FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2021-0535			Date of visit: 02/12/2021						
Time spent on site:	Hours	Main Inspecto	or:						
Site No: FS0887	Site Name:	Sallachy Site							
Business No: FB0235	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture (Freshwat	er) Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	5 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y						
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/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?		N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Additional Case Information:

Remote and physical inspection conducted by , observed by . Site recently stocked in week 45. Site has had a successful input with low morts. Fish taken for VMD appeared healthy upon internal examination. Site thermometer used as inspectors thermometer was unavailable.

FHI 059, Version 13	3	_	Issu	ıed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0535		Site No:	FS0887				
Date of Visit:		02/12/2021]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Auth	orisation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site de	tails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made t	o details?						N	
Site Details (inclu	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	ocked	7	No facilitie	s inspected	7
Species	SAL						<u> </u>	
Age group	2022 S1s							
No Fish	331,265							
Mean Fish Wt	44g							
Next Fallow Date (16/03/2022		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	June 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks)	•	ems?			Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:						(
1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records community 4. Are movement records community 5. Are records community 6. Are health certified Transport Record 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a system.	ection: plete and corre ecords availab plete and corre cates for introd s ents carried ou	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outwo	th and waste?	able? usiness (not us			21/03/2012	Y N/A N/A N/A
Mortality Records								
Mortality records		•						Y
How are mortalit If other detail:	ies disposed o	T?			Incinerated -	on site		
								V
3. Mortality records	•	correctly ente						Y
4. Recent mortality	•			2 0.02%) Week	k 46 (165 0.05	9%)		K.I
5. Evidence of rece							L	N
If yes, facility nos/n	o mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	//reason:				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	(unaval=i===1)		am want1 t	a wat an EUIIA				NI/A
7. Have increased		morτalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		norted to EUI	2 If no onton	dotoilo en ment	tality avents a	a cot		NI/A
8. Have 'mortality e	vents been re	ported to FHI	r it no, enter	details on mon	iality events si	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?
If yes, detail: T.M.S.
If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
Biosecurity records available for inspection?
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
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
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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:
ii iio, detaii.
Results of Surveillance
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: 23/03/2019 - 02/12/2021
Records checked between: 23/03/2019 - 02/12/2021

	11 000, VEISIOII 10			_	_			133	ucu by.				
	Case no:	2021-0	535	Site No:		FS0887			Date of Samplin		02/	12/2021	02/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	_	g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:0	00:00	15:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o.	9
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Н	Fish nos	F1-9	E10 10	F20-29									
		F 1-9	F 10-19	F20-29									
	Pool Group	CAL	CAL	CAL									
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	44g	44g	44g									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW									
		_	ے	_									
(A)	1	ear	ear	ear									
ails		, R	F	. Fe									
Details	1	ite	ter	ter									
	Stock Origin	Wester Fearn	Wester Fearn	Wester Fearn									
tock	Facility No	3		5									
S	I dollity 140	J	4	J									

12/2021	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
	VMD RIM numbers : 2123200, 2123097, 2102459, 2123098, 2123173, 2130030, 2122612, 2123172, 2102458,													
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													
	•													

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	f issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0535		Site No:	FS0887		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/12/2021		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	novements off	0	3	6	10	6
	Number of desi		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				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstream	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	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
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 equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category ∀ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	Ī			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 st	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		0]			0
	No		2	1			
					Total		9
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0535		Site No:	FS0887	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	eawater Sites Only)				
	ced sea lice problems in the previous	4 years?		Г	
•	anagement Area (or equivalent) fallov	•	n a single y	ear class basis?	
3. Does the site have ac	ccess to a range of licenced in-feed ar mectin benzoate) as well as access to	nd bath sea lice med	lications (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	
4. Is there a signed door Management Area (or e	umented farm management agreement quivalent)?	nt or statement relev	ant to the si	ite and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count red	cords available for inspection? (Legal	SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Г	
	y reflect the required standard specifi			egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmo</i> records are inspected?	onis) record levels below the suggester (CoGP Annex 6)	ed criteria for treatmo	ent in the Co	oGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult fe	emale sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers	per fish been at a le	evel of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish Health Inspectora	ate? If no, FHI see c	omment.		
-	ation at a level which is considered to			ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•	atments been administered or other a				
11. Has any other action	been taken (where applicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic tre	atments or the actions taken had a si	gnificant impact upo	n the lice le	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, whe	re conducted, carried out in cooperati	on between participa	ating farms?	?	
14. Is there a harvesting	strategy for the site, where fewer por	oulations or part pop	ulations are	held without treatment for	
15. Is there a site specif	ic written lice management procedure	with waypoints des	cribing set a	actions to deal with recognised	
16. Do the sea lice level	s observed on stocks reflect sea lice	count data? If no ple	ase detail r	easons.	
Containment Inspection	in .				
•	ced equipment damage due to predat	ors in the current or	previous pr	oduction cycles?	
	e to mitigate against the predation ex				
	, all feed stored in shed.	porioriood on oico. (i	Jotali Bolon	,	
If other, detail below:	an reed stored in stred.				
3. Have escape inciden	ts or events been experienced on or i	n the vicinity of the	site since the	e last FHI inspection?	
If Yes proceed with ques	stions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10			_	
4. Have these been repo	orted to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been repo	orted to local DSFB forthwith (where t	hey exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	l.17)	
6. Have these been repo	orted to the SSPO and local fisheries	trusts forthwith (whe	re they exis	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any	y) used to recover escapees? If yes gi	ve detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo Ministers? (Legal, CoGF	yed was this action agreed with local v P – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	wild fish interests an	d was perm	lission given by Scottish	
9. What action was take	n to prevent and minimise the risk of	further escapes? (N	ot covered i	n code but could	
be considered under	satisfactory measures of the Act)				
10. Is the site inspected	as satisfactory with regards to contain	nment? If no, please	detail reas	on(s)	

Site No: FS0887

Case No: 2021-0535

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2021-0535			Date of visit:	02/12/2021			
O''. N	E00007							
Site No:	FS0887			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.							
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Database	Insp		te of Notificat	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, CNI, VMD	13/12/2021							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0235Date of Visit02/12/2021Site NoFS0887Site NameSallachy Site

Case No 20210535 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.

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 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

Date: 13/12/2021

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/