FHI 059, Version 13	ls	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0270			Date of visit: 05/08/2021
Time spent on site:	h	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0413 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Camas Glas Mowi Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 13.9	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-34
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

#### FHI 059, Version 13

#### **Additional Case Information:**

#### Cleanerfish Previous peak mortalities:

LUM- 2020: wk16, 3251, decomp and wounds; wk17, 4114, decomp, wounds, culled (1648); wk18, 2235, decomp, wounds, culled (756); wk19, 1493, decomp, wounds, culled (400). Dropping after wk17.

SAL previous peak mortalities: 2019 wk 40, 2.94%; wk41, 9.54%; wk42, 4.90%; wk43, 2.73%; wk44, 2.41% (post treatment morts)

Recent mortality: LUM mortality: 2021 wk27, 197, decomp and wounds; wk28, 1277, decomp and wounds SAL mortality: 2021 wk27, 2301, 0.34%; wk28, 2088, 0.52%;wk29, 2519, 0.38%, physical damage; wk30, 2849, 0.43% WRS mortality: 2021 wk27, 53, wounds and fin damage; wk28, 85, wounds and fin damage; wk29- 814, mostly lumpfish Sea lice- wk9 2020, not reported over threshold

Concussion main cause of physical damage, looking to install bird poles to mitigate further damage.

Site uses environets, these seem to work well on the circle pens. A couple of pens had some warping of the handrail, this was reported to be due to completing swim-throughs when the temperatures were high, the plastic becomes slightly more maleable and when the weight of the wet net is supported on the handrail some warping occured. A trial of dyneema environets is ongoing with one pen fitted, the net is significantly lighter reducing strain on the pen structure.

The water was very clear allowing a good inspection of the stocks. Wrasse and lumpfish all appeared in good health. The salmon appeared very jumpy however no issues with lice are reported and the fish sampled had zero lice burden. Due to the issues with concussion the 'hamster' wheels are being replaced with bird poles.

Remote inspection conducted on the 29/07/2021 by and observed by and observed

FHI 059, Ver	sion 13			Issued by:	FHI		Date	of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0270		Site No:	FS0413	3			
Date of Visit:		05/08/2021			Inspector(s):			
1. Business/	n/Authorisation site details sum made to detail	mmary check	ed by site rep	resentative?			Y N	3
	(include clea	ner fish for a	-			_		
Total No faci	lities	12	Facilities stor	cked	12	No facilities	inspected	12
Species	SAL	LUM	WRS					
Age group	2021 Q1	2021	Wild					
No Fish	663,036	35,404	44,102					
Mean Fish Wt	449.16g	50g	-					
Next Fallow	Date (Site)	October 202	2	Next Input D	ate (Site)	December 2	2022	
	4 wks) diseas				Any escapes			Ν
If yes, detail:						<b>x</b>		
<ol> <li>Date of las</li> <li>Are record</li> <li>Are mover</li> <li>Are record</li> <li>Are record</li> <li>Are health</li> <li>Transport R</li> <li>Are any m</li> <li>If yes, is ther</li> <li>Mortality Re</li> <li>Mortality re</li> </ol>	t records avai st inspection: ds complete al ment records ds complete al certificates for tecords tovements car re a system in	nd correctly e available for c nd correctly e or introduction rried out by (o place for mai	ntered? lead fish and ntered? is (outwith GB r on behalf) of ntenance of ti	) available? f the business			22/10/2019	Y N/A N/A Y
If other	nortalities disp	osed of?			Incinerated -	· on site		
detail:	L							
-	ecords comple							Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): see additional information.								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
see additional information								
6. Any other	peaks in mort		eriod checked	?				Y
If yes, detail:		al information						
•	eased (unexpl	ained) mortal	ities been rep	orted to vet o	r FHI?			N/A
If yes, detail								
8. Have 'mor	tality events' ł	peen reported	to FHI? If no	, enter details	on mortality	events sheet.		Y

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	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	V
	· · ·
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased</i> ( <i>unexplained</i> ) mortality at the site been included?	V
	· ·
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?	V
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or	Y
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	Y
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?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Concussion and zooplankton damage noted (salmon), Pseudomonas anguillaseptica (cleanerfish: lumpfish	ו)
Records checked between: 22/10/2019-29/07/2021	

FHI 059, Version 13				Issued by: FHI	
Case no:	2021-0270	Site No:	FS0413	Date of visit/ Sampling:	05/08/2021 05/0
Priority samples:	VI	BA	PA	MG	н
Time sampling starts/ends:	12:00:00	13:00:00	Inspector:		VMD No. 16
Environmental conditions:	1 Indoors	2	3	4	5
Summary samples	HIST	BA	MG	VI	PA Total Samples

## Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No											
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
	Pool Group											
		SAL										
	Average weight	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490	0.4490		
	Sex	N/A										
	Water Type	SW										
Stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	5 Lochailort (FS1269)	5 Lochailort (FS1269)	5 Lochailort (FS1269)	v Lochailort (FS1269)	v Lochailort (FS1269)	v Lochailort (FS1269)	ی Lochailort (FS1269)	ی Lochailort (FS1269)	ی Lochailort (FS1269)		
Sto	Facility No	12	12	12	2	2	2	ן 5	5	5		

#### Date of issue: 12/05/2020

38/2021	Additio	nal Sam	pie intor	mation:							
0	I	Total To	ests ass	igned	0	l					

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

Thi 039, version 13		Issued by. I Th					. 12/03/2020
Case Number:	2021-0270		Site No:	FS0413		Insp:	
Date of Visit	05/08/2021		No of m	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup	•	0	5	10		5
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	10
movements on	Number of des		0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing waters	plant discharging into adjacent	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	i from Category V farm	10				
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 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				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				
					Total Rank		24 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0270		Site No:	FS0413
3. Does the site have access	sea lice problems in the pre gement Area (or equivalent) s to a range of licenced in-f	evious 4 years? ) fallowed synchronously on a single feed and bath sea lice medications (i /or mechanical control measures, and	ncluding deltameth	
4. Is there a signed docume equivalent)?	nted farm management agr	reement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Far	rm Management Area (
5. Are sea lice count records	s available for inspection? (	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequately re	flect the required standard	specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (	Legal SSI, CoGP	Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) (CoGP Annex 6)	record levels below the su	uggested criteria for treatment in the (	CoGP during the pe	eriod that records are ir
10/6/19) during the period th	at records are inspected?	imbers per fish been at a level of 3 or pectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	r above (prior to w/	b 10/6/19) or 2 or abov
•	•	ered to cause significant welfare prot	olems? (CoGP 4.3.	81, 5.3.50)
-		other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82,		eded the suggested cri
11. Has any other action be				
		ad a significant impact upon the lice l		
		operation between participating farms		
14. Is there a harvesting stra	ategy for the site, where few	ver populations or part populations a	re held without trea	atment for sea lice?
15. Is there a site specific was escalation of a sea lice infest		cedure with waypoints describing set	actions to deal wit	th recognised scenarios
16. Do the sea lice levels ob	served on stocks reflect se	a lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.	
Containment Inspection				
1. Has the site experienced	equipment damage due to	predators in the current or previous p	production cycles?	
	mitigate against the predat	tion experienced on site? (Detail belo	w)	
Top nets				
(birds), Tension				
nets, Seal				
blinds				
If other, detail below:				
•	•	on or in the vicinity of the site since t	he last FHI inspect	tion?
If Yes proceed with question		ion 10		
4. Have these been reported				
		where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5		
6. Have these been reported	I to the SSPO and local fish	heries trusts forthwith (where they ex	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.3	37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) us	ed to recover escapees? If	yes give detail		
8. If gill nets were deployed 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	was this action agreed with	n local wild fish interests and was per	mission given by S	cottish Ministers? (Leg
· ·	prevent and minimise the r	risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could	

be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act) 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

emamectin period of	N Y Y
or	Y
	Y Y
nspected?	Ν
e (from w/b	Y N N
teria for	Y
3 during the	N/A Y Y Y Y
	N Y
_	Ν
al, CoGP –	
	Y

FHI 059, Versi	on 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No:	2021-0270	Site No:	FS0413					
Date of Visit:	05/08/2021	Ins	spector:					
Point of Com								
1. Is the farm u	under inspection located	within a farm r	nanagement area?		Y			
If N, no further questions require completion.								
Points of Con	npliance for Both Farm	Management	Agreements and Sta	tements				
	nt farm management agi	-	-		Y			
	nt FMAg/S available for in		( 3 )		Y			
	Ag/S identify the releva	•	ement area?		Y			
	/Ag/S identify the fish fa	-			Y			
	/Ag/S identify the date o			or statement?	Y			
	/Ag/S identify the date o				Y			
Arrangements	s for Fish Health Manag	gement						
8. Does the FN farm?	MAg/S identify the minim	um health stan	dards for the stocks to	be introduced to the are	a or Y			
	MAg/S identify the vaccin	ation requirem	ents for stocks held in	the area or farm?	Y			
	MAg/S identify the speci	•			Y			
			•	any farm in the area or t	he Y			
individual farm		j						
12. Does the F	MAg/S identify the arran	aements for th	e storage and disposa	l of any dead fish from a	ny Y			
	e area or the individual fa	-	· ·	•				
-	s for The Management							
13. Does the F	MAG/S Identify arrangen	nents for the si	haring of data on sea li	ce numbers and treatme	nts? Y			
14. Does the F	MAg/S identify the availa	ability and the u	use of medicines on fa	rms covered by the	Υ			
agreement of s		•		•				
15. Does the F	MAg/S identify any requ	irements for th	e sensitivity testing of a	available treatments for s	sea Y			
	n the area or individual fa	•						
	MAg/S identify the circul in the area or individual		er which biological cont	trols and cleaner fish are	to be Y			
			nchronous treatments	on farms within the area	a? Y			
Live Fish Mov			- live fiels were be intro	durand an name of the set				
	WAG/S Identity the circul	mstances whe	n live fish may be intro	duced or removed from t				
area or farm?	MAR/Cidentify the error	wanaanta far th	e merionent of live field	h an and off sites in the c	area Y			
or individual fa		gements for th	e movement or live its	h on and off sites in the a	area T			
	1115:							

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable ha	rvest practices on farms in the area or indivi	dual farms?
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by w date when a farm or area may be restocked		v and the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one of the agreement or statement?		tes covered by Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brood covered by the agreement or statement?	dstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	on any site Y
<b>Point of Compliance for Farm Manageme</b> 24. Does the farm management agreement parties to the agreement?		e, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and oper 26. What is the version no/date of issue of the		tatement?

FHI 059, Version 13

Deputte Cummon	From	Data of Natification
Site No:	FS0413	Inspector:
Case No:	2021-0270	Date of visit: 05/08/2021

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
		T							
		1							

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	10/08/2021		

marine scotland science



## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS
 No
 FB0119

 SITE No
 FS0413

 CASE No
 20210270

DATE OF VISIT 05/08/2021 SITE NAME Camas Glas 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 medium. 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. At this occurrence where the average adult female sea lice per fish count reaches 2 or above this should have been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate within seven days of the date of the count.

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: 10/08/2021

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