| FHI 059, Version 12 | ls | ssued by: FHI | Date of issue: 08/10/2018 |
|--|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Case No: 2020-0129 | | | Date of visit: 05/03/2020 |
| Time spent on site: | 5h | Main Inspecto | or: |
| Site No: FS1296 Business No: FB0119 | Site Name: Business Name: | Colonsay Mowi Scotland Ltd | |
| Case Types: 1 CNA | 2 ESC 3 | 4 5 | 6 |
| Water Temp (°C): | Thermometer No: | | FHI 045 completed |
| Observations: | Region: ST | Water type: S | CoGP MA None |
| Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease obser Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? UNI/REG only - if unable to car | ved? | N/A If yes, see additional info N/A If yes, see additional info N/A If yes, see additional info N/A N/A | rmation/clinical score sheet. |
| | | | |

FHI 059, Version 12 Additional Case Information:

Following an extreme weather event (Storm Brendan) a loss of fish from pen 4 occured due to equipment failure. A pin that holds the base units that house the stanchions in the correct position on the horizontal axis failed. The base units and some stanchions had slid along the pen ring buckling the walkway due to the failure of the metal bracket. Plastic stays holding the stanchions in place had 'popped out' allowing the stanchion to lift up out of the holding bracket and resulting in the handrail collapsing into the pen beneath the waterline as well as a 1-2m tear in the net. It was reported that 73,600 fish had escaped.

A bracket has been placed around some of the pins to prevent excessive lifting. Divers have beeen onsite re-tightening the nuts (on all pens) that hold the pins in place.

Last visit to the site was 7/11/2019, partly completed an enhanced containment inspection (2020 - 0050) on the 18/2/2020 but this was completed on the mainland as access to Colonsay has been challenging due to weather and flight issues. The enhanced containment inspection was completed during this visit to the site.

Dive inspection reports were inspected and a number of repairs have been made to the nets by divers, it is reported that there have been issues with seal interaction during the winter months when there is a lack of wildfish available.

| FHI 059, Version 12 | | | lssu | ied by: FHI | | | Date of issu | e: 08/10/2018 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Case No: | 2020-0129 |] | Site No: | FS1296 | | | | |
| Date of Visit: | | 05/03/2020 |) | | Inspector(s): | | |] |
| Registration/Author 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to | ails summary | | ite representa | ative? | | | Y Y |] |
| Site Details | | | | | | | | |
| Total No facilities | | 14 | Facilities sto | cked | 13 | No facilitie | s inspected | 13 |
| Species | SAL | | | | | | | |
| Age group | 2019 Q2 | | | | | | | |
| No Fish | 940,000 | | | | | | | |
| Mean Fish Wt | 2kg | | | | | | | |
| Next Fallow Date (S | ite) | Late 2020 | | Next Input Da | ate (Site) | April/Augu | ist 2021 | |
| Recent (last 4 wks) | disease probl | lome? | | N | Any escapes | (cince last) | vicit)? | V |
| If yes, detail: | - | | being inspec | ted due to esc | | Since last | visitje | 1 |
| Movement Record | s | | | | | | | |
| 1. Movement record | | r inspection? | | | | | | Y |
| 2. Date of last inspe | | in inopeotion . | | | | | 18/02/2020 | |
| 3. Are records comp | | ectly entered? | ? | | | | | Y |
| 4. Are movement re | cords availab | le for dead fis | sh and waste? | ? | | | | N/A |
| 5. Are records comp | olete and corre | ectly entered? | ? | | | | | N/A |
| 6. Are health certific | ates for intro | ductions (outv | vith GB) availa | able? | | | | N/A |
| Transport Records | ; | | | | | | | |
| 1. Are any movement | | | | | | | | |
| If yes, is there a sys | tem in place f | for maintenan | ice of transpo | rtation records | ? | | | |
| Mortality Records 1. Mortality records | available for i | nenection? | | | | | | N/A |
| 2. How are mortalitie | | • | | | | | | |
| If other detail: | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Mortality records | complete and | correctly ent | ered? | | | | | N/A |
| 4. Recent mortality (| last 4 wks): | | | | | | | |
| 5. Evidence of recer | nt increased/a | atypical mortal | lities? | | | | | N/A |
| If yes, facility nos/no | mortality per | facility/no sto | ock per facility | /reason: | | | | |
| 6. Any other peaks i | n mortality du | ring period cl | necked? | | | | | N/A |
| If yes, detail: | | | iconcu. | | | | | |
| 7. Have increased (| unexplained) | mortalities be | en reported to | o vet or FHI? | | | | N/A |
| If yes, detail action: | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Have 'mortality ev | /ents' been re | ported to FHI | ? If no, add M | IRT case and e | enter on morta | ality events s | sheet. | N/A |

| 1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)? | |
|--|--------|
| If yes, detail: | |
| If other, detail: | |
| 2. Medicines records available for inspection? | |
| 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? | |
| 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? | |
| 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? | |
| If other, detail: | |
| 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? | |
| Biosecurity Records | |
| 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? | |
| 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? | |
| 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any | |
| increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? | |
| | |
| 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease | |
| is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? | |
| 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher | |
| health status, certification if required)? | |
| | |
| 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise | |
| transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? | |
| 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of | |
| aquaculture animals held on site? | |
| 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? | |
| If no, detail: | |
| Results of Surveillance | |
| 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? | |
| 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? | |
| 3. Any significant results? | |
| If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). | |
| | |
| | |
| Records checked between: Movement records only checked from 18/2/2020 to 5/3 | 3/2020 |

| FHI 059, Version 12 | | Issue | d by: FHI | Date of issue: 08/10/20 |
|---|------------|---------------|------------------------------|---|
| Case No: | 2020-0129 | Site No: | FS1296 | |
| Date of visit: | 05/03/2020 | Inspector(s): | | |
| Point of compliance | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
| ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER) | | | | |
| a. Enquiry relating to I) escape incidents and ii) contingency pro | cedures | | | |
| 1.1. Have escape incidents or events ¹ been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? | | Y | | Damage to one cage following storm 17/01/2020, estimated 73,600 fish escaped. Hole in net a result of failure in fixing, which connects steel bar between stanchions, causing structural failure in cage. |
| If yes answer 1.2-1.8: 1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery? | High | Y | AAAH Regs ⁴ 31D,E | FHI notified on 17/01/2020 - MSe170120SAL1 |
| 1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO ² and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust? | Medium | Y | CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17 | Notification was given although there was a delay with SSPO notification on the 20th January and the Argyll DSFB on the 22 January. |
| 1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail | | N | | |
| 1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT | Low | N/A | CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18 | |
| 1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18 | |
| 1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland? | Low | N/A | CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18 | |
| 1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been to | High | У | | Remaining cages being inspected and maintenance being carried out. Dive checks increased, previously monthly checks and before and after specific procedures and poor weather events. Now inspecting whenever weather allows. ROV has been purchased for inspecting the cage system. Steel plates are to be installed on fixings for steel bars to keep them in place. No documents in place indicating the correct installation of fixing nuts for steel bar supports for stanchions, or SOP for how they can be inspected as correctly installed. Update, fish were moved out of the damaged pen, pen manufacturer has been out to site recommended to retighten the nuts, brackets have been secured around pins that have been lifting to restrict movement, self tapper screws were installed on either side of pins. Diver have been on site to retighten all the pin nuts, and fully inspect. |

| FHI 059, Version 12 | | Issue | d by: FHI | | Date of issue: 08/10/2 | |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Point of compliance | Risk level Satisfactory? Requirement | | it | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary | | |
| 1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish? | High | Y | SSI, 2,9 | | | |
| b(I). Inspection of records relating to equipment,facilities and t | he site | | | | | |
| General records | | | CoGP: 4.4.9 | , 4.4.14, | | |
| 2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:- | | | SSI 2,1 | | | |
| site, a record should be maintained or | | Facilities | Moorings | Nets | - | |
| a) The name of the manufacturer | Low | V | V | V | - | |
| b) Any special adaptations | Low | y N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| c) The name of the supplier | Low | V | Y | Y | | |
| d) The date of purchase | Low | V | Y | Y | | |
| e) Each inspection including | | ŕ | | | | |
| I) the name of the person conducting the inspection | Low | y | y | у | - | |
| ii) the date of each inspection | Medium | Y | Y | Y | | |
| iii) the place of each inspection | Low | у | У | у | | |
| iv) the outcome of each inspection | High | У | У | у | Dive reports detail subsurface observations and repairs made | |
| f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling | High | У | У | У | Nets serviced at Morenot Scalpay | |
| reatment carried out | | | | | _ | |
| 2.2. In relation to each net a record of: | | | | | | |
| I) The mesh size | Medium | Y | SSI, 2,2 | | | |
| ii) The code which appears on the identification tag | Medium | Y | | | | |
| iii) The place of use, storage and disposal | Medium | Y | | | | |
| iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the | Low | Y | | | | |
| 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 | Y | SSI, 2,3 | | | |
| ii) The material used in construction | Low | Y | | | | |
| iii) Its dimensions | Low | Y | | | | |
| 2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of- | | | SSI, 2,4 | | | |
| I) The date of installation | Low | Y | | | | |
| ii) The design and weight of the anchors | Low | Y | | | | |
| iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains | Low | Y | | | | |
| 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 | | | SSI, 2,6 | | | |
| a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place | Low | | | | | |

| Point of compliance | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|---|--------------|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such | Low | | | |
| 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 | Medium | У | SSI, 2,11 (a) | |
| any facility, net or mooring | | - | | |
| b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage | High | У | SSI, 2,11 (b) | dive reports for net repairs, pen damage has not been repaired yet. |
| Pen and mooring systems | | | | |
| 2.7 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13 | |
| selection and installation of pens and moorings? | | | | |
| 2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification | High | Ν | CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14 | No records of assessments made maintained on the site. |
| of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed? | | | | |
| | High | N | CoGP 4.4.10 | Scale AQ report states incorrect fastening points for ropes. |
| 2.9 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?2.10 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / | High High | N | CoGP 4.4.10 CoGP 4.4.11 | Scale AQ report states incorrect fastening points for ropes. |
| experienced person(s)? | rigi | T | C0GP 4.4.11 | |
| 2.11 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in | High | N | CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15 | Letters of competence - Mallaig marine, more not, (aqualine letter of |
| the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring | g.i | | 0001 4.4.12, 4.4.10 | competence not available) |
| systems? | | | | , |
| 2.12 Are pen and mooring components inspected with | High | Ν | CoGP 4.4.16 | No records could be located. |
| a) a documented SOP | | | | |
| b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment | | | | |
| 2.13 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.17 | |
| 2.14 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.19 | |
| size in relation to net size | | | | |
| 2.15 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take | High | Ν | CoGP 4.4.20 | No records of this |
| into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site | | | | |
| and include adequate safety margins? 2.16 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor? | Low | N | CoGP 4.4.21 | |
| | Low | N | | |
| 2.17 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency? | High | Ŷ | CoGP 4.4.22 | |
| 2.18 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice? | High | T | CoGP 4.4.22 | |
| 2.19 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.23 | |
| 2.20 Are net inspection records maintained? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.23 | dive reports held on barge |
| 2.21 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.24 | |

| HI 059, Version 12 | | Issue | d by: FHI | Date of issue: 08/10/20 | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Point of compliance | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary | | |
| 2.22 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.25 | Following escape event MSe170120SAL1, net was repaired, remaining fish in cage then harvested out. Net subsequently removed. Remaining cages being inspected with fixings being tightened. Additional equipment (steel plates) are to be installed on fixings. | | |
| (ii). Inspection of records relating to training | | | | | | |
| .1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various nsite activities documented? | High | Y | CoGP 7.1.8 | | | |
| | High | Y | SSI 2,6,a | | | |
| 8.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a ecord 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 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | ssments High | Y | CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12 | | | |
| o(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk asses 1.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? | | Y | CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12 | | | |
| .1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping onsidered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? .2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in | | Y | CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12 CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c | | | |
| .1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping onsidered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? .2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in lace:) a documented risk assessments | High High | Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 | | | |
| 4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? 4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place: a) a documented risk assessments b) standard operating procedures | High High High | Y Y Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 | | | |
| .1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping onsidered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? .2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in lace: a documented risk assessments standard operating procedures contingency plan .3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are | High High | Y Y Y Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 | | | |
| .1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping onsidered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? .2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in lace:) a documented risk assessments) a documented risk assessments) standard operating procedures) contingency plan .3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are armed is there a record of | High High High | Y Y Y Y Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 | | | |
| .1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping onsidered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? .2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in lace:) a documented risk assessments) standard operating procedures) standard operating procedures) contingency plan .3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are armed is there a record of The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used n the site | High High High High | Y Y Y Y Y N/A | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c | | | |
| A.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? B.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place: a documented risk assessments b) standard operating procedures contingency plan A.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are armed is there a record of The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site | High High High High Low | Y Y Y Y N/A Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c SSI 2,6,b | | | |
| I.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping | High High High High Low | Y Y Y Y N/A Y Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c SSI 2,6,b | | | |
| A.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? A.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place: a) a documented risk assessments b) standard operating procedures c) contingency plan A.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are armed is there a record of The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site A.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation? A.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining | High High High High Low Low | Y Y Y Y Y N/A Y Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c SSI 2,6,b SSI 2,6,c | | | |
| Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk? Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place: a documented risk assessments b) standard operating procedures c) contingency plan In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are armed is there a record of The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site A Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation? A re there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining he risk of predator attack? | High High High Low Low | Y Y Y Y Y N/A Y Y | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c SSI 2,6,b SSI 2,6,c CoGP 4.4.26 | | | |

| FHI 059, Version 12 | Issued by: FHI | | | Date of issue: 08/10/2018 |
|---|----------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| Point of compliance | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
| - The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site | Low | | 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 | |
| c. Inspection of site and site equipment | | | | |
| 5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site? | High | Y | | Additional brackets have been placed over bolt fastenings to prevent further lifting of pins however the damaged pen remains in place. |
| 5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.18 | |

| 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 | Y | SSI 2,2 ii | |
| Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory? | Low | Y | | |
| 5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight? | Low | Y | CoGP 4.4.21 | |
| 5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary) | | Y | | MML, top nets, ADD in place but cant be used continuously |
| 5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens? | High | Y | CoGP 4.4.28 | Froya ring with 300kg centre weight, seal blinds. |
| 5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed? | Low | Y | 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 | Y | CoGP 4.4.31 | |
| 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 | | |
| b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air | High | N/A | | |
| 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 | d 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 | d 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: | 2020-0129 | - | | Date of visit: | 05/03/2020 | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|----------|------------|----------------|----------------|---------|------|----------------------|
| Site No: | FS1296 | 3 | Inspector: | | | | | |
| Results Summary | Freq. | | | | te of Notifica | | | |
| | | Database | Insp | Phone | Insp | Writing | Insp | 2 nd Insp |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | + | | | | | + | |

| Report Summary | | | |
|-----------------|------------|------|----------------------|
| Case Type | Date | Insp | 2 nd Insp |
| CNA | 20/11/2020 | | |
| ESC | 20/11/2020 | | |
| Case completion | 24/08/2022 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

marine scotland science



Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NOFB0119SITE NOFS1296INSPECTORSImage: Constraint of the second secon

 DATE OF VISIT
 05/03/2020

 SITE NAME
 Colonsay

 CASE NO
 20200129/20200050

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 following recommendations are made for improvement.

It is recommended that, following a documented review of site equipment, records should be put in place, in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) Chapter 4, points 4.9 & 4.14, to demonstrate the design specifications of pen and mooring systems, along with evidence that they are suitable for purpose and are correctly installed.

It is also recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.10, evidence should be provided to demonstrate that the pen system deployed at the site, including any modifications, meets the manufacturers guidelines.

Evidence was not available, during the inspection, to demonstrate the competence of pen designers or Mowi Scotland Ltd staff involved in their installation and maintenance.

It is also recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.15, evidence should be provided to demonstrate the competence of all personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems.

It is recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, point 4.16, pen and mooring components should be inspected in accordance with a documented standard operating procedure (SOP) and a documented inspection plan which is based on risk assessment.

There was no evidence to demonstrate that the suitability of the net design, quality and standard of manufacture, take into account the conditions likely to be experienced on the site. In addition dive records detailed that a high number of subsurface repairs had been made due to seal interaction and also, reports of nets looking worn.

It is recommended that in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, points 4.20 and 4.21, evidence should be provided to demonstrate that 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, along with treatment with UV inhibitor.

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

Fish Health Inspector

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice, the following recommendation is made due to the nature of the breach of containment reported on 17 January 2020.

It is recommended that a documented review of the pen and mooring system, including any modifications, is undertaken to ensure they are suitable for purpose, correctly installed and meet the manufacturers guidelines in accordance with the CoGP Chapter 4, points 4.9, 4.10 and 4.14

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by **21st May 2021**. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:

Date: 20/11/2020

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

R10





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS
 No
 FB0119

 SITE NO
 FS1296

 CASE NO
 20200129/20200050

DATE OF VISIT 05/03/2020 SITE NAME Colonsay

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 21st may 2021. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

This case will now be closed. This site may be subject to further audit and recommendations in the future.

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

Signed:

Date: 24/08/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

marine scotland science



Mowi Scotland Ltd Stob Ban House Glen Nevis Business Park Fort William PH33 6RX

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0119 SITE NO FS1296 INSPECTORS
 DATE OF VISIT
 05/03/2020

 SITE NAME
 Colonsay

 CASE NO
 20200129/20200050

Escape Investigation

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of 73,600 Atlantic salmon on 17/1/2020.

An enhanced containment inspection was conducted and a report will be issued separately.

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.

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.

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

Signed:

Date: 20/11/2020

Fish Health Inspector

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

R27