FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0464			Date of visit: 04/11/2020
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Insp	pector:
Site No: FS1343 Business No: FB0579	Site Name: Business Name:	Culnacnoc Salmon Farm Organic Sea Harvest Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: None
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	·	N If yes, see additional i	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Inspection of records carried out remotely on 29/10/2020

Lumpfish mortality has been low since input. Additional lumpfish input due for November

Application in to MS-LOT and council for using A.D.D on site, as a contingency, seal presence around site is very low.

Site thermometer used as FHI thermometer had a battery failure.

Salmon deep in cages and difficult to observe, Lumpfish seen near surface and appeared in good condition.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0464		Site No:	FS1343	,			
Date of Visit:		04/11/2020			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	details?						N	
Site Details (include	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	6	No facilitie	es inspected	6
Species	SAL	LUM						
Age group	2020 S0	2020						
No Fish	737,322	10,644						
Mean Fish Wt	130g	20g						
Next Fallow Date (Si	ite)	March 2022		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Autumn 20)22	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
Movement records		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							First inspect	ion
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	>					Y
4. Are movement red		•						Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst		• `		,				Y
Mortality Records1. Mortality records a	available for it	ocnoction?						$\overline{}$
2. How are mortalitie		•			Biogas - Ene	rgon Cumh	perpauld	'
If other detail:	s disposed of	ı i			Diogas - Life	rgen, Cumb	emaulu	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	0055,) - 1480 (0.3%)	w/b 05/10/20) - 3698 (0.8	8%) w/b 12/1	0/20 - 3083
5. Evidence of recen	•	tvoical mortal		7 1100 (0.07.5)	, 1110 001 . 01) 0000 (0	770), 1172	N
If yes, facility nos/no		•		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					Y
	w/b 21/09/20	- 10,904 (2.2	2%) - failed sn	molts following	transfer to site	e that week.	No requirem	ent for
If yes, detail:	reporting to F	FHI as within	6 weeks post-	-stocking.				
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) r	nortalities 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, enter (details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S.	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	V
Biosecurity records available for inspection? Healths manner and fraguency of mortality removal, recording and safe diaposal been considered?	ľ
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<u> </u>
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?	<u> </u>
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)?	<u> </u>
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?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
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: 19/09/2020 - 29/10/2020	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0464		Site No:	FS1343		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/11/2020	ovements/s	upp./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	
·	Number of sup	ocluding third country	0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3	6	10	3
iviovernents on	Number of desi		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				
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 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		0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	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	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	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		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 with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	1			
					Total		14
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2020-0464	Site No:	FS1343
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as	well as access to suitable biological and/or med gement agreement or statement relevant to the s	chanical control measures, and
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins6. Do records adequately reflect the required	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) If standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (I	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	coGP during the period that
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which 10. Have therapeutic treatments been admin	Imonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. In is considered to cause significant welfare problems tered or other actions taken when L. salmonis elongatus is considered to have welfare implication.	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N levels have exceeded the N/A
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site15. Is there a site specific written lice manag	applicable)? ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice led out in cooperation between participating farms, where fewer populations or part populations are sement procedure with waypoints describing set as reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail is	? e held without treatment for Y actions to deal with recognised Y
·	age due to predators in the current or previous protection the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No ski 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mini 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB f		4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	nigreed with local wild fish interests and was permissing the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	
•	regards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s)

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued b	y: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0464	Site No: FS1343		
Date of Visit: 04/11/2020	Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection located	within a farm managemen	nt area?	Y
If N, no further questions require comp	letion.		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm	Management Agreemer	its and Statements	
2. Has a current farm management ag			Υ
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for it			Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the releva	nt farm management area	ı?	Υ
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fa	rm site(s) to which it appli	es?	Υ
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date o	f commencement of the a	greement or statement?	Υ
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date o	f review?		Υ
Arrangements for Fish Health Mana	gement		
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minim farm?	um health standards for th	ne stocks to be introduced	to the area or Y
Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin	ation requirements for sto	cks held in the area or farr	n? Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spec	•		
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxi individual farm?	mum stocking density of a	iny pen on any farm in the	area or the Y
Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	-	ind disposal of any dead fis	sh from any Y
Arrangements for The Management	of Sea Lice		
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	nents for the sharing of da	ta on sea lice numbers and	d treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	ability and the use of med	cines on farms covered by	the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requ		testing of available treatm	ents for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual fa			
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circu		logical controls and cleane	er fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual			
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran	igements for synchronous	treatments on farms within	n the area?
Live Fish Movements			
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circularea or farm?	mstances when live fish n	ay be introduced or remov	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran or individual farms?	gements for the moveme	nt of live fish on and off site	es in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indivi	dual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restock 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether on agreement or statement?	y which the area or individual farm will be fallow ed? e or more year classes may be stocked onto si boodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	tes covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ment Agreements Only ent include arrangements for persons to becom	e, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and o 26. What is the version no/date of issue o	perated in accordance with the agreement or softhe FMAg/S? Nov-20	tatement?

Case No:	2020-0464			Date of visit:	04/11/2020]		
Site No:	FS1343	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
·		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary			1	1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI CNI SLI	17/11/2020		2 11150					





Organic Sea Harvest Ltd Macdonald House Somerled Square Portree IV51 9EH

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0579 SITE NO FS1343 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 04/11/2020
SITE NAME Culnacnoc Salmon Farm

CASE No 20200464

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.

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 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.

Date: 17/11/2020

Signed:

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/