FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2021-0465			Date of visit: 03/11/2021			
Time spent on site:	h	Main Inspect	tor:			
Site No: FS0271	Site Name:	Kames Bay (west)				
Business No: FB0134	Business Name:	Kames Fish Farming Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 SLI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 13.2	Thermometer No:	T205	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-40			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Clinical signs of disease observed? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed? N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Diagnostic samples taken?		IN				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

See case 2020-0241 for majority of paperwork for visit. Previous case carried out as REG, CNI and SLI as water temperature too high for ECI.

Salmosan treated under cascade so 500 degree day withdrawal.

Heavy metal testing - samples taken on Tuesday, no results yet.

Lice counts match submitted.

Harvesting is carried out on one cage at a time to enable treatments to be carried out on other cages if necessary.

Biosecurity records, FMA and surveillance frequency, harvest & lice strategy not checked again - site manager confirmed no changes.

Paperwork completed remotely by 29/10/21, Site visit by 29.

Low numbers of mortalities observed in a few pens. No moribund or lethargic fish observed. In some pens there appears to be some issues with the feed digestibility causing some red coloured oil from the feed to swim at the surface. Company is looking into it and hope to resolve this as soon as possible.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0465		Site No:	FS0271	1			
Date of Visit:		03/11/2021]		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Author								
Business/site detai Changes made to	_	checked by s	ite represent	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	uetalis?						IN	J
Site Details (include	cleaner fisl	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		4	Facilities sto	ocked	4	No facilitie	es inspected	4
Species	RTR							
	2021							
	85,000							
	1.722kg							
Next Fallow Date (Sit	*	July 2022`		Next Input Da	_ ` '	Oct 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) d	isease probl	ems?		N	Any escape	es (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Massamant Dagarda								
Movement Records	available for	r inapastian?						
 Movement records Date of last inspect 		inspections					28/07/2021	<u> </u>
Are records complete		actly entered?	2				20/01/2021	V
4. Are movement rec		•		?				Ÿ
5. Are records complete				•				Y
6. Are health certifica		•		able?				N/A
		(, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement	ts carried out	by (or on be	half) of the b	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syste	em in place fo	or maintenan	ce of transpo	ortation records	?			Y
Mortality Records	vailable for ir	annostion?						
 Mortality records at How are mortalities 					Ensiled - or	oito		'
If other detail:	s disposed of	l f			Erisilea - Oi	i site		
Mortality records co	omnlete and	correctly ent	ered?					
4. Recent mortality (la	•	correctly error		%, 0.29%, 0.35	50%			<u> </u>
5. Evidence of recent		typical mortal		70, 0.29 70, 0.30	70,			I N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		//reason:				
ir yes, radiity rids/rid i	mortanty per	Tability/110 otc	on per raomit	y/reason.				
6. Any other peaks in	mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?						N/A		
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality eve	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events	sheet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records								
1. Recent treatments	s (see comment)?		Y					
If yes, detail:	Salmosan							
If other, detail:								
2. Medicines records	s available for inspection?		Y					
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?								
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?								
5. If yes, what treatm	nent(s)?	Salmosan						
If other, detail:								
6. Are medicines sto	ored appropriately?		Y					
Biosecurity Record								
· ·	ds available for inspection?							
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?								
	•	Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any						
	ined) mortality at the site been included							
		esence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease						
is detected been included and how and when 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)?								
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.)?								
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of								
aquaculture animals held on site?								
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?								
If no, detail:								
Results of Surveilla			N					
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?								
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?								
3. Any significant results?								
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).								
-	Records checked between:	28/07/2021-29/10/2021						

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0465	Site No:	50271
3. Does the site have access to a range of licence	valent) fallowed synchronously on a single year sed in-feed and bath sea lice medications (include	ling deltamethrin,
can these be deployed in a reasonable period of	I as access to suitable biological and/or mechan time?	lical control measures, and
4. Is there a signed documented farm managem Management Area (or equivalent)?	ent agreement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
 Are sea lice count records available for inspect Do records adequately reflect the required sta 	tion? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) ndard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Lega	al 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 CoGF	P during the period that N
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmoi</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period t	nis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or abo hat records are inspected?	ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Hea	Ith Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Y
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is	considered to cause significant welfare problems	s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
•	red or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis leve</i> gatus is considered to have welfare implications	
11. Has any other action been taken (where app	licable)?	N/A
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions to	aken had a significant impact upon the lice levels	s recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried ou	t in cooperation between participating farms?	N
	ere fewer populations or part populations are he	
15. Is there a site specific written lice manageme scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infe	ent procedure with waypoints describing set actionstation?	ons to deal with recognised N/A
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks ref	flect sea lice count data? If no please detail reas	ons. Y
Containment Inspection		
	due to predators in the current or previous produ	iction cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the	predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	
f other, detail below:		
R Have escape incidents or events been experi	enced on or in the vicinity of the site since the la	st FHI inspection?
f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to	•	Stirin inspection:
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minister	•	
·		
The state of the s	with (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
b. Have these been reported to the SSPO and io	cal fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	(COGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give detail	
3. 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 permissi	ion given by Scottish
	se the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in co	ode but could
be considered under satisfactory measures		
•	ards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s	s)
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Case No:	2021-0465			Date of visit:	03/11/2021				
O'' N	E00074	-							
Site No:	FS0271	J		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						
ECI, SLI	07/12/2021								
	 								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0134 Date of Visit 03/11/2021

SITE NO FS0271 SITE NAME Kames Bay (west)
CASE NO 20210465 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.

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 bu siness and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

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).

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding 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/