FHI 059, Version 12	I	ssued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/20	)18
Case No: 2020-0095				Date of visit: 25/02/2020	
Time spent on site: 2.	5h		Main Inspector		
Site No: FS1336 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross The Scottish Salr	mon Company		3
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4	5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 8.5	Thermometer No:	Site		FHI 045 completed	כ
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type:	F	CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	n If yes, see a	dditional inforn	nation/clinical score sheet. nation/clinical score sheet. nation/clinical score sheet.	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:			

First cycle of fish going through the site.

Surveillance frequency number of movements offsite could not be assessed properly due to being the first cycle of fish and no movements have occurred yet. Estimate of movements off resulted in site being assessed as medium.

Sites thermometer used for biosecurity reasons.

FHI 059, Version 12	2 Issued by: FHI Date of is						Date of issu	sue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0095	]	Site No:	FS1336	3			
Date of Visit:		25/02/202	20		Inspector(s):			]
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ils summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details								
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	ocked	8	No facilities	s inspected	14
Species	SAL							
Age group	first feeding							
No Fish	1,714, 631							
Mean Fish Wt	0.5g							
Next Fallow Date (Si	te)	ongoing cy	cle	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	July 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) o If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		Ν	Any escapes	s (since last v	/isit)?	Ν
Movement Records								
1. Movement records		r inspection	?					у
2. Date of last inspec		r mopeouon					first inspect	-
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	d?					У
4. Are movement red	ords availab	le for dead f	ish and waste?	?				N/A
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	d?					N/A
6. Are health certification	ates for introc	ductions (out	twith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemer	ts carried ou	t by (or on b	ehalf) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N/A
If yes, is there a syst				•				N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie If other detail:	s disposed o	f?			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly er	ntered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (	ast 4 wks):		20118 (1.16	%) background	d mortalities			•
5. Evidence of recen	t increased/a	typical mort	alities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no s	tock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period	checked?					N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (u	(nevolained)	mortalitios b	een reported to	o vet or EUI2				N/A
If yes, detail action:	nexplained)	nonanties b	centreponed to					
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FI	H? If no, add M	IRT case and	enter on morta	ality events s	heet.	N/A

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N				
If yes, detail:					
If other, detail:	N/A				
<ol> <li>Medicines records available for inspection?</li> <li>Are records complete and correctly entered?</li> </ol>	IN/A				
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N/A				
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?					
If other, detail:					
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y				
Biosecurity Records					
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	У				
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	У				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any					
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	У				
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?					
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	У				
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	У				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	У				
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	У				
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:

23/1/2020 to 25/2/2020

FHI 059, Version 12

FRI 059, Version 12		ISSUED by. FILL			Date	or issue	. 00/10/2010
Case Number:	2020-0095		Site No:	FS1336		Insp:	
Date of Visit	25/02/2020		No of movements/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	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n		0	3	6	10	6
Novements on	Number of des		0	3	6	10	6
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or	,	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	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				<u> </u>
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status		4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
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				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 between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total		
					Total Rank		17 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0095	Site No: FS1336			
		·			
Sea Lice Inspection	n (Seawater Sites Only)				
1. Has the site exper	ienced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?			
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?			
azamethiphos and e	mamectin benzoate) as	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and			
	ed in a reasonable period				
Management Area (o	or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm			
5. Are sea lice count	records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
		standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
records are inspecte	d? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that			
2 or above (from w/b	10/6/19) during the peri	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?			
•	•	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.			
9. Is C. elongatus in	festation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)			
•		istered 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)			
11. Has any other ac	tion been taken (where a	applicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the action	is taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?			
		l out in cooperation between participating farms?			
14. Is there a harves		where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for			
sea lice?					
	ecific written lice manage escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised infestation?			
16. Do the sea lice le	evels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.			
Containment Inspe	ction				
		ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	Ν		
2. Are measures in p	lace to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y		
If other, detail belo	w.				
Site indoors			_		
	dents or events been ex	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	Ν		
	questions 4 – 9. If No ski				
•	reported to Scottish Minis				
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)			
6. Have these been i	reported to the SSPO an	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 gill nets were de	ployed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish			
Ministers? (Legal, Co	oGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)				
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could					
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)					
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s) Y					

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0095	]		Date of visit:	25/02/2020			
Site No:	FS1336	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
ECI,CNI	09/03/2020							

# marine scotland science



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 SITE NO FS1336 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 25/02/2020SITE NAMEApplecrossCASE NO20200095

### 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.

R04

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business 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: Fish Health Inspector

Date: 09/03/2020

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>