FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2021-0365			Date of visit: 05/10/2021					
Time spent on site:	3.5h	Main Inspec	etor:					
Site No: FS0645	Site Name:	Kirk Noust						
Business No: FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland	Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 12.7	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: OR	Water type: S	CoGP MA O-2					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving			ormation/clinical score sheet.					
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet.					
2 tag: 100 ta 10		<u></u>						
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detail	reason below:						

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

Case paperwork submitted on the 27/9/21 and inspected on 28/9/21 site inspected on the 5/10/21 accompanied by

Additional peaks in mortality: 2021, Wk. 29 1904 (0.75%), Wk. 30 1866 (0.74%), Wk. 31 1277 (0.51%) Wk. 32 1769 (0.71%) attributed to jellyfish/environmental.

FHI thermometer left ashore, therefore site thermometer used, temperature well below 14.

Leps reported to be on the increase in Orkney, some jellyfish issues recently.

Seal pro nets installed reported to be very effective.

Site is used a nursery site so no harvests occur.

One dead fish observed. Some jellyfish observed in a couple of pens.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issued by: FHI	_		Date of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case No: 20	21-0365	Site No	p: FS064	5			
Date of Visit:	C	5/10/2021		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Authorisa	ation Details						
1. Business/site details	summary che	ecked by site repre	esentative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to de	tails?					N	
Site Details (include cl	leaner fish fo	or all sections)					
Total No facilities	6		es stocked	6	No facilities	s inspected	ô
Species SA	L						
Age group 202	21 S1						
No Fish 24	4,307						
Mean Fish Wt 979	9g						
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Fe	bruary 2022	Next Input D	ate (Site)	April 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) dise	ase problem	s?		Y Any escapes	(since last v	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	D, Paramov	e treatment admi	nistered, good trea	tment reported			
<ol> <li>Movement records av</li> <li>Date of last inspection</li> <li>Are records complete</li> <li>Are movement record</li> <li>Are records complete</li> <li>Are records complete</li> <li>Are health certificates</li> </ol> Transport Records <ol> <li>Are any movements of</li> <li>If yes, is there a system</li> </ol>	n: e and correctl ds available for e and correctl s for introduct carried out by	y entered? or dead fish and w y entered? ions (outwith GB)  (or on behalf) of t	available? the business (not u			13/11/2019	Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records							
Mortality records avai	•	ection?		01			Y
2. How are mortalities d If other detail:		. 16 16 (		Other (detail	)		
3. Mortality records com		/ animal feed facto	ory				Y
4. Recent mortality (last	•		1 742 (0 200/ ) \///	25 507 (0 240/	\ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	(0.040/) \\\\\\	-
5. Evidence of recent in	,		713 (0.29%) Wk.	35 597 (0.24%)	), VVK. 30 96	(U.U4%), VVK.	37 755 N
If yes, facility nos/no mo	• •		acility/reason:			L	11
ii yes, lacility 1105/110 1110	ntanty per lac	mity/110 Stock per 1	aciiity/reasori.				
6. Any other peaks in m	ortality during	neriod checked?					Y
	e additional c	_					
7. Have increased (une			rted to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,						
8. Have 'mortality events	s' been repor	ted to FHI? If no, e	enter details on mo	rtality events s	heet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records								
Recent treatments (see comment)?		Y						
H2O2,								
If yes, detail: T.M.S.								
If other, detail:								
Medicines records available for inspection?		Y						
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?								
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		Y						
	T.M.S.							
If other, detail:								
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y						
Biosecurity Records		V						
Biosecurity records available for inspection?     Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	ing and acts disposal been considered?	V						
2. Has the manner and period in which the APR will notify Seed		У						
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scotincreased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	ittish iviinisters or veterinary professional of any	Y						
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the present	nee or cuspicion of the presence of a listed disease	·						
is detected been included and how and when that will be notif		Y						
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked		Y						
health status, certification if required)?	on the familiate been dovered (equal or higher							
Trouble Status, Solution and State S								
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	d between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y						
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visi								
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place		Y						
aquaculture animals held on site?								
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	nted on site?	Y						
If no, detail:								
Results of Surveillance								
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or o	on behalf of, the business?	Y						
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		Y						
3. Any significant results?		IN						
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).								
Passarda shooked hotuson:	40/44/2040 ÷- 40/0/2024							
Records checked between: 1	13/11/2019 to 19/9/2021							

Time s starts/ Enviro	ty samples: sampling		00:00	Site No:		FS0645 PA			Date of vi Sampling		05/1	10/2021	
Time s starts/ Enviro	sampling /ends:		00:00			PA		_					
starts/ Enviro	/ends:		00:00	15:0									
	onmental conditions	. 4			0:00		Inspecto	r:			VMD No	). [	20
Summ		: 1	Dry	2	Windy	3	Cloudy	4		5		•	
	mary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
	h/Pools - click												
	Fish No			•	4	-							
Fish n		1	2	3	4	5							
Pool G													
Specie		SAL	SAL	SAL		SAL							
	ige weight	1kg	1kg	1kg	800g	800g							
Sex		0111	0)1/	0144	0)4/	0111							
Water	r Туре	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW							
Stock Details Aports Aports Stock Details Aports Ap		Yetts o Muckart											

Additional Sample Information:														
0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	f issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0365		Site No:	FS0645		Insp:	
Date of Visit	05/10/2021		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	0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m	povements off	0	3	6	10	6
Movemente on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	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		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	•	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status						
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category ∀ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	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		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
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		17
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0365	Site No:	FS0645
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
Has the site experienced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years?	N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equiv	•	ear class basis?
<ol><li>Does the site have access to a range of licenc azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well can these be deployed in a reasonable period of</li></ol>	l as access to suitable biological and/or mec	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manageme Management Area (or equivalent)?	ent agreement or statement relevant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspec	tion? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
6. Do records adequately reflect the required star	ndard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criteria for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that Y
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmon</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period tl		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Heal	th Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	N/A
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is o	considered to cause significant welfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administer suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elon</i> g		
11. Has any other action been taken (where appl	icable)?	N/A
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions ta	ken had a significant impact upon the lice le	vels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out	t in cooperation between participating farms?	? Y
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, who sea lice?	ere fewer populations or part populations are	held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manageme scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infes		actions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks ref	lect sea lice count data? If no please detail r	easons. Y
Containment Inspection		
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage of	due to predators in the current or previous pr	oduction cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the p	predation experienced on site? (Detail below	Υ)
seal pro net sinker tubes top		
nets,		
If other, detail below:		
Have escape incidents or events been experie	enced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers		
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forth		1.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and lo	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agree Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	ed with local wild fish interests and was perm	ission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimis	e the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in	n code but could
be considered under satisfactory measures		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with rega		on(s)

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0365	Site No: FS0645	
Date of Visit: 05/10/2021	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance  1. Is the farm under inspection located w	ithin a farm management area?	V
If N, no further questions require comple	_	Ÿ
<ul><li>2. Has a current farm management agree</li><li>3. Is the current FMAg/S available for instance</li><li>4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant</li><li>5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm</li></ul>	t farm management area? n site(s) to which it applies? commencement of the agreement or staten	ed? Y y y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manage 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum farm?	e <b>ment</b> m health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the specie	tion requirements for stocks held in the area is of fish which may be stocked into the area num stocking density of any pen on any farn	a or farm?
	ements for the storage and disposal of any m?	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements	f Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the available of statement?	oility and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require lice on farms in the area or individual far	ements for the sensitivity testing of available ms?	e treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	stances under which biological controls and	d cleaner fish are to be
	ements for synchronous treatments on farn	ns within the area?
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum area or farm?	stances when live fish may be introduced o	or removed from the
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrang or individual farms?	ements for the movement of live fish on an	d off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restood 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether of agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s roodstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to becon	ne, or cease to be,
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or softhe FMAg/S?  Sep-21	statement?

	0004 0005				05/40/000						
Case No:	2021-0365	J		Date of visit	: 05/10/2021	J					
Site No:	FS0645	1		Inspector							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp			
	+										
	+										
	+										
	+										
	+										
	1										
	+										
	+										
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp								
ECI,CNI,SLI,VMD	12/10/2021										
	+										
	+										
	+										





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0095
 Date of Visit
 05/10/2021

 Site No
 FS0645
 Site Name
 Kirk Noust

Case No 20210365 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 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 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.

Date: 12/10/2021

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>