FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0041		Date of visit: 06/02/2019
Time spent on site: 2 hours	Main Inspector:	
Site No: FS0877 Site Name: Business No: FB0379 Business Name:	Drimsallie Mill River Lochy Association	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3 Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations: Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N	ation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Inspection; - paperwork

Next input; smolt in May 2019 from Garry catchment Stock going out as eyed ova on 11 Feb, Loch Arkaig, Also tributary of Lochy and Garry.

Ova are only placed out at brood source. Future brood fish are taken from the wild as parr or smolts and stripped twice. Genetic testing carried out by Rivers and lochs institute; genetic screening, for siblings, farmed and cluster populations.

Morts; 2nd strip fish culled and returned to river. Peak in fish from inchmore for MS smolt project..

Salt used in autumn mainly in brood fish for fungus. No other treatments.

Mowi vets visit to assess health. No issues picked up. Sample taken for range of diseases.

Catchment; Dubh Lighe

FHI 059, Version 12			Issi	ued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018		
Case No:	2019-0041		Site No:	FS0877				
Date of Visit:		06/02/2019)		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authoral. Business/site deta			site represent	tative?			Y	7
2. Changes made to	•	officored by c	nic represent	auvo.			Y	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		26	Facilities sto	ocked	21	No facilitie	es inspected	21
Species	sal	sal						
Age group	brood	post smolt	parr	ova				
No Fish	280	320	80	260,000				
Mean Fish Wt	1.5	800g	12	<1g				
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	none		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	May		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease proh	lems?		l N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	uisease prob	icinis:			Arry escapes	(Sirice last	VISIL):	IN
Movement Record	s							
Movement record		or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		n mopeoutin.					17/02/2015	
3. Are records comp		rectly entered	?				11702/23 .	Y
4. Are movement re				?				N/A
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		lable?				N/A
Transport Records	5							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried ou	ut by (or on be	half) of the b	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place	for maintenan	ice of transpo	ortation records	?			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records		•						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed o	of?			Other (detail))		
If other detail:	landfill							
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		low; 4 dead	l fish, 70 ova in	last 4 weeks			
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	atypical morta	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	r facility/no sto	ock per facility	y/reason:				
C. Americathor monkeri	·	······································	la alca dO					
6. Any other peaks i If yes, detail:				for 2 wooks	tim ol work			Y
7. Have increased (for 3 weeks - s	sentinei work			N/A
If yes, detail action:	•	mortanties be	en reported t	o ver or i i i :				TV/
8. Have 'mortality e		enorted to FH	2 If no add I	MRT case and	enter on morta	ality events	sheet	N/A
o. Have mortality c	CING DECITIO	ported to 1 11	II IIO, add I	vii ti case ana t	STILL OF THOSE	anty events.	SHEEL.	,, .

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspections. 3. Are records complete and correctly entered.		N/A
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? 5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		N
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		N/A
3. Has the manner and period in which the increased (unexplained) mortality at the sign of the side sign of the si	lity removal, recording and safe disposal beer APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinar	y professional of any Y sence of a listed disease
transmission of disease been covered (mo	asures implemented between each epidemiol vement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or de e measures in place to maintain the physical of	ead fish etc.)?
aquaculture animals held on site?	rineasures in place to maintain the physical c	Somanment of
Have the biosecurity procedures been a lf no, detail:	dequately implemented on site?	Y
Results of Surveillance		

2016- 6/2/19

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0041		Site No:	FS0877		Insp:	
Date of Visit	06/02/2019		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	
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0			14	-
Movements off			0			10	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	6
Exposure via water	rtumber er des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				igwdow
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					\vdash
		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		igwdot
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iainis apstream	TOT WITHIN T HALF EXCUISION	<u>'</u>	-	٥		_
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	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	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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	-			\vdash
out of practice				J			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		13
					Rank		LOW

		•			
Case No:	2019-0041		Site No:	FS0877	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?	?		
2. Is the CoGP Farm M	lanagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed sync	hronously on a single y	ear class basis?	
	amectin benzoate) as			cluding deltamethrin, hanical control measures, ar	nd
•	cumented farm manage	ement agreement or state	ement relevant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the	SSI and the CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	•	ow the suggested criteria	a for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	· ·	monis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or a	above during the period that	
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no	, FHI see comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause s	ignificant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•				levels have exceeded the ions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	applicable)?			
•	•	s taken had a significant	impact upon the lice le	vels recorded?	
		out in cooperation between	•		
				e held without treatment for	
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es			ypoints describing set a	actions to deal with recognise	ed
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count da	ta? If no please detail r	easons.	
Containment Inspecti	on				
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the	e current or previous pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	he predation experience	d on site? (Detail below	')	Υ
trapping, inside, lids					
If other, detail below:					
					N
•		perienced on or in the vici	inity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	IN
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	•	•			
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exist	;)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	J.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts for	thwith (where they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail			
0 16				dealer short by O	
If gill nets were deployed Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild fish i	interests and was perm	lission given by Scottish	
, -	•	mise the risk of further es	scapes? (Not covered i	n code but could	
be considered under	-	_			
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? I	f no, please detail reas	on(s)	Y

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0877

Case No: 2019-0041

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

Case No:	2019-0041			Date of visit:	06/02/2019			
Site No:	FS0877	l		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion		
ŕ		Database	Insp		Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI	15/02/2019		2 11130					





River Lochy Association Fuaim Na Mara Morar Inverness-shire PH40 4PD

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0379
SITE NO FS0877
SITE NAME Drimsallie Mill
INSPECTOR
CASE NO 20190041

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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.

R04

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.

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.

Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

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

Date: 15/02/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date o	of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0045			Date of visit:	06/02/2019
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Mai	in Inspector:	
Site No: FS1019 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Strondoir Bay The Scottish Salmor	n Company	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNA 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	DIA 6	
Water Temp (°C): 8.6	Thermometer No:	T205	FHI 045 comp	oleted N
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	S CoGP MA	M-42
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	Y If yes, see addit	tional information/clinical s tional information/clinical s tional information/clinical s	score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Additional Case Information:

A few moribund and lethargic fish observed on site, 5 fish removed for a diagnostic. Fish taken for VMD sample was matured, but otherwise feeding well and appeared healthy.

Small hole noticed on water line on one cage, staff notified. Repaired immediately with cable tie.

EC, SLI, VMD paperwork completed by supervised by CNA paperwork completed by F1 & F2 diagnostic sampling by F3-F5 diagnostic sampling and VMD sampling by

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0045]	Site No:	FS1019				
Date of Visit:		06/02/2019]		Inspector(s)]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		9	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	es inspected	9
Species	SAL	WRA						
Age group	2017 S0s	Wild caught						
No Fish	194,809	26,500						
Mean Fish Wt	5.07kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	July 2019		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Septembe	er 2019	
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
Movement Record								
Movement record		or inspection?						
2. Date of last inspe		i inspection:					28/11/2017	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	•				20/11/2017	Y
4. Are movement re		•		>				Y
5. Are records comp	olete and corr	ectly entered?	•					N
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	•							
Are any moveme		ıt by (or on be	half) of the hi	isiness (not iis	ing a STR\2			Y
If yes, is there a sys					_			Y
Mortality Records					•			
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Whole fish -	Dundas Ch	emicals	
			nd takes was	te to dumfries.	WHOIC HOIT	Duridus Ori	Cirilouis	
3. Mortality records								Y
4. Recent mortality	•			292 (0.75%) ad	ross whole s	ite per week		
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	atypical mortal						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks if yes, detail:	in mortality dι	ıring period ch	ecked?					N
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			zoportod ti					
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on mort	ality events	sheet.	N/A

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? If yes, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspecting and correctly enterprise and correctly enterpri		Y Y Y
• •	ality removal, recording and safe disposal be e APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterin	
is detected been included and how and w	event that the presence or suspicion of the polyhen that will be notified to Scottish Ministers nimals being stocked on the farm site been contained.	s?
transmission of disease been covered (mo	easures implemented between each epidemi ovement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or on the measures in place to maintain the physical adequately implemented on site?	dead fish etc.)?
Results of Surveillance		
 Has any animal health surveillance bee If yes, are results available for inspection Any significant results? 		Y
	AGD prob	lems in August 2018, Hydrogen peroxide

Samples taken to test for CMS in October 2018 after slighty increased mortality after a hydrolicer treatment. Results came

28/11/18-06/02/19

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

back negative for CMS.

administered to treat.

- 1	11 059, Version 12							153	sueu by. Fri	•	
	Case no:	2019-00	045	Site No:		FS1019			Date of visi Sampling:	it/ 06	6/02/2019 06/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		Н]
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:		1 DMV	No. 10
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5	
	Summary samples	HIST	Υ	ВА	Υ	MG	Υ	VI	Y PA		Total Samples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click										
Г	Pool/Fish No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	P1				
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	1-5	6			
	Pool Group	P1	P1	P1	P1	P1					
	Species	SAL									
	Average weight	3kg	3kg	3kg	2.5kg	4kg					
	Sex	Male		Male		N/A		N/A			
	Water Type	SW									
		Ę	Ę	<u>_</u>	۔ ا	Ę	Ę	ڃ			
ails		pur	pur	bur	pur	pur	pur	bur			
Details		sel									
	Stock Origin	Russelburn									
Stock	Facility No	1	1			2		8			
(1)	r domey 140	•	•	_	_	_		0			

02/2019	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
6	ı	Total To	ests ass	igned	4	1					

FHI 059, Version 12 Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 08/10/2018 Method of killing: Case no: FS1019 2019-0045 Site No: Inspector(s): Date of visit: 06/02/2019 Sheet Relevant: Y S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence Fish Number 60 Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes) 60 90 120 External Signs Behaviour Moribund Lethargic M Hanging vertical Spiralling Flashing Loss of equilibrium Body Dark Distended abdomen Scale Oedema W Opercula Shortened Flared Haemorrhaging Throat Ventrum Base of fins Elsewhere Eyes Exophthalmic Enophthalmic (sunken) Cataract Haemorrhagic Gills W Pale М W Zoned Necrotic М Lesions Flank M Elsewhere Vent Inflamed Trailing faeces <u>18</u> 11 Lice Load Estimate numbers Internal Signs Ascites Clear W Bloody Oedema In tissues Heart Pale/anaemic Granulomas Deformed Liver Petechial haem Gross haem Tissue breakdown Enlarged Colour number(s) Granulomas Lesions Pyloric caeca Petechial haem Tubules mauve Lack of fat М Spleen Enlarged Granulomas Gut No food present М Yellow pseudo-faeces External haem Internal haem Body wall Haemorrhaging Swim bladder Haemorrhaging Fluid filled Kidney Swollen Grey Granular Liquefied Parasites present М General

Anaemia

Case no: 2019-0045

Date of visit: 06/02/2019

Date of visit:	06/02/2019	נ					
S for etrong proces	nce: M for medium presence: W for	v.					
Fish Number	ice. Wi for medium presence. W for	n	_			_	
	er death (if > 45 minutes)						
External Signs	er death (il > 45 illillutes)						
Behaviour	Moribund						
Dellavioui	Lethargic						
	Hanging vertical						
	Spiralling						
	Flashing						
	Loss of equilibrium						
Body	Dark						
	Distended abdomen						
	Anorexic						
	Scale Oedema						
Opercula	Shortened						
,	Flared						
Haemorrhaging	Throat						
	Ventrum						
	Base of fins						
	Elsewhere						
Eyes	Exophthalmic						
	Enophthalmic (sunken)						
	Cataract						
	Haemorrhagic						
Gills	Pale						
	Zoned						
	Necrotic						
Lesions	Flank						
	Elsewhere						
Vent	Inflamed						
	Trailing faeces						
Lice Load	Estimate numbers	-	_				
Internal Signs	01						
Ascites	Clear						
Oedema	Bloody						
Heart	In tissues Pale/anaemic						
near t	Granulomas						
	Deformed						
Liver	Petechial haem						
LIVOI	Gross haem						
	Tissue breakdown						
	Enlarged						
	Colour number(s)						
	Granulomas						
	Lesions						
Pyloric caeca	Petechial haem						
	Tubules mauve						
	Lack of fat						
Spleen	Enlarged						
	Granulomas						
Gut	No food present						
	Yellow pseudo-faeces						
	External haem						
	Internal haem						
	Haemorrhaging						
Body wall	Haemorrhaging						
Swim bladder							
Swim bladder	Fluid filled		_				
	Fluid filled Swollen						
Swim bladder	Fluid filled Swollen Grey						
Swim bladder	Fluid filled Swollen Grey Granular						
Swim bladder Kidney	Fluid filled Swollen Grey Granular Liquefied						
Swim bladder	Fluid filled Swollen Grey Granular						

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Additional comments:		
F1 matured male in poor condition, fins very damaged observed. F2 with damage to the eyes and some damadorsal fin reduced to cartilidge, caudal fins severely da condition. Some fin damage but not significant. Damage	age to the snout. F3 damage to fins and head. maged. Damage to snout. F5 mature male in	Matured male. F4

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 08/10/2								
Case Number:	2019-0045		Site No:	FS1019		nsp:			
Date of Visit	06/02/2019		No of m	No of movements/supp./dest. Score					
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10			
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0		
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	۵	18	26			
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0		
11									
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10 10	10		
Exposure via water	INGITIBLE OF GES	Site contacts							
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					$\overline{}$		
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				0		
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2		
		or in a coastal zone with category III	<u> </u>				H		
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0		
		or in a coastal zone with category V		,					
	tarms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure				
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1		
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			0		
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0		
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0		
		from zone or compartment of							
	equivalent statu		4				0		
		from Category III farm	8				0		
	Processing fish	r from Category ∨ farm	10				0		
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0		
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3		
	Collection poin	for waste from other farms	5				0		
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0		
	Feeding unpas	· ·	5				0		
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4				
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2		
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0		
CoGP/Regulator				•					
Practices in accordance	Yes		0]			0		
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				0		
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1					
attorni access to cages	No		2	-			0		
				J					
					Total		23		
					Rank		MEDIUM		

Case No:	2019-0045	Site No: FS1019	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •	in the provious 4 years?	V
•	•	s in the previous 4 years?	Y
	-	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Y
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	mectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period		Y
Management Area (or e	equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
6. Do records adequate	ly reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	Υ
8. Have average adult f records are inspected?	· ·	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that	N
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N
•		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Υ
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ
•		out in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ
		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised nfestation?	Υ
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ
Containment Inspecti	on		
1. Has the site experier	iced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	
2. Are measures in plac	ce to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	
If other, detail below:			
il otilei, detail below.			
3. Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with que			
4. Have these been rep		•	
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
O If all noto were deal-	wod was this satisfact	ground with local wild fish interests and was normicaled alives by Castilate	
8. If gill nets were depid Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
9. What action was take	en to prevent and mini	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered under	satisfactory measu	res of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0045	Site No: FS1019	
Date of Visit: 06/02/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require compl	etion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ir4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fair	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or stateme	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin. 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	um health standards for the stocks to be introduced ation requirements for stocks held in the area less of fish which may be stocked into the area mum stocking density of any pen on any farm	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	gements for the storage and disposal of any darm?	lead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cove	ered by the agreement
	irements for the sensitivity testing of available arms?	
Does the FMAg/S identify the circur used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and farms?	cleaner fish are to be
	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or gements for the movement of live fish on and	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by date when a farm or area may be restocked	y which the area or individual farm will be fallo	w and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto s	sites covered by the Y
-	podstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	ot on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager	ment Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?	ent include arrangements for persons to becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and op	perated in accordance with the agreement or	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue of	f the FMAg/S? 26/02/2018	

Site No: FS1019
Case No: 2019-0045

Nature of non-compliance: Action taken (FHI):

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

Date of visit	: 06/02/2019	Inspector(s):						
Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary				
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)								
. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency pro	ocedures							
1.1. Have escape incidents or events ¹ been experienced on or in the richity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		N						
f yes answer 1.2-1.8:								
i.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH Regs⁴ 31D,E					
.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO ² and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust? .4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17					
f yes give detail .5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18					
I.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to ecapture?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18					
.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission ssued by Marine Scotland?	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18					
.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High							
I.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Υ	SSI, 2,9					
o(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and t	the site							
General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14,					
.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each ite, a record should be maintained of:-		Facilities	SSI 2,1					
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Moorings Nets Y					
b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y	Y					
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Υ	Y					
d) The date of purchase	Low	Υ	Υ					

Print of commission	Risk level Satisfactory? Requirement		4	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
Point of compliance	RISK level	Satisfactory?	Requiremen	ι	Comments and advice given or action taken it necessary
e) Each inspection including				Т.	
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	Υ	Υ	7
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Υ	Υ	Υ	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Υ	Υ	Υ	
 f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out 	High	Y	Υ	Υ	Site diary
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Υ	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Υ			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Υ			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the	Low	Υ			
seabed as measured at the mean low water spring					
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	Υ	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Υ			
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Υ			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	Υ			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Υ			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Υ			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5		
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters ³			SSI, 2,6		
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low				
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low				
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low				
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low				
2.6 A record of-			SSI, 2,7		
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)		Site diary
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Υ	SSI, 2,11 (b)		
Pen and mooring systems					

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	Procedure available surrounding general information for pen and mooring selection and instation, this is currently done by Gale Force (external contractor) and refers to their specific prodedure which the contractor follows.
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	Speced and installed by Gale Force
2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	staff member trained by Gale Force, company looking to get surveys and repairs done by external company starting this year but not yet in place.
2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	Cages are visually inspected daily as part of normal site checks (SOP in place). Formal inspections of surface moorings and submersed moorings are compleded based on manufacturers
2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.17	
2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	smaller mesh nets used for cleaner fish
2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.20	Knox nets
2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.22	Manufacturer also tests and maintains the nets.
2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.23	Daily inspections by site staff, nets are sent away for testinge and cleaning after each use (currently after the cycle as mesh size not changed).
2.20 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.23	Daily checks and knock database.
2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred,	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.25	Divers check nets every 3 weeks and make repairs.
or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?				

1111 000, Version 12		15540	a by. I i ii	Date of issue. 00/
Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Υ	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	All staff have completed boat training and inhouse containment training.
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk asse	essments			
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Υ		
o) standard operating procedures	High	Υ		
c) contingency plan	High	Υ		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Υ	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,c	work boats are fitted with propeller, these are shared between several sites
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Υ		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	Birdnets, no submerged predator nets

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		Small hole on the water line immediately repaired with zip tie
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.18	

Fill 600, Version 12						
Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary		
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	Υ	SSI 2,2 ii			
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Υ				
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.4.21			
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		Y		ADD, top nets, tension nets, seal blinds, MML		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28			
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Υ	MSA ⁵ 2010 P4, S21			
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence			
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5			
d. Inspection of site specific procedures						
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.31	None conducted during site inspection.		
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32			
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A	1			
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A	1			
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33			
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes						

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

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

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

- 3 being waters which do not form part of the sea or any creek, bay or estuary or of any river as far as far as the tide flows
- 4 The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended)
- 5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

Case No: 2019-0045 Date of visit: 06/02/2019 Site No: FS1019 Inspector: Results Summary Freq. Date of Notification Database Phone Insp Writing 2nd Insp Insp Insp MG SAV 12/03/2019 0/1 12/02/2019 MG ISA 0/1 12/02/2019 12/03/2019 MG IHN 0/1 12/02/2019 12/03/2019 12/03/2019 MG VHS 0/1 12/02/2019 MG IPN 12/03/2019 0/1 12/02/2019 ADHE 2/5 05/03/2019 12/03/2019 **PMCH** 5/5 12/03/2019 05/03/2019 SKIN 2/5 05/03/2019 12/03/2019 05/03/2019 **HPAT** 2/5 12/03/2019 VSPE 3/5 11/03/2019 12/03/2019 VVIS 1/5 11/03/2019 12/03/2019 Report Summary 2nd Insp Case Type Date Insp ECI, SLI, VMD 12/02/2019 CNA 22/02/2019 DIA 12/03/2019





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0169
 Date of Visit
 06/02/2019

 Site No
 FS1019
 Site Name
 Strondoir Bay

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190045

Section 1: Summary

During a routine site inspection moribund fish were observed on site and five fish were removed for diagnostic sampling.

Histopathology examination revealed lesions at the level of the integument showing high numbers of mixed bacteria (likely secondary infection) and mild skeletal muscle necrosis. This may be associated with physical damage. Mild myocarditis was also noted.

Vibrio spp. isolates and Moritella viscosa were isolated. At the level of growth observed the bacteria are not considered to be the primary source of morbidity.

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

Section 2: Case Detail

Observations

At the time of the visit the site was stocked with 194,000 2017 S0s and wrasse cleaner fish. Mortality levels were not particularly elevated on site, however upon inspection of the pens a number of poor doing fish were observed near the surface in several cages. Most poor doing fish appeared to have sustained some physical damage and seemed to be early maturing fish also referred to as grilse. Several fish were removed and sampled for diagnostic purposes.

All fish removed for diagnostic sampling were lethargic and moribund and all but one appeared to be considerably below the site's average weight (F5). All fish sampled apart from F5 had considerable external damage to fins and the head. F1 and F3 were anorexic and F3 also had a slightly shortened operculum. The gills were pale in F4 and F5; and zoned in F1 and F3. Lesions

R09

were observed on the flank in F4 and on or near the head in F1 and F3. Estimated lice numbers of all stages of between 11-18 were observed on F1, F3 and F5.

Internally F3 had bloody ascites and F1 had small areas of haemorrhaging on the liver, with the liver appearing pale in F1, F3 and F4. The liver of F2 appeared darker. Lack of fat around the pyloric caeca was observed in F1 and the spleen appeared enlarged in F1 and F2. Yellow pseudo faeces were present in F1. Generally internally signs of maturity were evident in all fish examined.

Samples

Samples were collected from five fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Pool number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1 - F2	P1	1	Atlantic salmon	2017 S0s, 5kg	Russelburn
F3 - F5	P1	2	Atlantic salmon	2017 S0s, 5kg	Russelburn

Results

Bacteriology: Kidney, gill and lesion material from 5 fish was inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

The following bacteria were isolated:

- Vibrio spp.: F1-F2 (kidney), F3 (lesion), F1 (gill)
- Moritella viscosa isolated from F3 (lesion)

Virology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (QPCR).

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV) and viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV).

Histology: Tissue samples of gill, skin and skeletal muscle, heart, pyloric caeca, pancreas, hind gut, liver, spleen and kidney were taken from five fish. The tissue samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin.

Histopathological examination by light microscopy revealed the following:

<u>Gill:</u> Some multifocal basal interlamellar hyperplasia (F2), F3 showed mild diffuse interlamellar hyperplasia and in F5 was noted several scattered thrombi with lamellar epithelial hyperplasia, increase number of eosinophilic granular cells (EGC) at the centre of the gill filament (F2). Some tip clubbing also noted in all gills. One aneurysmal dilation/telangiectasia (F1). Lamellar congestion and free blood among gill filaments noted in all fish and generalised epithelial lifting noted in all fish likely associated with post-mortem artefact.

<u>Skin & Muscle:</u> Lesions (F1 & F4) showed partial to total absence of epidermal layer, dermal oedema with mild leukocyte cell infiltration and melamine deposits along the external face of the dermal layer. High numbers of mixed bacteria that stained Gram negative were also noted in the dermis and hypodermis. Some red skeletal muscle necrosis was also noted in F4.

<u>Heart:</u> Mild leukocyte cell infiltration and few shrunken myofibres at the spongy layer of ventricle (F1 & F3). Mild pericarditis (F4). F2: no atrium in section.

Gut and pyloric caeca: Hindgut of F1 showed presence of some bacteria within the lumen. Lack of abdominal adipose tissue noted in F1 and F3. Some fibrous adhesions likely associated with vaccine administration noted in F5. Mild cell sloughing (likely associate with post-mortem artefact).

Pancreas: Within the normal range.

<u>Liver:</u> Mild diffuse haptic vacuolation (F1), few scattered apoptotic cells (F3) and some capillary congestion noted in F2.

<u>Kidney:</u> Scattered shrunk glomeruli and slightly increase numbers of melanomagrophage noted in F4.

<u>Spleen:</u> Some fibrous adhesions likely associated with vaccine administration noted in F3. Slightly congested noted in F5.

Signed:

Date: 12/03/2019

Fish Health Inspector

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





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0169Date of Visit06/02/2019Site NoFS1019Site NameStrondoir BayInspectorCase No20190045

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

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

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

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

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

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

Site specific procedures were not taking place at the time of the visit and could not be observed.

Further Action

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

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







The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0169
 DATE OF VISIT
 06/02/2019

 SITE NO
 FS1019
 SITE NAME
 Strondoir Bay

 INSPECTOR
 CASE NO
 20190045

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion, samples were taken for diagnostic purposes. A separate report will be issued detailing the results of these tests.

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 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.

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.

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

 For the records of fish waste removed from the site, the destination was missing from one record.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2013

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.

An enhanced containment inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

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

Signed: Date: 12/02/2019
Fish Health Inspector

2019-0045

F1 external





F2 external









F4 external



F5 external



FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0046			Date of visit: 07/02/2019			
Time spent on site:	h	Main Inspecto	r:			
Site No: SS0451 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Troustan Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd				
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:				

Additional Case Information:

16 bags. Total weight: 19.2 tonnes.

All bags inspected at shorebase prior to loading on transport lorry.

No other bivalve species observed. Mussels fairly clean but some fouling observed.

Certificate issued. Ref no. INTRA.GB.2019.0003290 (MD19-015).

Bags inspected and certificate completed by Case sheet completed by supervised by

Paperwork completed by , under supervision.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issued by: FHI Date of issue					
Case No:	2019-0046		Site No:	SS0451				
Date of Visit:		07/02/2019]		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author 1. Business/site detai 2. Changes made to 0	ls summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N]
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10 lines	Facilities sto	cked	2 lines	No facilitie	s inspected	0
	MED							
- 5 - 5 F	2018							
	20,000kg							
Mean Fish Wt	15-20mm							
Next Fallow Date (Site	e)	next week		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	natural spa	atfall	
Recent (last 4 wks) di	isease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
•								
Movement Records								
Movement records		r inspection?					07/00/2040	Y
 Date of last inspect Are records complete 		atly optorod?	•				07/08/2018	Y
4. Are movement reco		•						N/A
5. Are records comple								N/A
6. Are health certificate		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records		(, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Are any movement	te carried out	by (or on be	half) of the bu	einess (not usi	ing a STR\2			
If yes, is there a syste			•	•	_			
Mortality Records	·		·					
1. Mortality records a	vailable for ir	nspection?						N/A
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail)			
If other detail:	Empty shells	fall to the se	abed and are	not collected.				
3. Mortality records co	•	correctly enter	ered?					N/A
4. Recent mortality (la	ast 4 wks):		no mortalitie	s observed sin	ce last inspec	tion		
71							N/A	
If yes, facility nos/no r	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6 Any other neaks in	mortality du	ring period ch	acked?					N/A
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? If yes, detail:							14//	
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?							N/A	
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.							N/A	

FHI 059, Version 12	les	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1111 055, VEISIOII 12	133	ued by. 1111	Date 01 133de. 00/10/2010
1. Recent treatments	(last 4 wks)?		
If yes, detail:			
If other, detail:			
	s available for inspection?		
4. Are fish in a withdo	lete and correctly entered?		
5. If yes, what treatm	•		
If other, detail:	cm(3):	•	
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		
Biosecurity Record	s available for inspection?		
•	•	ording and safe disposal been considered	12
	•	Scottish Ministers or veterinary profession	
	ned) mortality at the site been included	* *	ar or arry
` '	,		
4. Has the action tha	t will be taken in the event that the pres	sence or suspicion of the presence of a li	sted disease
is detected been incl	uded and how and when that will be n	otified to Scottish Ministers?	
		ed on the farm site been covered (equal	or higher
health status, certific	ation if required)?		
6. Have the husband	ry and biosecurity measures implemen	nted between each epidemiological unit to	o minimise
	•	visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)	
7. Is documentation	available regarding the measures in pla	ace to maintain the physical containment	of
aquaculture animals			
	ity procedures been adequately implen	nented on site?	
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	ince		

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

07/08/18-07/02/19

Case No:	2019-0046			Date of visit:	07/02/2019					
Cusc No.	2010-0040			Date of visit.	0170272010	ı				
Site No:	SS0451			Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
					-	-				
					-					
					i e					
Report Summary				1						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
MOV	12/02/2019									
	1									





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 SB0530
 Date of Visit
 07/02/2019

 Site No
 SS0451
 Site Name
 Troustan

 Inspector
 Case No
 20190046

Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of mussel spat for placing on the market in the Republic of Ireland was inspected. Health certificates were issued which must travel with the consignments to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 12/02/2019
Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018			
Case No: 2019-0053			Date of visit: 07/02/2019			
Time spent on site:	5hrs	Main Inspec	etor:			
Site No: FS0894 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Rubha Stillaig The Scottish Salmon Compa	any			
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 8.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-42			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

After current cycle, it is unknown whether or not this site will be used again. TBC.

Morts are transported to Stronachullin shore base to be collected.

Visibility good, but fish were sitting in deeper water so difficult to see. Fish that were seen appeared healthy, including sample taken for VMD.

Two salmon mortalities and one ballen wrasse mortality noticed floating on the surface of one cage, staff were notified and fish were removed. These were thought to be due to recent handling of the cage.

Paperwork completed by supervised by VMD sampling by

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0053		Site No:	FS0894				
Date of Visit:		07/02/2019			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author	risation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by si	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilities	s inspected	10
Species	SAL	WRA						
Age group	2017 S0s	Wild caught						
No Fish	105,206	13,000						
Mean Fish Wt	4.65 kg	Mixed						
Next Fallow Date (Si	te)	April 2019		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	No plans		
					1.			.,
Recent (last 4 wks) of	lisease proble	ems?		IN	Any escapes	(since last \	/isit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
1. Movement records	s available for	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							15/02/2017	
3. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?						Y
4. Are movement red				,				Y
5. Are records comp		•						Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	its carried out	t by (or on bel	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst				•	_			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie					Whole fish - I	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	omplete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
				en 41-213 (0.03		ss whole site	e per week. V	VRS: 0-36 (0-
4. Recent mortality (I	•			ss whole site p	er week.			
5. Evidence of recen		• •						Y
If yes, facility nos/no								
Week 3 morts reach				was due to a re	ecent hydrolice	er treatment		V
6. Any other peaks in	•	• 1		h = 1.4.450 //	0.540/\\ ======	de el el elle	0 hl.	!'!
Previosuly, in week 41 (2018), morts reached 1,158 (0.54%) across whole site. 6 cages hydroliced, thought to be due to this.								
7. Have increased (u			en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.								

Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y							
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y							
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?								
If other, detail:	V							
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	T							
Biosecurity Records								
Biosecurity records available for inspection?								
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	V							
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	Y							
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?								
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	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?	V							
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?	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: 15/02/2017-07/02/19								

1111 055, VEISIOII 12							133	ueu by. i				
Case no:	2019-00)53	Site No:		FS0894			Date of Samplin		07/	02/2019	
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI		1	
Time sampling starts/ends:	13:0	0:00	13:1	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	(
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	F1											
Pool Group												
Species	SAL											
Average weight	4.65kg											
Sex	N/A											
Water Type	SW											
Stock Origin	Loch Damph (Migdale)											
ਸ਼ਿਲੀ Facility No	8											

	Additional Sample Information:											
0	l	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l						

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0053		Site No:	FS0894		Insp:	
Date of Visit	07/02/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Mayamanta off							10
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10 10	10
Exposure via water	rtuiliber er des	Site contacts					
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				\vdash
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		igsquare
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	1	8		
	iainis apstream	TOT WILLIEF T LIGHT EXCULSION	<u>'</u>	-	٥		_
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	n 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	Ī			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				-
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	1			\vdash
				,			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		21
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0053		Site No:	FS0894				
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •							
•	•	in the previous 4 years?			N			
	-	quivalent) fallowed synchronously			Y			
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed	mectin benzoate) as in a reasonable period		al and/or mecl	hanical control measu	res, and			
 Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e 		ement agreement or statement rele	evant to the si	ite and CoGP Farm	Y			
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	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. salme</i> records are inspected?		ow the suggested criteria for treatr	nent in the Co	oGP during the period	that Y			
8. Have average adult f records are inspected?	•	monis) numbers per fish been at a	level of 3 or a	above during the perio	d that N			
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see	comment.		N/A			
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infes	tation at a level which	is considered to cause significant	welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50) N			
		stered or other actions taken when longatus is considered to have we						
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?			N/A			
•	•	s taken had a significant impact up	on the lice le	vels recorded?	Y			
		out in cooperation between partici			Y			
		where fewer populations or part po			nt for Y			
15. Is there a site speci scenarios during the es		ment procedure with waypoints de nfestation?	scribing set a	ections to deal with rec	ognised Y			
16. Do the sea lice leve	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no p	lease detail re	easons.	Y			
Containment Inspection								
1. Has the site experien	iced equipment dama	ge due to predators in the current o	r previous pr	oduction cycles?	N			
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against t	he predation experienced on site?	(Detail below	')	Υ			
ADD, Seal blinds, top	o nets, tension nets,	MML						
If other, detail below:								
Have escape incider	nts or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicinity of the	site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N			
If Yes proceed with que	stions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10						
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Minis	ters?						
		rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP		•				
6. Have these been rep	orted to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (wh	ere they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)			
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail						
8 If all nots were deplo	wed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests a	nd was norm	ission given by Scottis	sh			
Ministers? (Legal, CoG	P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		·					
		mise the risk of further escapes? (I	Not covered in	n code but could				
be considered under	•	· ·						
10. Is the site inspected	l as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, pleas	se detail reaso	on(s)	Υ			

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2019-0053	Site No: FS0894	
Date of Visit: 07/02/2019	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require compl	etion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreements and Statements	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ir4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fair	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or stateme	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manag	gement	
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin. 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	um health standards for the stocks to be introduced ation requirements for stocks held in the area less of fish which may be stocked into the area mum stocking density of any pen on any farm	or farm? Y Y
individual farm?	gements for the storage and disposal of any d	
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of data on sea lice number	ers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms cove	red by the agreement Y
	irements for the sensitivity testing of available arms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circur used on farms in the area or individual	mstances under which biological controls and farms?	cleaner fish are to be
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	gements for synchronous treatments on farms	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduced or gements for the movement of live fish on and	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	ole harvest practices on farms in the area or individu	ual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restored.	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow a cked?	and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto site	s covered by the
	broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept or t?	n any site Y
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	gement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ment include arrangements for persons to become,	or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	d operated in accordance with the agreement or star	tement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 26/02/2018	

Case No:	2019-0053			Date of visit:	07/02/2019						
Site No:	FS0894			Inspector:		1					
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
	ļ										
	-										
	 				-						
	 										
	 										
	_										
			<u> </u>								
	 										
	 										
	 										
Report Summary				1							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	12/02/2019										





The Scottish Salmon Company
1 Smithy Lane
Lochgilphead
Argyll
PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NOFB0169DATE OF VISIT07/02/2019SITE NOFS0894SITE NAMERubha StillaigINSPECTORCASE NO20190053

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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.

R25

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 2013

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: 12/02/2019
Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12	ls	sued by: FHI		Date o	f issue: 08/10	/2018
Case No: 2019-0060				Date of visit:	25/02/2019	
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	M	ain Inspector	: [
Site No: FS0575 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Smolt Un Landcatch Natural		d		∃
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 7.3	Thermometer No:	Site]	FHI 045 comp	leted	N
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F	CoGP MA		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see add	ditional inforn	nation/clinical s nation/clinical s nation/clinical s	core sheet.	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail r	eason below:				

Additional Case Information:

Mortalities:

18/02/2019

S1: 3632 (0.21%)

S0: 8366 (0.24%)

11/02/2019

S1: 2889 (0.7%)

S0: 19407 (0.55%)

04/02/2019

S1: 2630 (0.15%)

S0: 38550 (1.12%)

28/01/2019

S1: 5204 (0.31%) S0: 14396 (0.46%)

S0s brought onto site in January 2019.

Formalin prescribed and administered under CASCADE.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Small number of morts observed at screens in tanks. No moribund fish or clinical signs observed.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018				
Case No:	2019-0060		Site No:	FS0575	5							
Date of Visit:		25/02/2019	•		Inspector(s)):]				
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	-				
Site Details												
Total No facilities Species	SAL	108 SAL	Facilities sto	cked	97	No facilitie	es inspected	108				
Age group No Fish	2019 S0 3,354,209	2019 S1 1,694,894										
Mean Fish Wt	0.4g	80.3g										
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No fallow		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March/Apr	il 2019					
Recent (last 4 wks) of the second (last 4 wks) o		lems? 31. Some Funç	gus in S0s	Y	Any escape	es (since last	visit)?	N				
 Movement records Date of last inspect Are records compt Are movement records Are records compt 	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											
If yes, is there a syst Mortality Records		• •	•	•	_							
Mortality records a How are mortalitie If other detail:		•			Incinerated	- on site		Y				
Mortality records of Recent mortality (correctly ente		nal comments.	S0s mostly a	attributed to p	ost transfer a	and runt				
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	• •	lities?					N				
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:								
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	n mortality du	iring period ch	necked?					N/A				
7. Have increased (ulif yes, detail action:	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and	enter on mor	tality events s	sheet.	N/A				

If yes, detail:	Formalin, Slice								
If other, detail:									
2. Medicines records availa	·	Y							
Are records complete an	·	Y							
4. Are fish in a withdrawal p		Y							
5. If yes, what treatment(s)	? Formalin								
If other, detail:									
6. Are medicines stored ap	propriately?	Y							
Biosecurity Records									
1. Biosecurity records avail	able for inspection?	Y							
	quency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y							
•	riod in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any								
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?									
4 11 41	- 4-1 i- 4b								
	be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	[†]							
	aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y							
health status, certification if									
Trouis Clarac, Coranocación II	· roquirou).								
6. Have the husbandry and	I biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y							
transmission of disease be	en covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?								
7. Is documentation availab	ble regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y							
aquaculture animals held o									
	cedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y							
If no, detail:									
Results of Surveillance									
1. Has any animal health so	urveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y							
2. If yes, are results availab		Y							
3. Any significant results?		N							
If yes, detail (if not detailed	under recent disease problems).								

Records checked between:

6/11/18-25/02/19

٠.	11 000, 10101011 12			_	_				dea by.				
	Case no:	2019-00	060	Site No:		FS0575			Date of Samplin		25/	02/2019	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	16:3	0:00	17:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	26
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Δ.	dd Field (Beele elield												
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21-24	25-28	29-32	33-36	37-40	41-44	45-48
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL
	Average weight	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800	0.0800
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW
		کر	ŞIŞ	ery	şı	şıy	şıy	کان	SIZ.	کان	Şı.	Şı	Σi
		che	che	che	che	che	che	che	che	che	che	che	che
		Hat	Hat	Hatchery	Hat	Hat	Hatchery	Hatchery	Hat	Hat	Hat	Hat	- Tat
Details		γ	y Ł		уŀ	y ŀ	y ŀ	γ	y Ł	γ	y Ł	y ŀ	γ
)et		sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar	sar
	Charale Orienia	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary	Ormsary	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary Hatchery	Ormsary Hatchery
tock	Stock Origin Facility No))	•	•))))		
S	racility NO	E5	E7	B1	B4	A3	A6	E1	E8	E15	E16	A4	E20

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
O]	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	1					
49-52											
SAL											
0.0800											
N/A FW											
FW											
Crmsary Hatchery											

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	t issue	: 08/10/2018		
Case Number:	2019-0060		Site No:	FS0575		nsp:			
Date of Visit	25/02/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.	p./dest.			
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10			
Movements on (from out		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	0		
	Number of sup		0			14	0		
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off	I 0	3	6	10	10		
	Number of des		0		6	10	6		
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10				
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				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		0		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0		
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		
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0		
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0		
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				0		
		from Category III farm	8				0		
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10						
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			0		
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3		
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0		
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0		
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				0		
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4				
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0		
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0		
CoGP/Regulator									
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0		
code of practice	No		3				0		
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0		
	No		2	j			0		
					Total Rank		20 MEDIUM		

Case No:	2019-0060		Site No:	FS0575						
Sea Lice Inspection	(Seawater Sites Only)									
1. Has the site exper	ienced sea lice problem	s in the previous 4 years	?							
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed syn	chronously on a single ye	ear class basis?						
azamethiphos and er can these be deployed	mamectin benzoate) as ed in a reasonable perio locumented farm manag	well as access to suitab d of time?	sea lice medications (inc le biological and/or mech tement relevant to the si	nanical control measu	ires, and					
	records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)							
			e SSI and the CoGP? (Lo	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)					
7. Are sea lice (L. sarrecords are inspected		low the suggested criter	ia for treatment in the Co	GP during the period	that					
8. Have average adu records are inspected	· ·	monis) numbers per fish	been at a level of 3 or a	above during the perio	od that					
If yes, have these be	en reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If n	o, FHI see comment.							
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)										
			aken when <i>L. salmonis l</i> to have welfare implicati							
11. Has any other ac	tion been taken (where	applicable)?								
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the action	is taken had a significan	t impact upon the lice lev	vels recorded?						
13. Are treatments, v	here conducted, carried	l out in cooperation betw	een participating farms?	•						
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?										
	ecific written lice manage escalation of a sea lice		aypoints describing set a	ctions to deal with red	cognised					
16. Do the sea lice le	evels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count da	ata? If no please detail re	easons.						
Containment Inspec	ction									
1. Has the site exper	ienced equipment dama	ge due to predators in th	ne current or previous pro	oduction cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in p	lace to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (Detail below))	Υ					
Top nets, electric fe	ence									
If other, detail belov	w:									
3. Have escape incid	dents or events been ex	perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N					
•	uestions 4 – 9. If No ski reported to Scottish Mini	•								
5. Have these been r	reported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	et)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)						
6. Have these been r	reported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)					
7. Were methods (if	any) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detai	l							
9. If all note were de	played was this action a	grood with local wild fish	interests and was permi	iceion given by Cocti	eh.					
	pioyed was this action a pGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish	interests and was perm	ission given by Scotti	311					
		imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not covered in	n code but could						
	ler satisfactory measu		,							
	•	•	If no, please detail reaso	on(s)	Υ					

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0575

Case No: 2019-0060

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

Case No:	2019-0060	Date of visit: 25/02/2019							
Site No:	FS0575	l		Inspector:		l			
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	1								
	+								
Report Summary	1								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI, VMD	01/03/2019	шэр	2 insp						
LOI, OIVI, VIVID	01/03/2010								
	 								
	1								
	1								
	1								
	1								
	1								
	1								





Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd Ormsary Fish Farm Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8PE

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0061Date of Visit 25/02/2019Site NoFS0575Site NameOrmsary Smolt UnitInspectorCase No20190060

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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.

R04

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: Date: 01/03/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018						
Case No: 2019-0061			Date o	f visit: 25/02/2019						
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Ma	ain Inspector:							
Site No: FS0681 Business No: FB0061	Site Name: Business Name:	Ormsary Hatchery Landcatch Natural	Selection Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6	\blacksquare						
Water Temp (°C): 7.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 04	5 completed N						
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F Coo	GP MA						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see add	itional information/d itional information/d itional information/d	clinical score sheet.						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:										

Additional Case Information:

Stock on site currently hatching.

Some post hatch mortalities observed, low mortality % no clinical signs observed.

Water treated with Formalin up to twice a week to prevent fungal infections.

Paperwork and inspection completed b Observed by

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2019-0061		Site No:	FS0681]				
Date of Visit:		25/02/2019]		Inspector(s):]	
	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y	}	
Site Details			_						
Total No facilities		1	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilitie	s inspected	1	
Species .									
Age group No Fish						-	-		
Mean Fish Wt Next Fallow Date (S		June 2019		Next Input Da	te (Site)	Septembe	r 2019		
Treat raile in Bate (e		ourio 2010		rtoxt input Bu	1	Сертенные	1 2010		
· ·	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N/A	
If yes, detail:									
Movement Records	S								
1. Movement record	. Movement records available for inspection?								
•							23/02/2018		
•		•						Y	
								Y	
	Authorisation Details e details summary checked by site representative? ade to details? Pacilities stocked The Authorisation Details e details summary checked by site representative? All Standard Sta								
		idelions (odivi	itii OD) avalle	abic:				·	
Are records complete and correctly entered? Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? Are records complete and correctly entered? Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?									
-					_			IN	
Mortality Records									
•	available for i	nspection?						Y	
•		•			Incinerated -	on site			
If other detail:									
•		correctly ente						Y	
• `				% across whole	e site (post ha	tch mortalit	y)		
		• •		/·				N	
if yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	Tacility/no sto	ck per facility	reason:					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N	
If yes, detail:		9							
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A	
If yes, detail action:									
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A	

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
TTII 039, VEISIOII 12		issued by. I I II	Date of Issue. 00/10/2010
1. Recent treatments (ast 4 wks)?		Y
If yes, detail:	Formalin		
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records a	vailable for inspection?		Y
3. Are records complete	te and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdra	wal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatme	nt(s)?	Formalin	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines store	d appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records			
•	available for inspection?		V
•	I frequency of mortality remova	l recording and safe dispose	l boon considered?
		•	
	I period in which the APB will n	•	terinary professional of any
ıncreasea (unexpiaine	 d) mortality at the site been inc 	ciuaea?	ĭ

23/02/18-25/02/19 Records checked between:

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	t issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0061		Site No:	FS0681		nsp:	
Date of Visit	25/02/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out		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	18
	Number of sup		0			14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of des		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				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		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
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
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				0
		from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				0
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 poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	1			0
					Total Rank		40 HIGH

Case No:	2019-0061		Site No:	FS0681						
Sea Lice Inspection	(Seawater Sites Only)									
1. Has the site exper	ienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?								
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously	on a single y	ear class basis?						
azamethiphos and el can these be deploye	mamectin benzoate) as ed in a reasonable period locumented farm manag	enced in-feed and bath sea lice me well as access to suitable biologica of time? ement agreement or statement rele	l and/or mec	hanical control measu	res, and					
		ection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	3)							
		standard specified in the SSI and the		egal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6)					
7. Are sea lice (L. sa records are inspected		ow the suggested criteria for treatn	nent in the Co	oGP during the period	that					
8. Have average adurected	•	nonis) numbers per fish been at a	level of 3 or a	above during the perio	d that					
If yes, have these be	en reported to the Fish I	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see	comment.							
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)										
		stered or other actions taken when longatus is considered to have we								
11. Has any other ac	tion been taken (where a	pplicable)?								
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the action	s taken had a significant impact up	on the lice le	vels recorded?						
13. Are treatments, v	vhere conducted, carried	out in cooperation between particip	oating farms?	•						
14. Is there a harves sea lice?	ting strategy for the site,	where fewer populations or part po	pulations are	held without treatmer	nt for					
	ecific written lice manage escalation of a sea lice i	ment procedure with waypoints de festation?	scribing set a	ections to deal with rec	cognised					
16. Do the sea lice le	evels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no pl	ease detail re	easons.						
Containment Inspe	ction									
1. Has the site exper	ienced equipment dama	e due to predators in the current o	r previous pr	oduction cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in p	lace to mitigate against	ne predation experienced on site?	(Detail below)	Y					
Site indoors										
If other, detail belo	w:									
					Tarra .					
•		erienced on or in the vicinity of the	site since the	e last FHI inspection?	N/A					
	uestions 4 – 9. If No ski reported to Scottish Mini	•								
5. Have these been r	reported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP	- 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)						
6. Have these been r	reported to the SSPO an	l local fisheries trusts forthwith (wh	ere they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)					
7. Were methods (if	any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail								
8 If all note were do	nloved was this action o	reed with local wild fish interests a	nd was norm	ission given by Scottic	sh					
	pioyed was this action at pGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	Toda with local wild fish litterests a	na was penn	Solon given by Scottis						
		mise the risk of further escapes? (N	Not covered in	n code but could						
	ler satisfactory measu									
	•	gards to containment? If no, pleas	e detail reas	on(s)	Y					

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0681

Case No: 2019-0061

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

Case No:	2019-0061	Date of visit: 25/02/2019							
Site No:	FS0681	l		Inspector:		ı			
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
D10									
Report Summary Case Type									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI	01/03/2019								





Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd Ormsary Fish Farm Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8PE

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061 DATE OF VISIT 25/02/2019
SITE NO FS0681 SITE NAME Ormsary Hatchery
INSPECTOR CASE NO 20190061

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

R04

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 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: 01/03/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12	Is	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018								
Case No: 2019-0062			Date of visit: 26/02/2019								
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Main Ir	nspector:								
Site No: FS0468 Business No: FB0134	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Tralaig Kames Fish Farming Lt	d								
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6								
Water Temp (°C): 6	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed N								
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA								
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving 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 carr	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:										

Additional Case Information:

All waste held at Kames Bay Pier, prior to being transported to Energen for disposal..

Fungus has been present on site during cycle, treated with formalin. 5 morts observed across site, no moribund fish or clinical signs observed. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Paperwork inspection and VMD sampling completed by Observed by

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018	
Case No:	2019-0062		Site No:	FS0468					
Date of Visit:		26/02/2019			Inspector(s):]	
Registration/Authornal 1. Business/site detaction 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y Y]	
Site Details									
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilitie	s inspected	6	
Species	SAL								
Age group	S1								
No Fish	163,249								
Mean Fish Wt	67.6g								
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	April 2019		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	August/Se	ptember 201	9	
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	lems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N	
Movement Record									
	_							V	
Novement record Date of last inspe	Movement records available for inspection? Y Date of last inspection: 13/02/2018								
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	,				13/02/2010	Y	
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y	
5. Are records comp								Y	
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A	
Transport Records									
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y	
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_			Y	
Mortality Records									
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y	
2. How are mortalitie		•			Biogas - Ene	raen. Cumb	ernauld		
If other detail:						· g-··, - · · · ·			
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly enter	ered?					Y	
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		2937 (1.8%)	across whole	site over 4 we	eks. Attribu	ted to fungus.		
5. Evidence of recei	nt increased/a	atypical mortal	ities?					N	
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ıring period ch	ecked?					N	
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unevolained)	mortalities he	en reported to	vet or EUI2				N/A	
If yes, detail action:	unexplaineu)	mortanties pe	en reported to	VELOI I I II :				14//	
	/ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A	
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.									

ii yes, detaii.	Formalin & TIVIS		
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?		Y
3. Are records compl	lete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdr	rawal period?		Y
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)?	Formalin, T.M.S.	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Record	e		
_	s available for inspection?		Y
•	•	l, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ÿ
		otify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ned) mortality at the site been inc	• •	Y
ποιοασσα (αποκριαπ	iou) mortainty at the one book mo		
4. Has the action tha	t will be taken in the event that th	e presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
		be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health sta	tus of aquaculture animals being	stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific			
,			
6. Have the husband	ry and biosecurity measures imp	lemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disea	ase been covered (movement of	staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation a	available regarding the measures	in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals	held on site?		
8. Have the biosecur	ity procedures been adequately in	mplemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	ınce		
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried ou	t by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
•	available for inspection?	,,	Y
3. Any significant res	· ·		N
	etailed under recent disease prob	lems).	
, .,		,	

13/02/18 - 26/02/19

Records checked between:

г	HI 059, Version 12							ISS	suea by: i	гпі			
	Case no:	2019-00	062	Site No:		FS0468			Date of Samplin		26/0	02/2019	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		₉ . HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:3	0:00	13:4	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	8
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-12	13-24										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	0.0600	0.0600										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	FW	FW										
tock Details		N Clachan Hatchery	ਨੂੰ Glachan Hatchery										
U,	, admity 140	/\I Z	Al J										

	Additional Sample Information:														
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	t issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0062		Site No:	FS0468		lnsp:	
Date of Visit	26/02/2019		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 pliers	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m	ovements off	T 0	3	6	10	3
INDVENIENCE OII	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				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		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
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
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				0
		from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	I 0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	3 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2	1			0
					Total Rank		12 LOW

Case No:	2019-0062		9	Site No:	FS0468	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in th	e previous 4 vears	s?			
•	Management Area (or equiva	•		a single y	ear class basis?	
3. Does the site have a azamethiphos and emacan these be deployed	access to a range of licenced amectin benzoate) as well a l in a reasonable period of til cumented farm managemen	d in-feed and bath as access to suitab me?	sea lice medic ble biological ar	ations (inc nd/or mecl	cluding deltamethrin, hanical control measu	ures, and
	ecords available for inspection	on? (Legal SSI, Co	GP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required stand	lard specified in th	e SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the (CoGP Annex 6)	e suggested criter	ria for treatmen	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	I that
8. Have average adult records are inspected?	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish	h been at a leve	el of 3 or a	above during the perio	od that
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish Health	Inspectorate? If n	no, FHI see con	mment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is co	nsidered to cause	significant well	fare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)
	reatments been administered reatment or where <i>C. elonga</i>					
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applic	able)?				
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions take	en had a significan	nt impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in	n cooperation betw	veen participati	ing farms?	?	
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where					
	ific written lice management scalation of a sea lice infesta		aypoints descri	ibing set a	actions to deal with red	cognised
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks refle	ct sea lice count d	ata? If no pleas	se detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion					
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment damage du	e to predators in the	he current or p	revious pr	oduction cycles?	N
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the pr	edation experience	ed on site? (De	etail below	')	Υ
Tension nets, top ne	ts, predator nets (when re	equired), electric	fencing (to de	eter otters	s)	
If other, detail below:	:					
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been experien	iced on or in the vi	icinity of the site	e since the	e last FHI inspection?	N
•	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to q		cirility of the sit	e since un	e last i i i i i i spection :	
	ported to Scottish Ministers?					
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwi	th (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4	4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)	
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and loca	al fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where	they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	ny) used to recover escapee	s? If yes give detai	il			
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, CoG	oyed was this action agreed GP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	with local wild fish	n interests and	was perm	ission given by Scotti	sh
, -	en to prevent and minimise	the risk of further	escapes? (Not	covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures o		(1.1.2.1			
	d as satisfactory with regard	· ·	If no, please d	letail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0468

Case No: 2019-0062

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

Case No:	2019-0062	Date of visit: 26/02/2019							
Site No:	FS0468	l		Inspector:		l			
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat				
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	-								
Report Summary									
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI, VMD	01/03/2019	шэр	2 insp						
LOI, OIVI, VIVID	01/03/2010								





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NOFB0134DATE OF VISIT 26/02/2019SITE NOFS0468SITE NAMELoch TralaigINSPECTORCASE NO20190062

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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

Records

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

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

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.

Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

Date: 01/03/2019

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date o	of issue: 08/10/2018						
Case No: 2019-0063			Date of visit:	26/02/2019						
Time spent on site:	hours	Ma	in Inspector:							
Site No: FS0269 Business No: FB0134	Site Name: Business Name:	Kames Hatchery Kames Fish Farmin	g Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 MIX	4 5	6]						
Water Temp (°C): 6.9	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 comp	pleted						
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F CoGP MA							
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.										
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:										

Additional Case Information:

Waste taken to Kames Bay Pier for storage prior to being transported to Energen for disposal. Majority of mortalities was associated with RTFS, second to deformaties in ova. 3 morts observed across site, no moribund fish or clinical signs observed. Paperwork and inspection completed by

FHI 059, Version 12	2		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018		
Case No:	2019-0063]	Site No:	FS0269)					
Date of Visit:		26/02/201	9		Inspector(s):]		
Registration/Author			_							
1. Business/site det	•	checked by	site representa	ative?			Υ			
2. Changes made to	o details?						Y			
Site Details										
Total No facilities		15	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilities	s inspected	15		
Species	RTR	RTR								
Age group	2019	2018								
No Fish	80,000	40,000								
Mean Fish Wt	Ova	150g								
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	N/A		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	March 201	9			
Popont (last 4 wks)	disease prob	lome?			Any assance	(cinco lact)	/icit\2	N		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease prob	iems?		1	Any escapes	(Since last)	visit) ?	IN		
Movement Record										
		:						V		
Movement record Data of last incord		or inspection?					13/02/2018	ĭ		
 Date of last inspensions Are records compared to the compared to the		ooth, optorod	2				13/02/2016			
4. Are movement re	•	•		•				V		
5. Are records com								Ÿ		
6. Are health certific	•	•		able?				Y		
Transport Records	S	·	·							
1. Are any moveme	ents carried ou	it by (or on be	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y		
If yes, is there a sys	stem in place	for maintenar	nce of transpo	rtation records	?			Y		
Mortality Records										
1. Mortality records	available for i	inspection?						Y		
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed o	of?			Biogas - Ene	rgen, Cumb	ernauld			
If other detail:										
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly en		100()			•••	Y		
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		(post hatch	0.42%) across	whole site; Ov	a - 2,314 (2.	.8%) across \	whole site		
5. Evidence of rece	•	atypical morta		mortanty).				N		
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:						
,,		,,,,,,								
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	uring period c	hecked?					N		
If yes, detail:								N/A		
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?										
If yes, detail action:		ported to EU	12 If no odd M	IDT case and	ontor on morts	lity ovente s	hoot	N/A		
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.										

ii other, detail.			
2. Medicines records	available for inspection?		N/A
3. Are records comp	lete and correctly entered?		N/A
4. Are fish in a withd	rawal period?		N/A
5. If yes, what treatm	ient(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Record	ls		
1. Biosecurity record	s available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner a	nd frequency of mortality removal, recor	rding and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner a	nd period in which the APB will notify So	cottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplain	ned) mortality at the site been included?		Y
	·	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	Y
	luded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be no		
		ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	ation if required)?		
6. Have the husband	dry and hiosecurity measures implement	ted between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
	•	isitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
	•	ce to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals		oo to mantan are prijotear comaniment of	
•	rity procedures been adequately implem	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	ance		
1 Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out by, o	r on hehalf of the husiness?	Y
•	available for inspection?	on bendinor, the business:	Y
3. Any significant res	•		N
• •	etailed under recent disease problems).		
ir yee, detail (ii riot di	stanca ander recent disease problems).		
F	Records checked between:	13/02/18 - 26/02/19	

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2019-0063		Site No:	FS0269		nsp:	
Date of Visit	26/02/2019		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or			40	00	
species	compartment in Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			26 14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3
F	Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Earm is protect	Site contacts ed (secure water supply through	0	1-5	6-10		_
farms (holding species	disinfection or l		0				0
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		├ ──┤
		or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			0
the fales of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				0
		from zone or compartment of	,				
	equivalent state	n from Category III farm	4				0
	Processing fish	10				0	
			10]			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		· · ·	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				3
Diatform access to cares	Yes			1			
Platform access to cages	No		0	-			0
	140		2	J			
					Total		25
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2019-0063	Site No: FS0269	
Sea Lice Inspectio	n (Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site expe	rienced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farn	n Management Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	
azamethiphos and e can these be deploy	emamectin benzoate) as vired in a reasonable period documented farm manage	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and for time? The ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	
		pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
		standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
	almonis) record levels bel ed? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	
8. Have average ad records are inspected	· ·	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above during the period that	
If yes, have these be	een reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus ir	nfestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
		stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>clongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other a	ction been taken (where a	applicable)?	
12. Have therapeuti	c treatments or the action	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments,	where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating farms?	
sea lice?		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	
	pecific written lice manage e escalation of a sea lice in	ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised infestation?	
16. Do the sea lice I	evels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	
Containment Inspe		ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
		he predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
Site indoors.			
If other, detail belo	ow.		
ii otilor, detail bele	,		
3. Have escape inc	idents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with	questions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10	
4. Have these been	reported to Scottish Minis	sters?	
5. Have these been	reported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been	reported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if	any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
8 If all nots were de	enloved was this action ac	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish	
	oGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild half litterests and was permission given by acottish	
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could	
be considered un	der satisfactory measur	res of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspec	cted as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0269

Case No: 2019-0063

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2019-0063	Date of visit: 26/02/2019							
Site No:	FS0269	l		Inspector:		ı			
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary									
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
FCL CNI	01/03/2019	шэр	Z IIISP						
ECI, CNI MIX	01/03/2019								
WIDX	01/00/2010								
	_								
	-								
	_								





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0134 Date of Visit 26/02/2019
Site No FS0269 Site Name Kames Hatchery
Inspector Case No 20190063

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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.

R04

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 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: 01/03/2019

Fish Health Inspector

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018								
Case No: 2019-0066			Date of visit: 14/02/2019								
Time spent on site:	hr	Main Inspecto	r:								
Site No: SS0451 Business No: SB0530	Site Name: Business Name:	Troustan Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd	1								
Case Types: 1 MOV	2 3	4 5	6								
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed								
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA								
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.											
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:										

Additional Case Information:

Export from Troustan to Ireland. Health Certificate no. INTRA.GB.2019.0004168, Local Reference no. MD19/019 16 bags (approx 19,000 kg) of mussels for export. These 16 bags reportedly fallowed the site and new lines to be put out to catch settlement in spring/summer 2019. Bags inspected at the shorebase. From the stock observed the mussels were clean and appeared in good condition.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2019-0066		Site No:	SS0451				
Date of Visit:		14/02/2019	· j		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authori 1. Business/site detail 2. Changes made to o	ils summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	-
Site Details								
Total No facilities		30	Facilities sto	cked	0	No facilitie	es inspected	0
	Fallow							
Age group No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (Site	e)	Fallowed		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Spring/Su	mmer 2019 s	ettlement
,	•				1	Ср		
Recent (last 4 wks) di	isease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
1. Movement records	available for	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspect	tion:						07/02/2019	
3. Are records comple	ete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement reco								N/A
5. Are records comple		•						N/A
Are health certificat	tes for introd	uctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement	s carried out	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			
If yes, is there a syste				•	_			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records av	vailable for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	s disposed of	f?			Other (detail))		
If other detail:	Seabed							
3. Mortality records co	omplete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (la	ast 4 wks):		No mortalitie	es observed sin	ice previous ir	nspection		
5. Evidence of recent	increased/a	typical mortal	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no r	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
	f 19 - 1		0					N
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:	mortality dur	ring period ch	lecked?					N
7. Have increased (ur	nexplained) r	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,		on repense					
8. Have 'mortality eve	nts' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, add M	IRT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	sheet.	N/A

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

Results of Surveillance

3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

Records checked between: 07/02/19 to 14/02/19

Case No:	2019-0066	Date of visit: 14/02/2019						
Site No:	SS0451	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
Report Summary								
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MOV	15/02/2019		Z IIISP					
mo v	10/02/2010							





Loch Striven Mussel Farms Ltd The Point Ardtaraig Estate Loch Striven Argyll PA23 8RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO SB0530 SITE NO SS0451 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 14/02/2019
SITE NAME Troustan
CASE NO 20190066

Inspection for placing on the market in the EU

In accordance with the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC, the above site was visited and a consignment of Blue Mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) for placing on the market in Ireland was inspected. A health certificate was issued which must travel with the consignment to the destination. The official authority in the importing country has been notified.

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

Signed: Date: 15/02/2019

Fish Health Inspector