FHI 059, Version 13	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2022-0109			Date of visit: 26/04/2022						
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspect	or:						
Site No: FS1335	Site Name:	Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe							
Business No: FB0125	Business Name:	Scottish Sea Farms Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8.1	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed						
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA S-5						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	Y If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet.						
Clinical signs of disease observe	•		rmation/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed?		N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet.						
Diagnostic samples taken?		N							
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Additional Case Information:

Remote inspection 19/04/22 by , observed by

Site inspection and VMD sampling 26/04/22 by , observed by

Site had experienced low level AGD from PCR screening, not causing issues on site and levels from recent samples have decreased.

Very good visibility at time of inspection. Fish were shoaling deeper in the water. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy. Site were conducting sea lice counts at time of inspection, 10 fish per cage. Physical treatments recently undertaken on site for sea lice, thermolicer and two cages with the hydrolicer. There were 1 to 2 lethargic fish in the cages treated with the Thermolicer, but noticeably more lethargic fish observed in cages recently treated with the hydrolicer, some with varying degrees of physical damage. The Thermolicer treatments were conducted using the new purpose built Inverlussa boat, which was reported to be very effective and had capacity to treat a cage quicker than previous thermolicers used. All cages have double nets installed

T304 used, however not in drop down list therefore left blank.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0109		Site No:	FS1335				
Date of Visit:		26/04/2022			Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ils						
1. Business/site det	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	o details?						Y	
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		12	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	es inspected	12
Species	SAL							
Age group	2021 Q4							
No Fish	539, 582					 		
Mean Fish Wt	2.2 Kg					1		
Next Fallow Date (S		2022 Q4		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	2023 Q3	•	
Recent (last 4 wks)	,				Any escapes		visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					, any occupies	(000		
,, ,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,								
Movement Record	s							
1. Movement record	ds available for	r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe	ection:						18/02/2020	
3. Are records comp	plete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availabl	e for dead fis	sh and waste?	•				Y
5. Are records comp	olete and corre	ectly entered?	?					Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any moveme		by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys								Y
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	available for in	enection?						
2. How are mortaliti		•			Other (detail	\		
If other detail:					Other (detail)		
3. Mortality records	Pelagia Bres							
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly erit		(0.2%), Wk 13	2 1 020 /0 /0)/ \ \M/ L 1.1	1 221 (0 20/)	\/\k 15
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks)·		1,192 (0.2%		5 - 1,939 (0.4)	70), VVK 14 -	1,321 (0.2%)	, VVK 15 -
5. Evidence of rece		typical mortal		<i>)</i>				N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
ir yes, rasinty riss/ric	o mortality per	raomity/110 Std	on per raomey	71000011.				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (unexplained) r	nortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been re	oorted to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events s	heet.		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?	,
Diagonwite Basawla	
Biosecurity Records	V
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ĭ
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?	Y
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?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
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	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented 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?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 18/02/2020 to 19/04/2022	

FHI 059, \	ersion 13							ISS	uea by: I	ТПІ			
Case n	0:	2022-01	09	Site No:		FS1335			Date of Samplin		26/	04/2022	26/0
Priority	samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI		١	
Time s	ampling ends:	13:0	0:00	13:1	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD N	o. 	9
Enviror	nmental conditions:	1	Sunny	2	Cloudy	3		4		5			
Summa	ary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
	/Pools - click												
Pool/Fi	sh No												
Fish no	s	1											
Pool G	roup												
Specie	S	SAL											
	e weight	2.5000											
Sex													
Water	Туре	SW											
Stock Details Facility Stock Of the stock of		Barcaldine Smolt Unit											

04/2022 Additional Sample Information:															
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0														
\Box															
\vdash															

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	t issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0109		Site No:	FS1335		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/04/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		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 necluding third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup		0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	I 0	3	6	10	10
	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	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
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
and raids of the unconve	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				0
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				0
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				0
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				0
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				0
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	unpasteurised feed	0	i			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				0
					Total Rank		20 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0109	Site No: FS	S1335
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous like the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) for the Site have access to a range of licenced infection and emamectin benzoate) as well as access as these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	allowed synchronously on a single year ed and bath sea lice medications (includ	ling deltamethrin,
Is there a signed documented farm management agree Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement or statement relevant to the site a	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Le 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard sp		al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggrecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	gested criteria for treatment in the CoGP	o during the period that
3. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) num 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that reco		ve (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or Y
f yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspe	ctorate? If no. FHI see comment.	Y
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered		s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or oth suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is		
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in coop 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewere lice?	eration between participating farms?	Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procescenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	dure with waypoints describing set actio	ons to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea	lice count data? If no please detail reas	ons. Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to proceed. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation of Nets, Seal for the foother, detail below:		oction cycles?
,		
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced or f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (who 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fishe	n 10 ere they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If ye	es give detail	
3. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with low Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 3. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the rise be considered under satisfactory measures of the Action was taken to prevent and minimise the rise be considered under satisfactory measures of the Action with respect to the considered under satisfactory measures.	k of further escapes? (Not covered in co	ode but could
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to co	ntainment? If no, please detail reason(s	Y Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020	0
Case No: 2022-0109	Site No: FS1335		
Date of Visit: 26/04/2	2022 Inspector:		
Point of Compliance			
1. Is the farm under inspection local	ted within a farm management area?	Y	
If N, no further questions require co	mpletion.		
2. Has a current farm management3. Is the current FMAg/S available f4. Does the FMAg/S identify the rele5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish	evant farm management area? h farm site(s) to which it applies? te of commencement of the agreement or	prepared? Y Y Y Y	
Arrangements for Fish Health Ma 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the mir farm?	nnagement nimum health standards for the stocks to l	be introduced to the area or Y	
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the sp	ccination requirements for stocks held in the pecies of fish which may be stocked into the naximum stocking density of any pen on an	the area or farm?	
	rrangements for the storage and disposal all farm?	of any dead fish from any	
Arrangements for The Managements 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arran	ent of Sea Lice gements for the sharing of data on sea lic	e numbers and treatments?	
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the avoid statement?	vailability and the use of medicines on farm	ms covered by the agreement Y	
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any relice on farms in the area or individual	equirements for the sensitivity testing of a all farms?		
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the ci used on farms in the area or individ	ircumstances under which biological contri lual farms?	rols and cleaner fish are to be	
	rrangements for synchronous treatments	on farms within the area?	
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the ci area or farm?	ircumstances when live fish may be introd		
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the all or individual farms?	rrangements for the movement of live fish	on and 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 restoct 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or 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 ent include arrangements for persons to becom	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and of 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or of the FMAg/S? 03/07/2021	statement?

		_				_		
Case No:	2022-0109			Date of visit:	26/04/2022			
Cita Na	EC4225							
Site No:	FS1335			Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
Report Summary			1	1				
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1				
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	04/07/2022							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0125 Date of Visit 26/04/2022

SITE No FS1335 SITE NAME Swarta Skerry, Dury Voe

Case No 20220109 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 medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second 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.

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 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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed:

Date: 04/07/22

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/