FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2021-0060			Date of visit: 29/04/2021				
Time spent on site:	3hrs	Main Inspec	tor:				
Site No: FS0249 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Ardnish Mowi Scotland Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 9.1	Thermometer No:	T205	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-31				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ry out intended visit deta	il reason below:					

Additional Case Information:

2020 above 2: wk41 2.02AF; wk44 4.12AF, wk45 3.38AF, wk46 2.29AF, site fallow from wk47. Towards the end of the cycle last year when numbers increased had planned a hydrolicer treatment however this was abandoned as due to availability for harvesting sites in the area, the site emptied earlier than originally anticipated (site fallow 2020 wk47 rather than December). 2021 all counts 0

Historic sea lice notification for 2020 data above reporting criteria received 28/4/2021. (Data recorded from records checks above.) Confirmation that no data above reporting criteria for years 2018 & 2019.

Paperwork completed on 21/04/2021 by _____, shadowed by _____. Physical site inspection on 29/04/2021 by _____. Stock in trial pens at very low density and deep in the water so difficult to observe. Good feed response in the two mobile pens. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy. Two mobile pens have a larger mesh outer net with a smaller (mesh) shallower net inside it, this means there is a space between the nets at the bottom and this is hoped to prevent any possible seal attacks, site does not have a history of seal issues. All new nets have been put on the site with stronger more rigid mesh to prevent possible seal attacks.

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI Date of issue:						
Case No:	2021-0060		Site No:	FS0249]			
Date of Visit:		29/04/2021	1		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Author	risation Deta	iils						
1. Business/site deta			ite representa	ative?			Y	1
2. Changes made to	•						N	1
Site Details (include	_		_					
Total No facilities		78	Facilities sto	cked	28	No facilitie	s inspected	78
Species	SAL							
Age group	2021 Q1							
No Fish	74,600							
Mean Fish Wt	150g							
Next Fallow Date (Si	*	June/July 202	22	Next Input Da	_	September		
Recent (last 4 wks)	lisease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records								
Movement records		rinspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec							10/10/2018	
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								
Are any movement		by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst				•	_			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for in	espection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
			indas Chemic	cals or Scottish			Alliodio	
3. Mortality records of				als of Cootton	Water, Curris	erriadia,		Y
4. Recent mortality (I	•	•		it by cage group	ns: w/h 22/03	/21 0 059%	41 morts for	FTI I3
5. Evidence of recen	•			t by dage great	JS. WID ZEIGG.	21 0.000 70,	41 1110/13 101	Y
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
w/b 12/4/21 increase		-			nd net around	the actual c	ages net this	seems to
have been effective i	•	•	•	ive put a secon	d fiet around	tric actual of	ages net the	Secilis to
6. Any other peaks in								Y
		• •		m hatchery (10	C), thought to	be thermic	shock due to	5C
				o site. 20% mor	**			
	•		•	erence betweer	•			
If yes, detail:		nt well, with lo						
7. Have increased (u		•		vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:		Vet notified f	or the 20% m	ortality due to t	thermic shock	, initial visit	and second v	isit with
If yes, detail action: Vet notified for the 20% mortality due to thermic shock, initial visit and second visit 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								N/A

If yes, detail:	
If other, detail: TMS	
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)?	
If other, detail: TMS	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Piococurity Pocorde	
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	V
·	1
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	<u> </u>
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	<u> </u>
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
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	
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?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). Thermic shock	
Feb 2021 input of 900 fish 20% mortality with remaining stock culled due to thermic shock. March 2020: Pseudoi	monas

anguilliseptica in Lumpfish treated with medicated feed (Florfenicol)

Records checked between:

10/10/2018-21/4/2021

Г	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	sued by: I	FHI			
	Case no:	2021-00	060	Site No:		FS0249			Date of Samplin		29/0	04/2021	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	12:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	10
	Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2	Windy	3	Cloudy	4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	1-6	7-12										
Н	Pool Group	1-0	1-12										
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	120g	120g										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Loch Lochy	Loch Lochy										
U.	acility NO	M16m	M26m										

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0060		Site No:	FS0249		Insp:	
Date of Visit	29/04/2021		No of m	ovements/s	supp./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			40		
species		ncluding third country	0		18	26 14	0
	Number of sup	pilers	U		10		0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	0
F	Number of des		0		6	10	0
Exposure via water Water contacts with other	Earm is protect	Site contacts ed (secure water supply through	0	1-5	6-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,		or in a coastal zone with category III		_			
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstrean	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	cessing	0]			0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1	1			
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	_	from zone or compartment of		1			
	equivalent stati		4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category ∨ farm	10	1			
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			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		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0
	No		2				
				ı			
					Total		2
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0060		Site No:	FS0249	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
Has the site experienced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?		N	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously o	n a single	year class basis?	
3. Does the site have access to a range of lic azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as				
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relev	ant to the	site and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and th	e CoGP? (I	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)				
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. sali				
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H			N	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which	•	•		
10. Have therapeutic treatments been admini suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C.</i> e				
11. Has any other action been taken (where a			Y	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action	•			
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried		_		
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site,			_	
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks		_		
10. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	Tenect sea lice count data? If no pie	ease detail	reasons.	
Containment Inspection				
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage	•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Are measures in place to mitigate against t	ne predation experienced on site? (I	Detail belov	w)	
If other, detail below:				
			1 (511)	
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp		site since tr	ne last FHI inspection?	
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip			_	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for		. 4 4 37 5	4 17)	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and				
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action as Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests an	id was pern	mission given by Scottish	
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini	mise the risk of further escapes? (N	ot covered	in code but could	
be considered under satisfactory measure	res of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please	detail reas	son(s)	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0060 Site	No: FS0249	
Date of Visit: 29/04/2021	Inspector:	
Edit of Viole	mopostor.	
Point of Compliance		
Is the farm under inspection located within	a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require completion.		<u> </u>
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Mana	agement Agreements and Statements	
Has a current farm management agreement	_	
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspec		Y
Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farrDoes the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site	_	Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of com	• • •	ent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review	ew?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manageme	nt	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum he	ealth standards for the stocks to be intro	duced to the area or Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	requirements for stocks held in the area	or farm?
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of	•	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum	stocking density of any pen on any farm	in the area or the
individual farm? 12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	ents for the storage and disposal of any	dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual farm?	mio for the otorage and alopeous of any	
Arrangements for The Management of Se	a Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements	for the sharing of data on sea lice numb	pers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability	and the use of medicines on farms cover	ered by the agreement
of statement?		
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requireme lice on farms in the area or individual farms?	• •	treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstan	nces under which biological controls and	cleaner fish are to be Y s within the area?
used on farms in the area or individual farms		idbi- db 2
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	ents for synchronous treatments on farm	s within the area?
Live Fish Movements		V
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstar area or farm?	ices when live fish may be introduced of	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeme	ents for the movement of live fish on and	off sites in the area
or individual farms?		

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 inc	dividual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restock 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto oodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke	o sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only ent include arrangements for persons to become	ome, 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	operated in accordance with the agreement of the FMAg/S? dated: 12/02/2021	or statement?

Site No: FS0249

Case No: 2021-0060

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

Case No:	2021-0060			Date of visit:	29/04/2021	J					
Site No:	FS0249	1		Inspector							
One 140.	1 00240			пізрескої.							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary				1							
Report Summary Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	10/05/2021		2 11100								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0119
 DATE OF VISIT
 29/04/2021

 SITE NO
 FS0249
 SITE NAME
 Ardnish

 CASE NO
 20210060
 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

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.

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 fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to have had average adult female *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* ('sea lice') per fish counts of 2 or above. These counts had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as part of the required measures to demonstrate that satisfactory measures are in place for the control of sea lice. Where the average adult female sea lice per fish count reaches 2 or above this must be reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate within seven days of the date of the count. Please ensure that future counts that exceed the reporting level are reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.



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/