FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2021-0526			Date of visit: 06/12/2021			
Time spent on site:	mins	Main Inspecto	r:			
Site No: FS0885 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Geisgeil (Tank Site) Loch Duart Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 5.6	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed			
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Fish came on from Outer Bay (FS0671) in June 2021.

No treatments have been done on the site and fish are reported to be in good health.

The males are being stripped beginning 30/12 and the females will be stripped shortly after. Milt is being exported to Norway for cryogenic freezing as contingency for supply issues.

Fish appeared in good condition and were active in the tanks.

FHI 059, Version 13	;		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0526		Site No:	FS0885				
Date of Visit:		06/12/2021]		Inspector(s):			ı
Registration/Autho	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site det			ite representa	ative?			Y	1
2. Changes made to	•		·				N	j
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	SAL						T	
Age group	Broodstock							
No Fish	495							
Mean Fish Wt	11kg							
Next Fallow Date (S		January 22		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	August 22		
Recent (last 4 wks)	•			•	Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:					, ,	`	,	
Movement Record 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records completed for the complete form of the c	ds available for ection: blete and corrected available blete and corrected for introductions.	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outw	h and waste? vith GB) availa half) of the bu	able? usiness (not usi	-		30/10/2018	Y Y Y Y N/A
1. Mortality records	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti		•			Other (detail)			
If other detail:			ealed bins at t	the shorebase	,		ll for disposal	. Fish waste
3. Mortality records								Y
4. Recent mortality	•	,		cross the site f	or the month of	of Novembe	er .	
5. Evidence of rece	•	tvpical mortal		01000 1110 0110 1	or the month	01 140 4011100	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period of	necked?					I N
If yes, detail:	in mortality du	ring period cr	ieckeu!					I
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records					
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N			
If yes, detail:					
If other, detail:					
Medicines records available for inspection?		Y			
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		Y			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N			
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?					
If other, detail:					
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y			
civilo iniculonico cicioù appropriatoly.					
Biosecurity Records					
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y			
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 Sci	•				
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Y			
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the prese	ence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	-			
is detected been included and how and when that will be not	·	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)?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemente	ed between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y			
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, vis	sitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place	e to maintain the physical containment of	Y			
aquaculture animals held on site?					
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately impleme	ented 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?	N/A			
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:	30/10/2018 - 29/11/2021				

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0526	Site No: FS0885					
Date of Visit	06/12/2021 No of movements/supp./des						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	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	18	26	
CFC0.00	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
NA	<u> </u>					10	2
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	3
Exposure via water	Transor or doo	Site contacts	0				
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	•	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	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 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	g 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 ow	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	from Category V 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 poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0]			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 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			1			0
	No		2				
					Total		10
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0526	Site No:	FS0885
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems		
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	year class basis?
	senced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (if well as access to suitable biological and/or med of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	gement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins6. Do records adequately reflect the required	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the 0	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. sal</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the peri	<i>Imonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or od that records are inspected?	r above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish In 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. I is considered to cause significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
suggested criteria for treatment or where C.	istered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> elongatus is considered to have welfare implications	
11. Has any other action been taken (where a		
-	ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice l	
	d out in cooperation between participating farms	
sea lice?	where fewer populations or part populations at	re neid without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	ement procedure with waypoints describing set infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
-	ge due to predators in the current or previous p	production cycles?
	the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	
Perimeter fence Tanks covered If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been explif Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No ski	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since t p to question 10	he last FHI inspection?
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	sters?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP $-4.4.37, 5$.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they ex	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action a Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was per	mission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and min	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	l in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measured. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with r	res of the Act) regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	uson(s)
and the inspector at ballotation, with	- James to Community in the product detail red	

Case No:	2021-0526			Date of visit:	06/12/2021				
Site No:	FS0885]		Inspector:		ı			
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
,	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	↓								
	+								
	 								
	+								
	†								
	 								
Report Summary	1			1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
Case Type ECI, CNI	13/12/2021		2 11100						
	 								
	+								
	+								
	1								
	1								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0398 Date of Visit 06/12/2021

SITE NO FS0885 SITE NAME Geisgeil (Tank Site)

Case No 20210526 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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland 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.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:

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/

Date: 13/12/2021