

Case No:	2022-0110	Date of visit:	27/04/2022			
Time spent on site:	4 Hours	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS1057	Site Name:	Vee Taing			
Business No:	FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 SLI	4 VMD	5 DIA	6
Water Temp (°C):	8.3	Thermometer No:	T309	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region:	SH	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	S-2
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>					

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

--

**Additional Case Information:**

Remote inspection conducted by [REDACTED], supervised by [REDACTED] (20/04/2022)

Site inspection, VMD sampling and diagnostic sampling conducted by [REDACTED], supervised by [REDACTED] (27/04/2022).

During site inspection fish were deeper in the water, displayed good shoaling behaviour and responding well to feed. Dead baskets are available on site, mortalities are removed using an ROV with basket. This was reported to be very effective and worked well across sites. The work boat with ROV was operating on neighbouring site at time of inspection.

The general population of these cages appeared healthy. Approximately 30 moribund or lethargic fish were observed in cage 4 and approximately 20 moribund or lethargic fish were observed in cage 6 at time of inspection. These fish displayed varying degrees of eye damage and lesions to the flanks. One fish observed hanging vertically, however, unable to catch as closer to centre of cage. The site underwent a physical treatment for sea lice on 01/04/2022.

A routine health inspection was conducted on 05/04/22 by CAS health team, no significant results identified.

Case No: 2022-0110 Site No: FS1057

Date of Visit: 27/04/2022

Inspector(s):

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?
2. Changes made to details?

Y
N

**Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)**

Total No facilities	12	Facilities stocked	12	No facilities inspected	12
Species	SAL				
Age group	2020 S0				
No Fish	318,188				
Mean Fish Wt	4.17 Kg				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	June 2022	Next Input Date (Site)	August 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		N	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:					

**Movement Records**

1. Movement records available for inspection?
2. Date of last inspection:
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?
5. Are records complete and correctly entered?
6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?

Y
06/08/2019
Y
Y
Y
N/A

**Transport Records**

1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)?
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?

Y
Y

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection?
2. How are mortalities disposed of?

Whole fish - TWMA (Shetland)

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

Y
---

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

Wk 15 - 669 (0.21%), Wk14 - 1983 (0.62%), Wk13 - 1524 (0.47%), Wk 12 - 334 (0.1%)

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

N
---

If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

N
---

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

N/A
-----

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

N/A
-----

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?  Y  
 If yes, detail: T.M.S.  
 If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?  Y  
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered?  Y  
 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?  Y  
 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S.  
 If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?  Y

**Biosecurity Records**

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?  Y  
 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?  Y  
 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 *how* and *when* 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 health status, certification if required)?  Y  
 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.)?  Y  
 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?  Y  
 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: 06/08/2019 - 27/04/2022

Case no:  Site No:  Date of visit/  
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI  BA  PA  MG  HI

Time sampling starts/ends:   Inspector:  VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1  2  3  4  5

Summary samples HIST  BA  MG  VI  PA  Total Samples

**Add Fish/Pools - click**

Pool/Fish No	F1	F2	F3	F4								
Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL					
Average weight	4.1700	4.1700	4.1700	4.1700	4.1700	4.1700	4.1700					
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW					
Stock Details		Balta Isle	Balta Isle	Balta Isle	Balta Isle	Balta Isle	Balta Isle	Balta Isle				
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	4	4	4	4	2	5	8					



Case no: 2022-0110

Site No: FS1057

Method of killing: Percussive

Date of visit: 27/04/2022

Inspector(s):

Sheet Relevant: Y

S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence

Fish Number		1	2	3	4				
Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes)									
External Signs									
Behaviour	Moribund	W	W	W	W				
	Lethargic								
	Hanging vertical								
	Spiralling								
	Flashing								
	Loss of equilibrium								
Body	Dark								
	Distended abdomen								
	Anorexic								
	Scale Oedema								
Opercula	Shortened								
	Flared								
Haemorrhaging	Throat								
	Ventrum								
	Base of fins								
	Elsewhere								
Eyes	Exophthalmic								
	Enophthalmic (sunken)								
	Cataract								
	Haemorrhagic								
Gills	Pale								
	Zoned								
	Necrotic								
Lesions	Flank	M	W	W	W				
	Elsewhere								
Vent	Inflamed								
	Trailing faeces								
Lice Load	Estimate numbers								
Internal Signs									
Ascites	Clear								
	Bloody								
Oedema	In tissues								
Heart	Pale/anaemic								
	Granulomas								
	Deformed								
Liver	Petechial haem								
	Gross haem								
	Tissue breakdown								
	Enlarged								
	Colour number(s)	4	4	4	4				
	Granulomas								
	Lesions								
Pyloric caeca	Petechial haem								
	Tubules mauve								
	Lack of fat								
Spleen	Enlarged				M				
	Granulomas								
Gut	No food present								
	Yellow pseudo-faeces								
	External haem								
	Internal haem								
Body wall	Haemorrhaging								
Swim bladder	Haemorrhaging								
	Fluid filled								
Kidney	Swollen								
	Grey								
	Granular								
	Liquefied								
General	Parasites present								
	Anaemia								





Additional comments:

Moribund and lethargic fish around edges of cages on site displayed varying degrees of eye damage.

Case Number:	2022-0110	Site No:	FS1057	Insp:		
Date of Visit	27/04/2022	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	0
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				0
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
<b>Management practices</b>		None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				0
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>10</b>	<b>LOW</b>

Case No: **2022-0110**

Site No: **FS1057**

**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 equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
- 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
- 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
- 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
- 7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
- 8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?
- If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.
- 9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
- 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
- 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
- 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
- 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?
- 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?
- 15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
- 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

- 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

**Seal Pro Nets,**

If other, detail below:

- 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?
- If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
- 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
- 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
- 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
- 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
- 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
- 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2022-0110

Site No: FS1057

Date of Visit: 27/04/2022

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

**Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements**

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

**Arrangements for Fish Health Management**

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

**Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice**

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

**Harvesting**

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

**Fallowing**

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

**Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only**

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

**Management and operation**

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?



Site No: FS1057
Case No: 2022-0110
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

**BUSINESS No** FB0095  
**SITE No** FS1057  
**CASE No** 20220110

**DATE OF VISIT** 27/04/2022  
**SITE NAME** Vee Taing  
**INSPECTORS** [REDACTED]

### Section 1: Summary

During a routine inspection, approximately 50 moribund and lethargic fish were observed in cages 4 and 6. These fish displayed varying degrees of eye damage and lesions to the flanks. Four fish from cage 4 were removed for diagnostic sampling.

Histopathology examination revealed pathology consistent with cardiomyopathy syndrome (CMS). Mild *peritonitis* and *splenitis* were also observed. Samples confirmed piscine myocarditis virus (PMCV) (4/4) by qPCR.

*Moritella viscosa* was identified on plates taken from lesion material of fish 3, the level and purity would suggest this bacterium would be the primary cause of this lesion and as a known fish pathogen could potentially have an impact on overall fish health. *Vibrio* sp. was identified on plates taken from kidney material of fish 1-4, lesion material of fish 1-3 and gill material of fish 1-4. The level and purity would suggest this bacterium would be significant to fish health.

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

### Section 2: Case Detail

#### Observations

During a routine inspection, approximately 50 moribund and lethargic fish were observed between cages 4 and 6. These fish displayed varying degrees of eye damage and lesions to the flanks. 4 fish from cage 4 were removed for diagnostic sampling. At the time of visit the site was stocked with 318,188 Atlantic salmon at a mean fish weight of 4.17 kg. There had been no reports of elevated mortality during the current production cycle.

All fish removed for diagnostic sampling were observed to be moribund and lethargic. From external examination, all fish displayed lesions to the flanks, damaged tails and pectoral fins and erosion of the snouts. Internally, all fish exhibited pale colouration to the liver and little stomach content. F4 had an enlarged spleen.



Samples were collected from F1 – F4 fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1	4	Atlantic Salmon	2020 S0	Balta Isle
F2	4	Atlantic Salmon	2020 S0	Balta Isle
F3	4	Atlantic Salmon	2020 S0	Balta Isle
F4	4	Atlantic Salmon	2020 S0	Balta Isle

## Results

**Bacteriology:** Kidney, gill, and lesion material from 4 fish inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

The following bacteria were isolated:

*Moritella viscosa* : F3 (Lesion)

*Vibrio* sp.: F1 - 4 (Kidney)

*Vibrio* sp.: F1 - 4 (Gill)

*Vibrio* sp.: F1 - 3 (Lesion)

From the tests conducted, we do not have evidence of resistance to amoxicillin, oxytetracycline, sulphamethoxazole/trimethoprim or florfenicol.

**Virology:** Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens using real-time PCR (qPCR).

Infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV):

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	-	-	-	-	NEGATIVE
F2	-	-	-	-	NEGATIVE
F3	18.33	35.44	35.1	34.89	POSITIVE
F4	-	-	-	-	NEGATIVE

Piscine myocarditis virus (PMCV):

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	17.2	16.74	16.75	16.73	POSITIVE
F2	18.83	23.15	23.18	23.18	POSITIVE
F3	19.16	19.26	19.3	19.25	POSITIVE
F4	19.61	20.04	20.1	20.2	POSITIVE

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV) and viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV).

**Histology:** Tissue samples of gill, skin and skeletal muscle, heart, pyloric caeca, pancreas, hind gut, liver, spleen and kidney were taken from F 1 - 4. The tissue samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin.

Histopathological examination revealed the following:

Gill: Very mild interlamellar hyperplasia (F2). One aneurysmal dilation/telangiectasia noted in one individual (F1). F3 & F4 difficult to read due to post-mortem artefact and small area of gill.

Skin & Muscle: Within the normal range.

Heart: F4 displayed marked myocardial mononuclear cell infiltration (endocarditis) and marked myocardial degeneration and necrosis in the ventricle chamber and in lesser extension observed in F1 and F3. F3 also displayed moderate endocarditis in the atrium chamber. F2 exhibit an area restricted to few fibres with degeneration and mononuclear cell infiltration. F3 displayed mild pericarditis.

Gut and pyloric caeca: Some to moderate fibrous adhesions (likely associated with vaccine administration) (F1 & F3). F4 displayed some cell sloughing potentially associated with post-mortem artefact).

Pancreas: Within normal range.

Liver: Mild multifocal hepatic necrosis (F4), some diffuse hepatocellular vacuolation (macroviscules) (F2).

Kidney: Within normal range. F4: Some post-mortem artefact.

Spleen: Several foci of sparse haematopoietic tissue (F3) and small area of infiltration of mononuclear cells (F3). Slight congested (F1, F4)

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 02/09/2022

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/>

R09

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0095	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	27/04/2022
<b>SITE No</b>	FS1057	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Vee Taing
<b>CASE No</b>	20220110	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]

### 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. Samples were taken for diagnostic purposes. A separate report will be issued detailing the results of these tests.

#### 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.

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: 16/08/22

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/>



Fish 1



Fish 1



Fish 1



Fish 1



Fish 2 and Fish 3



Fish 4