FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0327			Date of visit: 21/10/2020
Time spent on site:	5 Hrs	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: fs0683 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Gob a Bharra Loch Fyne The Scottish Salmon Compan	у
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y
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?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

## **Additional Case Information:**

Lumpfish mortality - 7.46% since input.

Paper work completed on the 28/08/2020, however site visit could not be conducted until 21/10/2020.

Vmd fish appeared healthy when sampled.

Site thermometer used as case inspectors not working

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0327	]	Site No:	fs0683				
Date of Visit:		21/10/2020	]		Inspector(s):			1
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		ite representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								•
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	9	No facilitie	s inspected	10
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	2018 S0	2019						
No Fish	250,000	27,000						
Mean Fish Wt	3.547 Kg	45g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Apr 2021		Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Sept 2021		
Recent (last 4 wks) of If yes, detail:	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
Movement Records								
Movement records     Date of last inspect	ction:						27/03/2018	Y
Are records comp     Are movement records.	cords availab	le for dead fis	h and waste?					Y
<ol><li>Are records comp</li><li>Are health certification</li></ol>		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records			·				'	
1. Are any movement If yes, is there a syst					_			N
Mortality Records	leni in piace i	or maintenan	ce of transpor	tation records	:			
1. Mortality records a	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly enter	ered?					Y
<ol><li>Recent mortality (</li></ol>	last 4 wks):		21/09 - 347 (	0.11 28/09 - 10	0.32% 05	5/10 345 0.1	1 12/10 745 (	0.23%
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical mortal	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in		•						Y
If yes, detail:	WK 33 and \	WK 30 1028 (	0.32%) 1955	0.61% - hydro	licer treatment	t WK36 1.41	1% 3543 - pos	st treatment
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	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	RT case and e	enter on morta	ility events s	heet.	Y

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1111 000, VEI3IOII 12	issued by. I Till	Date 01 133de: 00/10/2010
Recent treatments (last 4 wks)	2	Y
If yes, detail:	TMS	
If other, detail:	THO	
2. Medicines records available fo	r inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and corr	ectly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period	·	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	TMS	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropri	ately?	Y
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for	or inspection?	Y
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) mortalit	y at the site been included?	Y
	n in the event that the presence or suspicion of the pres	sence of a listed disease Y
	w and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
<ol><li>Has the health status of aquac health status, certification if requi</li></ol>	ulture animals being stocked on the farm site been cove red)?	ered (equal or higher Y

aquaculture animals held on site?

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

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

- 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
- 3. Any significant results?

If no, detail:

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

Records checked between:

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

27/03/2018 - 21/10/2020

	11 000, 10101011 12								aca by.				
	Case no:	2020-03	327	Site No:		fs0683			Date of Samplin		21/	10/2020	21/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	0:00	15:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:		1	VMD No	o.	18
	Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Г	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	3.6 Kg	3.6 Kg	3.6 Kg									
	Sex	N/A		N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
sils													
Details	1	ale	ale	ale									
	L	Migdale	Migdale	Migdale									
Stock	Stock Origin	Σ	Σ										
St	Facility No	1	2	5									

10/2020	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:											
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018	
Case Number:	2020-0327		Site No:	fs0683		Insp:		
Date of Visit	21/10/2020		No of m	No of movements/supp./dest.				
Live fish movements			(	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	(	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone o	r (	9	18	26	П	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers			10	14	-	
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off		) 3	6	10	10	
Wovernerits on	Number of des				6	10	3	
Exposure via water	<u> </u>	Site contac	ts (	1-5	6-10			
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	C					
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2	
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш	
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш	
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure			
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent water	rs (	1	2		1	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		(				0	
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	ı				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	2				
	equivalent statu		4	ı				
	_	n from Category III farm	8	3				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10	)			ш	
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	(					
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	3			3	
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed		_   			0	
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5				
Biosecurity		Number of site	es 1	2 or 3	≥ 4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	(	1	2		2	
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	(	1	2		2	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes						0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			ш	
CoGP/Regulator				_				
Practices in accordance	Yes						0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes						0	
	No		2					
					Total Rank		23 MEDIUM	

Case No:	2020-0327		Site No:	fs0683					
Sea Lice Inspection (	••	s in the previous 4 years	s?		N				
•	•	equivalent) fallowed syn		year class basis?	Y				
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 documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm  Management Area (or equivalent)?									
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)									
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in th	e SSI and the CoGP? (	Legal SSI, CoGP Anne	x 6) Y				
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		low the suggested criter	ria for treatment in the 0	CoGP during the period	that Y				
_	•	<i>monis</i> ) numbers per fisl od that records are insp		above (prior to w/b 10/	6/19) or N				
If yes, have these beer	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If r	no, FHI see comment.		N/A				
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause	significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50) N				
		istered or other actions selongatus is considered							
11. Has any other actio	on been taken (where	applicable)?			Y				
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the action	ns taken had a significar	nt impact upon the lice l	evels recorded?	Y				
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation bety	veen participating farms	s?	Y				
		where fewer population			nt for Y				
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the es		ement procedure with winfestation?	aypoints describing set	actions to deal with rec	ognised Y				
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no please detail	reasons.	Υ				
Containment Inspecti	on								
•		ge due to predators in t	he current or previous p	production cycles?	N				
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against	the predation experience	ed on site? (Detail belo	w)	Y				
ADD To	ensioned nets	Seal Blind	MML						
If other, detail below:									
2. Hava sasana insida	mts av avanta baan av	navianas dan ay in tha vi	sinite of the city since t	ha laat El II inanaatian0	N				
·		perienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site since t	ne last FHI Inspection?					
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep	'	•							
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB fo	orthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	.4.17)					
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they exi	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)				
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give deta	il						
8 If all note were deal	oved was this action o	greed with local wild fish	interests and was non	mission given by Scottic	sh.				
o. II gill nets were depli Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild list	i interests and was pen	mission given by scottis	,,,				
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and min	imise the risk of further	escapes? (Not covered	in code but could					
be considered under									
	•	regards to containment?	If no, please detail rea	son(s)	Υ				

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0327	Site No: fs0683	
Date of Visit: 21/10/20	20 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection locate	ed within a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require con	npletion.	
Points of Compliance for Both Far	m Management Agreements and Statements	
<ul> <li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for</li> <li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance</li> <li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish</li> <li>6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date</li> <li>7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date</li> </ul>	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? of commencement of the agreement or statement of review?	Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Man	agement	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the mini farm?	mum health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	cination requirements for stocks held in the area of ecies of fish which may be stocked into the area of eximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in	or farm?
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrafish farm in the area or the individual	angements for the storage and disposal of any de I farm?	ead fish from any
Arrangements for The Managemer	nt of Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	ements for the sharing of data on sea lice number	rs and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ailability and the use of medicines on farms covere	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any reclice on farms in the area or individual	quirements for the sensitivity testing of available to I farms?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circused on farms in the area or individu	cumstances under which biological controls and c al farms?	
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arra	angements for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
area or farm?	cumstances when live fish may be introduced or re angements for the movement of live fish on and o	

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Harvesting		
20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	le harvest practices on farms in the area or indivi	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restor	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow cked?	v and the earliest
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto si	tes covered by the
_	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept t?	on any site
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	e, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation		
25. Is the fish farm being managed and	l operated in accordance with the agreement or s	statement?
26. What is the version no/date of issue	e of the FMAg/S? 26/02/2018	

Case No:	2020-0327			Date of visit:	21/10/2020					
Site No:	fs0683	Inspector:								
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp		
	+									
	+									
	+									
	+									
Report Summary	T			1						
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp							
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	03/11/2020		2 IIISP							
201, 0111, 021, 11115	00/11/2020									
	1									
	1									
	1									





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 FS0683

INSPECTOR

**DATE OF VISIT** 21/10/2020

SITE NAME Gob a Bharra Loch Fyne

**CASE No** 20200327

## 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.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

## Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

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

Date: 03/11/2020