)	0 e they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	N
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes	give detail		
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of the considered under satisfactory measures of the Action. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to cont	of further escapes? (Not covered i	in code but could	Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0041	Site No: FS0946	
Date of Visit: 08/03/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located v	within a farm management area?	v
If N, no further questions require comple	· ·	T
2. Has a current farm management agree3. Is the current FMAg/S available for instance4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	t farm management area? m site(s) to which it applies? commencement of the agreement or statem	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimu farm?	ement m health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie	ation requirements for stocks held in the area es of fish which may be stocked into the area num stocking density of any pen on any farm	a or farm?
	gements for the storage and disposal of any rm?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	of Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	pers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availal of statement?	bility and the use of medicines on farms cover	ered by the agreement
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requir lice on farms in the area or individual far	rements for the sensitivity testing of available rms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	nstances under which biological controls and arms?	I cleaner fish are to be
	gements 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
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang or individual farms?	gements for the movement of live fish on and	d off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable h	narvest practices on farms in the area or in	dividual farms?
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocke 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brocke covered by the agreement or statement? Point of Compliance for Farm Manageme 24. Does the farm management agreement	ed? or more year classes may be stocked onto odstock or potential broodstock are to be k nent Agreements Only	co sites covered by the Y Except on any site
parties to the agreement? Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and op 26. What is the version no/date of issue of		or statement?

Case No:	2022-0041	J		Date of visit	: 08/03/2022	4		
Site No:	FS0946	1		Inspector				
		1						
Results Summary	Freq.				ate of Notifica			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	+							
	+							
	+							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI,SLI, VMD	14/03/2022							
	+							
	+							
	+							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0440
 DATE OF VISIT
 08/03/2022

 SITE NO
 FS0946
 SITE NAME
 North Voe

 CASE NO
 20220041
 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.

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		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020		
Case No: 2022-0042			Date of visit: 09/03/2022		
Time spent on site:	1.5hrs	Main Inspect	or:		
Site No: FS1116	Site Name:	Lee of Burrafirth			
Business No: FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland	Ltd		
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 7.3	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-8b		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?		rmation/clinical score sheet.		
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?		rmation/clinical score sheet.		
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet.		
Diagnostic samples taken?		N			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:					

Additional Case Information:

The site was made inactive in 2009 and reactivated for fish to come onto site in Nov 2021.

The stock origin of the fish on site are from Stead of Aithness. To reduce biomass on site, some fish were transferred to Lee of Burrafirth.

Weather on the day of the site inspection was inclement, therefore fish were not easily observed. In addition, they were swimming

Remote inspection conducted by on 03/03/2022, and supervised by site inspection conducted by on 09/03/2022 and supervised by

VMD samples taken on 09/03/2022 by and supervised by . Fish sampled for VMD was seen to be healthy and exhibited no clinical signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0042		Site No:	FS1116				
Date of Visit:		09/03/2022			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)			_		
Total No facilities		5	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilities	s inspected	5
Species	SAL							
Age group	2020 S0							
No Fish	84,999							
Mean Fish Wt	4.08kg							
Next Fallow Date (S		April 2022	•	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	not plannin	ng to stock aft	er
Recent (last 4 wks)	*	•		•	Any escapes		_	N
If yes, detail:					, any occupies		,	
Movement Records	•							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					14/09/2009	
3. Are records comp		actly entered?	,				14/03/2003	Y
4. Are movement re				•				
5. Are records comp								
6. Are health certific				ahle?				N/A
o. Are nearly certine	ates for introc	idolloris (oditi	vitir OD) availe	abic:				1071
Transport Records				. , ,				NI NI
1. Are any movemen								N
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpor	rtation records	<i>?</i>			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente						Y
				0.31%, 266; W	k7, 1.26%, 13	376; Wk6, 0.	23%,319; Wk	(5,
4. Recent mortality (•		0.20%,280					
Evidence of recer		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
C Amir other meales :								NI NI
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	mortality du	ring period cr	lecked?					N
•	unovaloined\	mortalitics be	on roported to	vot or EUI2				NI/A
7. Have increased (unexplained) i	nortalities be	en reported to	vecor Fri?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	antal bass	name of the Elli	0.16.00.000	-l-t-:l '	-1:6			N1/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	V
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	1
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	V
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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
ii iio, detaii.	
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	V
	•
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	N
3. Any significant results?	IN
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 17/11/2021-09/03/2022	
Records checked between: 17/11/2021-09/03/2022	

Г	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	uea by: Fr	ור			
	Case no:	2022-00)42	Site No:		FS1116			Date of vis		09/0	03/2022	09/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling.	н			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. [10
	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											
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	4Kg											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	SW											
		SS											
		je							_				
١.,		Ė							_				
9		of 6							_				
Details		o pi					l						
		Stead of Aithness (FS0637)					l						
Stock	Stock Origin Facility No	5											
V.	acility NO	5											

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0042		Site No:	FS1116		Insp:	
Date of Visit	09/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0	_	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	0
Movements on	Number of desi		0		6	10	0
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
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				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			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		2
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		T 0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		9
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0042	Site No:	S1116
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivale 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as can these be deployed in a reasonable period of times.	ent) fallowed synchronously on a single year in-feed and bath sea lice medications (include access to suitable biological and/or mechan	ding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Management Area (or equivalent)?		and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection 6. Do records adequately reflect the required stands		al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	suggested criteria for treatment in the CoG	P during the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that		ove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health	Inspectorate? If no. FHI see comment.	Y
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is con		s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongat</i>		
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicand). Have therapeutic treatments or the actions takend in the actions takend in the actions takend in the action in t	n had a significant impact upon the lice levels cooperation between participating farms?	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestat		ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflec	t sea lice count data? If no please detail reas	sons. Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the pre seal pro nets, bird	· · ·	uction cycles?
f other, detail below:		
 Have escape incidents or events been experience Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to qu Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith 	restion 10 n (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17	7)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local	fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	(CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees	? If yes give detail	
3. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	with local wild fish interests and was permiss	ion given by Scottish
What action was taken to prevent and minimise to be considered under satisfactory measures of		ode but could
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards	•	s) Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by:	FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0042	Site No: FS1116		
Date of Visit: 09/03/2	2022 Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection local	ted within a farm management a	area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require co	ompletion.		
Points of Compliance for Both Fa 2. Has a current farm management 3. Is the current FMAg/S available of 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the rel 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the da 7. Does the FMAg/S identify the da	agreement or statement (FMAg for inspection? evant farm management area? In farm site(s) to which it applies te of commencement of the agre	g/S) been prepared? ?	Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Ma 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the mi farm?	_	stocks to be introduced to t	he area or Y
 Does the FMAg/S identify the va Does the FMAg/S identify the s Does the FMAg/S identify the mindividual farm? 	pecies of fish which may be stoo	cked into the area or farm?	Y Y A or the
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the a fish farm in the area or the individu		disposal of any dead fish f	rom any Y
Arrangements for The Managements 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arran		on sea lice numbers and tr	eatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the a of statement?	vailability and the use of medicir	nes on farms covered by the	e agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any r lice on farms in the area or individu		esting of available treatment	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the cused on farms in the area or individ		gical controls and cleaner fis	sh are to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the a		eatments on farms within th	e area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the carea or farm?	ircumstances when live fish may	/ be introduced or removed	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the a or individual farms?	rrangements for the movement	of live fish on and off sites in	n the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue:	12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable har	rvest practices on farms in the area or ir	ndividual farms?	
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by widate when a farm or area may be restocked? 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or	?		
agreement or statement? 23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broods covered by the agreement or statement?	stock or potential broodstock are to be l	kept on any site	
Point of Compliance for Farm Managemer 24. Does the farm management agreement i parties to the agreement?		come, or cease to be, N/A	
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and oper 26. What is the version no/date of issue of th		or statement?	

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0042			Date of visit:	09/03/2022			
Site No:	EC1116			la ana ataw				
Site No.	FS1116	ı		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
ŕ	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary				1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	14/03/2022							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0095
 DATE OF VISIT
 09/03/2022

 SITE NO
 FS1116
 SITE NAME
 Lee of Burrafirth

 CASE NO
 20220042
 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.

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	Į:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2022-0043			Date of visit: 09/03/2022				
Time spent on site:	1.5Hrs	Main Inspecto	or:				
Site No: FS0637	Site Name:	Stead of Aithness					
Business No: FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland L	_td				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 7.5	Thermometer No:	T148	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-8b				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	•		mation/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observ	ed?	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.					
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional infor	rmation/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detail	reason below:					

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

Additional Case Information:

The stock origin of the fish on site is Furnace (FS0339).

Lice skirts are used in the first year of the cycle.

The fish at harvest are transferred off site via deadhaul.

Weather on the day of the site inspection was inclement, therefore fish were not seen. In addition, the fish were swimming deep

Remote inspection conducted by on 03/03/2022, and supervised by

Site inspection conducted by on 09/03/2022, supervised by

VMD samples taken on 09/03/2022 by and supervised by . Fish sampled for VMD were seen to be healthy and did not exhibit any signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0043		Site No:	FS0637				
Date of Visit:		09/03/2022			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho								
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)			_		
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilities	s inspected	12
Species	SAL							
Age group	2020 S0							
No Fish	24,100							
Mean Fish Wt	4.602kg							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	April 2022		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	September	r/October 202	.2
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record	s available fo	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec	ction:						27/03/2019	
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement red	cords availabl	e for dead fis	sh and waste?	•				Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
6. Are health certification				able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:						•	,	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
		•		1.04%, 3806; V	Vk7. 0.86%. 3	3523: Wk6. 0	0.15%. 671:W	/k5.
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		0.14%,647	,, .	,, -	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		,
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								

Treatments and Medicines Records	V
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	1
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	V
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 <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)?	
1 ,	
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:	
ii iio, detaii.	
Results of Surveillance	
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	V
	•
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	N
3. Any significant results?	IN
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 27/03/2019-09/03/2022	
Records checked between: 27/03/2019-09/03/2022	

- 1 1	ni 059, version 15							155	ueu by. F	111			
	Case no:	2022-00	043	Site No:		FS0637			Date of v		09/	03/2022	09/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	11:3	0:00	12:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	о.	22
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	1	2	3									
	Pool Group	'	_	3									
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	4Kg		4Kg									
	Sex	N/A		N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
	water Type	300	300	344									
tock Details		Fumace (FS0339)	Fumace (FS0339)	Furnace (FS0339)									
Sto	Facility No	3	9	11									

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

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0043		Site No:	FS0637		Insp:	
Date of Visit	09/03/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0		10	14	0
Movements off			I 0		6	10	3
Movements on	Frequency of m Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V 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				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category ∨ 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 unpast	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		15 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0043	Site No:	FS0637
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the property of the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced integrated in the company of the compan	fallowed synchronously on a single yea feed and bath sea lice medications (incl cess to suitable biological and/or mecha	uding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm management ag		e and CoGP Farm
Management Area (or equivalent)? 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? ((Legal SSI CoGP Anney 6)	V
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard		gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below the surecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ggested criteria for treatment in the Co	GP during the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) nu 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that red		pove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Ins	pectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Υ
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is consider	ered to cause significant welfare probler	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable	is considered to have welfare implication	
11. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken h		els recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in co		Y
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where few sea lice?		held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice management prospectation of a sea lice infestation		tions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect se	a lice count data? If no please detail rea	asons.
Containment Inspection		
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to		
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predat	ion experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
seal pro nets, if other, detail below:		
il other, detail below.		
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced	on or in the vicinity of the site since the	last FHI inspection?
f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to quest	on 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?		
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (w		
Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fish	neries trusts forthwith (where they exist)	? (CoGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If	yes give detail	
B. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	local wild fish interests and was permis	ssion given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the	risk of further escapes? (Not covered in	code but could
be considered under satisfactory measures of the	e Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please detail reason	n(s) Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/0)5/2020
Case No: 2022-0043	Site No: FS0637		
Date of Visit: 09/03/2	022 Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection locat	ted within a farm management area?	Υ	
If N, no further questions require con	mpletion.		
2. Has a current farm management3. Is the current FMAg/S available for4. Does the FMAg/S identify the rele5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish	evant farm management area? n farm site(s) to which it applies? e of commencement of the agreement o	prepared? Y Y Y Y Y	
Arrangements for Fish Health Mar 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the min farm?	nagement nimum health standards for the stocks to	be introduced to the area or Y	
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the sp	ecination requirements for stocks held in becies of fish which may be stocked into aximum stocking density of any pen on a	the area or farm?	3
	rangements for the storage and disposal al farm?	l of any dead fish from any	
Arrangements for The Manageme 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrang	ent of Sea Lice gements for the sharing of data on sea lic	ce numbers and treatments?	5
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the av of statement?	vailability and the use of medicines on far	rms covered by the agreement	9
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any relice on farms in the area or individual	equirements for the sensitivity testing of a al farms?		3
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the cirused on farms in the area or individu	rcumstances under which biological cont	trols and cleaner fish are to be	3
	rangements for synchronous treatments	on farms within the area?	
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the cir area or farm?	rcumstances when live fish may be introd		
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arror individual farms?	rangements for the movement of live fish	h on and off sites in the area	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restood 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of 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 becon	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or softhe FMAg/S? 09/11/2021	statement?

-											
Case No:	2022-0043	l		Date of visit:	: 09/03/2022	2					
Site No:	FS0637	1		Inspector							
Cho Ho.	. 00007	ı		mopeotor.							
Results Summary	Freq.				Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
	 										
	+										
					-						
	+										
	+										
	1										
	 										
	+										
	+										
	1										
Panart Cumman				1							
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1							
ECI, CNI,SLI, VMD	14/03/2022		Z IIISP								
	+										
	+										
	1										
	1										





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0095 **Date of Visit** 09/03/2022

SITE NO FS0637 SITE NAME Stead of Aithness CASE NO 20220043 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.

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.

R25

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed: Date: 07/04/2022
Fish Health Inspector

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