FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2022-0016			Date of visit: 15/02/2022					
Time spent on site:	hours	Mair	n Inspector:					
Site No: FS0149 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Langavat The Scottish Salmon	Company					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 7.8	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed?	•	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.						
Diagnostic samples taken?  N UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:								

### **Additional Case Information:**

Morts 2020 - issues with fungus. - Reported to FHI wk 36 - 17825 - 2.25% wk37 - 83413 - 10.76% wk38 - 55549 - 8.03%

Water was very murky and fish could not easily be observed. Fish that were observed appeared to be healthy and no signs of damage or clinical disease was observed.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0016		Site No:	FS0149				
Date of Visit:		15/02/2022			Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary ch		e representa	itive?			Y N	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fish f	or all section	nns)					
Total No facilities Species Age group	8 SAL 22S1's		Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilitie	s inspected	8
No Fish Mean Fish Wt	382,636 66g							
Next Fallow Date (S Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	,	arch 2022 ns?		Next Input Da	ate (Site) Any escapes	August 20 (since last		N
Movement Records 1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspe 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement re 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific  Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a systematical	s available for in ction: blete and correct cords available blete and correct ates for introduct ints carried out b	ly entered? for dead fish ly entered? ctions (outwi	th GB) availa	able? siness (not us	-		04/12/2019	Y Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records		pection?						Y
2. How are mortalitied of their detail:	es disposed of?				Ensiled - on s	site		
3. Mortality records	complete and co			%) wk2 (101 -	· 0.02%) wk1 (	233 - 0.06%	6) wk52 2021	Y (278 -
<ul><li>4. Recent mortality (</li><li>5. Evidence of recent yes, facility nos/no</li></ul>	nt increased/aty	oical mortalit	0.07%) ies?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			<u></u>	N
6. Any other peaks i		• .	ecked?					Y
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased ( If yes, detail action:	See additional unexplained) mo		n reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been repo	rted to FHI?	If no, enter of	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		Y

Treatments and Me	dicines Records		
1. Recent treatments			Y
	Aquacen ,		
If yes, detail:	Cress , TMS		
If other, detail:			
	available for inspection?		Y
•	lete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdr			Y
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)?	TMS, Aquacen, Cress	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Y
Diagonality Dogord			
Biosecurity Record			Y
	s available for inspection?	recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
		ify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	ned) mortality at the site been inclu		Y
` .	•	presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	uded and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be	•	Y
		tocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	•		
,	• ′		
6. Have the husband	ry and biosecurity measures imple	mented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
		aff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation a	available regarding the measures in	n place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals	held on site?		
8. Have the biosecur	ity procedures been adequately im	plemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla			
•	ealth surveillance been carried out l	by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
	available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant res			N
If yes, detail (if not de	etailed under recent disease proble	ems).	
		0.4/4.0/00.4.0.4.5/00/00.00	
K	Records checked between:	04/12/2019-15/02/2022	

	mi 059, version 15							133	ueu by. r	1 11			
	Case no:	2022-00	)16	Site No		FS0149			Date of v		15/0	)2/2022	15/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		РА		MG		y. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:		0:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	17
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Α	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Fish nos	1-8	9-16	17-24	25-34								
	Pool Group	1-0	3-10	17-24	25-54								
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	66g	66g	66g	66g								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW								
Stock Details		Geocrab	Geocrab	Geocrab	Geocrab								

02/2022 Additional Sample Information:														
All fish sampled appeared healthy and showed no clinical signs of disease.														
0 Total Tests assigned 0														
														1

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0016		Site No:	FS0149		Insp:	
Date of Visit	15/02/2022		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 supp	ocluding third country pliers	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		1 0	3		10	6
Wovernonts on	Number of dest		0			10	3
Exposure via water	,	Site contacts	5 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or b	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
,	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstream	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	cessing	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 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 wast	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	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity	<del>!</del>	Number of sites	<u> </u>	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				- O
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					<b>Total</b> Rank		14 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/	05/2020
Case No: 2022-0016	Site	No: FS0149	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)			
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?		
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or ed		ngle year class basis?	
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as we can these be deployed in a reasonable period	well as access to suitable biological and/c		
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to	the site and CoGP Farm	
<ul><li>5. Are sea lice count records available for insp</li><li>6. Do records adequately reflect the required</li></ul>		GP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels believed are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in	the CoGP during the period that	
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salr.</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period		f 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	•		
10. Have therapeutic treatments been adminis suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. e</i>			
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?		
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions	s taken had a significant impact upon the	lice levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, sea lice?	where fewer populations or part populatio	ns are held without treatment for	
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice in		g set actions to deal with recognised	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please of	etail reasons.	
Containment Inspection			
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage	ge due to predators in the current or previ	ous production cycles?	
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the	he predation experienced on site? (Detail	below)	
top nets			
If other, detail below:			
Have escape incidents or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site si	nce the last FHI inspection?	
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	•	ite da l'activiti inopositori.	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	•		
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fo		37 5 4 17)	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and			
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail		
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was	s permission given by Scottish	
9. What action was taken to prevent and minim		ered in code but could	
be considered under satisfactory measur	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d reason(s)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please deta	ii leasuli(s)	

Case No:	2022-0016			Date of visit:	15/02/2022	2					
Site No:	FS0149	]		Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification									
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp			
			-								
							_				
	1										
Report Summary				1							
	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	-							
Case Type ECI, CNI, VMD	24/03/2022		Z INSP								
201, 0111, 11112	2 1/ 00/ 2022										





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0169Date of Visit15/02/2022Site NoFS0149Site NameLoch LangavatCase No20220016Inspector

# 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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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 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.

Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

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>

Date: 29/03/2022