FHI 059, Version 12	_	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2020-0118			Date of visit: 10/03/2020					
Time spent on site:	2 hours	Main In	spector:					
Site No: FS1318 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Portree Outer The Scottish Salmon Co	ompany					
Case Types: 1 REG	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-26					
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin	•		al information/clinical score sheet.					
Clinical signs of disease observed?	vea :		al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.					
Diagnostic samples taken?		N						
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	rry out intended visit detai	I reason below:						
Unable to inspect pens due to adverse weather								

Additional Case Information:

Live harvest to Arnish.

Morts; 2020 wk7 735, 0.17%, wk8 550, 0.13%, wk 9 2194, 0.52 (seal and post treatment), wk10 851, 0.21%

Unable to inspect pens due to adverse weather. Fish had been collected from yesterdays harvest and stored at the site shore base for flesh quality sampling by TSSC and EWOS. Pen numbers were recorded. Samples were taken from these fish for VMD sampling.

Morts ensiled on barge, removed by Ferguson. 5 removals this cycle. Taken to Energen Biogas in Cumbernauld.

Routine health checks every 2 weeks by own health team.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0118		Site No:	FS1318				
Date of Visit:		10/03/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Autho	risation Det	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	site representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Υ	1
Site Details								
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	9	No facilitie	es inspected	0
Species	sal	lump fish					T	
Age group	2018 S0	MVG						
No Fish	341,917	about 11%				+		
Mean Fish Wt	4278	mixed						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	April/ May 20	020	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Sept 2020		
(,	, 4			1	СТР		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	lems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	<u> </u>							
Movement records		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		Порослоги					28/11/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				20/11/2015	Y
4. Are movement red				?				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	em in place f	or maintenan	ice of transpo	rtation records	?			N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie	s disposed o	if?			Ensiled - on	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ent						Y
4. Recent mortality (•		see addition	al info				
Evidence of recen		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
O Arresthan paaka ii		······································	l d2					
6. Any other peaks in If yes, detail:				/ post treatme	nt reported			'
7. Have increased (u				% post treatmer	nt - reported			Y
If yes, detail action:	пехрапеч,	Reported to		J Vet Of 1 Th:				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re			ART case and e	enter on morta	ality events s	sheet.	Y

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments If yes, detail: If other, detail:	(last 4 wks)? T.M.S.			Y
	•	T.M.S.		Y Y Y
If other, detail: 6. Are medicines store Biosecurity Records				Y
 Biosecurity records Has the manner an Has the manner an 	available for inspection? d frequency of mortality removal, d period in which the APB will no ed) mortality at the site been incl	tify Scottish Ministers or veter		Y Y

28/11/18-11/3/20 Records checked between:

П	HI 059, Version 12							ISS	suea by:	гпі			
	Case no:	2020-01	118	Site No:		FS1318	,		Date of Samplin		10/0	03/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	13:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. [15
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	4kg	4kg	4kg	4kg								
	Sex												
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
		٤	٤	5	٤								
<u>s</u>		Bul	Bul	Bul	Bul								
Details		<u>@</u>	<u>@</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>@</u>								
		Russel Burn	Russel Burn	Russel Burn	Russel Burn								
Stock	Stock Origin												
St	Facility No	19	16	12	13								

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0					

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:						: 08/10/2018		
Case Number:	2020-0118			Site No:	FS1318		Insp:		
Date of Visit	10/03/2020			No of mo	No of movements/supp./dest.				
Live fish movements				0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	3	0	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zon	0	9	18	26	$\overline{}$		
·	compartment including third country Number of suppliers				5	10	14	-	
Movements off	Frequency of m			0	3	6	10	10	
Wovernerits on	Number of des			0		6	10	3	
Exposure via water		Site cor	ntacts	0	1-5	6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,		0					
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with categor n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	2	4		1	
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with categor n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	3	6		ш	
		or in a coastal zone with categor n or within 1 tidal excursion	у∨	1	4	8		ш	
Management practices				None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent v	waters	0	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro			0					
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)		1				1	
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status		2					
	Processing fish equivalent state		4						
		from Category III farm		8					
	Processing fish	rfrom Category ∨ farm		10				\Box	
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		0					
products	Common proce	esses with other farms		3	1			ш	
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5				5	
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed		0	j			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5					
Biosecurity		Number of	f 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	1				
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No			1				1	
CoGP/Regulator					,				
Practices in accordance	Yes			0				0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3					
Platform access to cages	Yes			0	1			0	
	No			2					
						Total Rank		23 MEDIUM	

Case No:	2020-0118	Site No: FS1318							
Sea Lice Inspection (S	• •								
•	•	s in the previous 4 years?	N						
2. Is the CoGP Farm Ma	anagement Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Υ						
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?									
4. Is there a signed doc Management Area (or e		ement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm	Y						
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)									
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)									
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)									
_	•	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?	N						
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A						
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infest	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 elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Υ						
11. Has any other action	n been taken (where a	applicable)?	Υ						
•	•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ						
•			Υ						
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms? Y 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?									
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised Y scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?									
16. Do the sea lice level	ls observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	N/A						
unable to inspect due to	weather								
Containment Inspection	on								
•		ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N						
•		the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ						
		lic restrictions, looking to get seal pro next cycle.							
If other, detail below:	no 7122 dec dae to	no resultations, restaining to get sear pro mexicoyote.							
il other, detail below.									
3. Have escape inciden	nts or events been ext	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N						
If Yes proceed with que									
4. Have these been repo		•							
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)							
6. Have these been repo	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) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail							
8 If all note were deale	yed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish							
Ministers? (Legal, CoGF	9 – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)								
		mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could							
be considered under	•	·							
•	•	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	N/A						
unable to inspect due to	weather								

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version	n 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0118	Site No:	FS1318		
Date of Visit:	10/03/2020	Ins	pector:		
Point of Comp	liance				
1. Is the farm u	nder inspection located v	vithin a farm ma	anagement area?		Y
If N, no further	questions require comple	etion.			
Points of Com	pliance for Both Farm	Management A	Igreements and St	atements	
3. Is the curren4. Does the FM5. Does the FM6. Does the FM	nt farm management agreet t FMAg/S available for in IAg/S identify the relevant IAg/S identify the fish farm IAg/S identify the date of IAg/S identify the date of IAg/S identify the date of	spection? It farm manage m site(s) to whi commencemen	ment area? ch it applies?		Y Y Y Y Y
Arrangements	for Fish Health Manag	ement			
8. Does the FM farm?	IAg/S identify the minimu	m health stand	ards for the stocks t	to be introduced to the are	a or Y
10. Does the F		es of fish which	may be stocked into		Y Y Y
	MAg/S identify the arrang area or the individual fa		storage and dispos	al of any dead fish from a	ny Y
Arrangements	for The Management o	of Sea Lice			
13. Does the F	MAg/S identify arrangem	ents for the sha	aring of data on sea	lice numbers and treatme	nts?
14. Does the Floring statement?	MAg/S identify the availa	bility and the us	e of medicines on fa	arms covered by the agree	ement Y
	MAg/S identify any requir		sensitivity testing of	f available treatments for s	
	MAg/S identify the circum in the area or individual f		which biological cor	ntrols and cleaner fish are	
17. Does the F	MAg/S identify the arrang	gements for syn	chronous treatment	ts on farms within the area	a? Y
Live Fish Mov	ements				
18. Does the Flarea or farm?	MAg/S identify the circum	nstances when	live fish may be intro	oduced or removed from t	he
		gements for the	movement of live fi	sh on and off sites in the a	rea Y

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/20
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	le harvest practices on farms in the area or ind	ividual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restoo	by which the area or individual farm will be fallecked?	ow and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether be covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke ??	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag	ement Agreements Only	
24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	nent include arrangements for persons to beco	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	operated in accordance with the agreement or	r statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 11/07/2018	

Site No: FS1318

Case No: 2020-0118

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

Case No:	2020-0118			Date of visit:	10/03/2020				
ouse no.	2020 0110			Date of Visit.	10/00/2020				
Site No:	FS1318			Inspector:		1			
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	1								
D 10									
Report Summary	D (nd						
Case Type	Date 10/03/2020	Insp	2 nd Insp						
Reg, SNI, SLI, VMD	19/03/2020								





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
 11/03/2020

 SITE NO
 FS1318
 SITE NAME
 Portree Outer

 INSPECTOR
 CASE NO
 20200118

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

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

On this occasion, the site inspection could not be conducted due to adverse weather. Paperwork was completed and samples were taken from previously harvested fish for veterinary residue testing.

Records

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

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

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

R25

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented. However an inspection of the fish and pens was not possible to confirm procedures on site.

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 paperwork 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 paperwork was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes. An inspection of the fish and pens was not possible to confirm procedures on site.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 19/03/2020