

Case No: 2021-0031 Date of visit: 18/03/2021

Time spent on site: 6 hours Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: FS0683 Site Name: Gob a Bharra Loch Fyne
Business No: FB0169 Business Name: The Scottish Salmon Company

Case Types: 1 ECS 2 CNA 3 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): N/A Thermometer No: T172 FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA: M-42

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken? N/A

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:
[Redacted]

Additional Case Information:

Inspection conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams, no physical inspection conducted at site.

Two initial notification submitted in February 2021 (MSe250221SAL1 and MSe220221SAL1). During the latest event a seal was observed in the cage, and in the earlier event a hole was discovered by the net cleaning team. No fish were thought to have escaped during either event.

The company used to use a person with a MML who was deployed to sites around Loch Fyne when required. He will no longer be used due to a change in law regarding MML's

The site now has a license to use an ADD, required during a recent policy change.

Weather before both incidents was windy, but the wind was not enough to cause an issues by itself.

Fish will be harvested on Saturday from cage 9. Most recent notification.

About 38,533 lumpfish were input on the site. Left with about 2,000 over the site. Unsure exactly how the LUM have died.

Maybe due to increase procedures around within the cage e.g. net washing etc. Estimate taken from observing cleaner fish on the sorting table during grading. No moribund fish were observed during the cycle. TSSC biology team were notified but there were no moribund fish to sample.

LUM hatchery reared from Ocean Matters.

Although initial notifications for escapes were received, it is thought no fish have escaped.

All lice treatments using Hydrolicer this year, Optilicer also used last year. Lice numbers have not caused any issues.

Mse220221SAL1 - cage 10, most south westerly cage. Initially net lifted to stop fish escaping. Then a patch was placed over the hole by yhte dive team, using nylon thread to secure it. Fish moved to another cage (cage 5) as the hole was big and they had capacity on site. Hole possibly caused by the net rubbing on a bridle during bad weather (manager is 99% sure this was the cause). The bridle rope was the only thing close to the hole. Edges of the hole were frayed suggesting that it had rubbed on something. Fairly sure there was no snag as the hole did not have clean edges that you would expect from a snag. FNC8 system (flying net cleaner, distributed by Akva Group) is remote controlled and comes equipped with HD cameras and lights to see any damage. One cage is cleaned every week during which the nets are checked for damage. FNC8 travels between sites in the area (disinfection takes place between sites). External company (Inverlussa) comes in to inspect and adjust bridles at end of cycle. The company has attended since escape.

Seal pro nets will be used in the next cycle. Always been many seals on the site. They have had problems on and off for several years. They did have a contractor with an MML but no longer due to policy change.

MSe250221SAL1: possibly caused by seal. The edges of the hole were not as frayed at the first event. Little significant boat activity close to cage, so unlikely to be caused by boat handling. The hole was small but so was the seal. The seal swam out of the cage once the edge of the net was dropped and the divers chased it out. Patch placed over the hole and stitched onto net using nylon thread. Fish will be harvested out of the cage by Saturday (20/03/21), the fish will be counted off the site. Should have numbers next week. The net will not be used on site again as they are switching to seal pro nets.

All nets have seal blinds at the bottom

Although cleaner fish were on side during time when the breaches in containment occurred, it is thought very unlikely that any e

Case No: Site No:

Date of Visit: Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="10"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="6"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="10"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL LUM"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="19 S0"/>	<input type="text" value="2019"/>			
No Fish	<input type="text" value="106,167"/>	<input type="text" value="~2000"/>			
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="5.8kg"/>	<input type="text" value="~200g"/>			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="End of April 2021"/>		Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="Aug 2021"/>	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	<input type="text" value="N"/>		Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
If yes, detail:	<input type="text" value=""/>				

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection?

2. Date of last inspection:

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?

4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?

5. Are records complete and correctly entered?

6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?

Transport Records

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?

If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection?

2. How are mortalities disposed of?

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	TMS	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	TMS	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
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.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
If no, detail:		

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		

Records checked between:	21/10/2020 - 18/03/2021
--------------------------	-------------------------

Case Number:	2021-0031	Site No:	FS0683	Insp:	
Date of Visit	18/03/2021	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10
Exposure via water	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0			
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4	2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream 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 processing	0			0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1			
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4			
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8			
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10			
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0			
	Common processes with other farms	3			3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0			0
	Feeding unpasteurised 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 staff and equipment	0	1	2	1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0			0
	No	1			
CoGP/Regulator					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0			0
	No	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			0
	No	2			
Total Rank					20 MEDIUM

Case No: 2021-0031 Site No: FS0683

Date of visit: 18/03/2021 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 procedures

1.1. Have escape incidents or events ¹ been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		Y		No actual escape of fish, but two initial notifications have been submitted for February when circumstances arose that may have given rise to a significant risk of an escape of fish. Both holes mended. MSe220221SAL1: fish also moved into another cage. MSe250221SAL1: fish will be harvest on 20/03/2021
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	
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	
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	Y	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 taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		
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 the site

General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1	Seal blinds at bottom	
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-					
		Facilities	Moorings		Nets
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Y		Y
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A	N/A		Y
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y	
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	Y	Y	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
e) Each inspection including i) the name of the person conducting the inspection ii) the date of each inspection iii) the place of each inspection iv) the outcome of each inspection f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	Low Medium Low High High	Y Y Y Y Y	Y Y Y Y Y N/A	Net not tested yet as it was made new for the site and not removed since being hung. Antifoulant treatment are recorded on Knox database before being moved onto site. Repairs detailed in divers records.
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		Nets not stored on site, only stored at Knox before dispatch to site. Knox disposes of nets
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y		
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 ³			SSI, 2,6	
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A		
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	N/A		
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A		
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A		
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				
2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.9 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	N	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	Exceed industry standards At the end of every cycle Knox conduct testing and they are manufacturer. Every time divers are on site and can use net cleaner (FNC8) to check for damage. At least one net cleaned each day. Diver records and net cleaner records maintained Inspected between cycles using ROV and using sea crane to lift and inspect the grid from the boat. Detailed in dive reports, and daily stock containment check sheet
2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.16 Does 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?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.20 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.22 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.23 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	
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record 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	
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	Landing craft has a propeller guard, polar boat does not have a prop guard. This is recorded License for ADD acquired No lethal means permitted after change in policy. No lethal means conducted. No predator nets deployed this cycle.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	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	N/A		Inspection conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams, no physical inspection conducted at site.
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	N/A	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	N/A	SSI 2,2 ii	
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	N/A		
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.21	
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		N/A		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	N/A	MSA ⁵ 2010 P4, S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	N/A	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	N/A	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	Helicopter transfer of fish never used
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 granted 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 granted 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:	2021-0031	Date of visit:	18/03/2021
Site No:	FS0683	Inspector:	

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ESC	23/04/2021		
CNA	20/05/2021		
Case completion	19/11/2021		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	18/03/2021
SITE No	FS0683	SITE NAME	Gob a Bharra
CASE No	20210031	INSPECTOR	██████████

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. and A Technical Standard for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture .

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

In relation to the inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site, the following recommendations are made:

It is recommended that a documented review is conducted of the procedures in place for the selection and installation of moorings in accordance with the Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (Chapter 4, section 4.13). This should include a review of the installation of bridle ropes to avoid the abrasion of the nets in inclement weather and any possible interaction between mooring and net over time.

It is recommended that a documented review is conducted of the procedures in place for the selection of nets in accordance with the CoGP (Chapter 4, section 4.20). This should include a review of the selection of nets, the attachment systems and net weighting components to avoid abrasion of the nets when environmental conditions may influence the position of the net.

It is recommended that a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment in accordance with the CoGP (Chapter 4, section 4.16) is put in place for the inspection of pen and mooring components.

It is recommended that a documented review is conducted of the procedures in place for the inspection of nets in accordance with the CoGP (Chapter 4, section 4.23). This should include a review of inspection of nets following inclement weather conditions to ensure the integrity of the nets is maintained.

It is advised that the reviews described above should demonstrate that the guidance issued in A Technical Standard for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture is being met for points 3.2.1.1.8, 5.2.1.1.3 8.6.1.3.2, 8.6.1.3.4, also in Annex 4 points A4.10, A4.18.1.1 and A4.21.1.1 (implemented through point 1.3.1.1).

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

It is recommended that a documented review is conducted of the site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack in accordance with the CoGP (Chapter 4, section 4.26). This should include a review of the measures available and in place to mitigate against seal ingress.

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

d) Inspection of site specific procedures


The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

Further Action

Please ensure that these points have been addressed by **23rd November 2021**. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below). The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above points not be taken within the time period stipulated.

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: 20/05/2021

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



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	18/03/2021
SITE No	FS0683	SITE NAME	Gob a Bharra
CASE No	20210031	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 23/11/2021. 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 inspections 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:

[REDACTED]

Date: 19/11/2021

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/>

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	18/03/2021
SITE No	FS0683	SITE NAME	Gob a Bharra
CASE No	20210031	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Escape Investigation

The site was inspected following notification of circumstances which gave rise to a significant risk of escape of Atlantic salmon on 22/02/2021 and 25/02/2021 (Marine Scotland escape incident numbers: MSe220221SAL1 and MSe250221SAL1)

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

The inspection was conducted remotely.

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. No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

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.

Medicine records were inspected and found 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: 23/04/2021

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