

Case No:	2022-0184	Date of visit:	08/06/2022			
Time spent on site:	3hrs	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0894	Site Name:	Rubha Stillaig			
Business No:	FB0169	Business Name:	The Scottish Salmon Company			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 SLA	4 VMD	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	13.6	Thermometer No:	T308	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA:	M-42
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/> N					

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

Additional Case Information:

Site has stocked salmon and lumpfish. Salmon are from Landcatch (Ormsary), but transferred onto site from Gob a Bharra (FS0683) and lumpfish are from Otter Ferry and were input on 02/03/2022.

SAV was detected in pen 9 and 10. Pancreas Disease (PD) then was also found in pen 6. Feeding was slightly reduced with low levels of PD found across the site. Pen 9 and 10 are back on their feed fully and feeding well. Mortalities remain low even though PD has been detected. Vaccine has been noted to be helping. During site inspection, very few fish were seen hanging around the pens.

All harvests will be conducted as livehaul.

Lumpfish are culled at harvest but new procedures will see lumpfish being reduced after each cycle.

Lumpfish mortality:

from 06/06/2022 : 0.47%, 43

3.63%, 348

4.84%, 488

1.28%, 131

Paperwork and site inspected on 08/06/2022 by [REDACTED] and supervised by [REDACTED].

VMD samples were taken on 08/06/2022 by [REDACTED]. All fish sampled were found to be healthy.

Case No: **2022-0184** Site No: **FS0894**
 Date of Visit: **08/06/2022** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	10	Facilities stocked	10	No facilities inspected	10
Species	SAL	LUM			
Age group	2021 S0	2022			
No Fish	274,600	9,158			
Mean Fish Wt	2.26kg	n/a			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	May 2023		Next Input Date (Site)	July/Aug 2023	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:	SAV detected 2 months ago, low level PD on whole site.				

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
 2. Date of last inspection: **07/02/2019**
 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
 If other detail: **Morts transferred to skip at the Stronahullin shorebase.**
 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **2022: Wk 21, 205, 0.07%; Wk20, 814, 0.29%; Wk19, 801, 0.29; Wk18, 1099, 0.39%**
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**
 If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**
 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**
 If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**
 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
 If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. **N/A**

Treatments and Medicines Records1. Recent treatments (see comment)? Y

If yes, detail:

T.M.S.

If other, detail:

2. Medicines records available for inspection? Y3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y4. 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? Y2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? Y3. 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? Y4. 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? Y5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? Y6. 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.)? Y7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y

If no, detail:

Results of Surveillance1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y2. If yes, are results available for inspection? Y3. Any significant results? Y

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

AGD positive 05/05/2022, 6/11 samples.

In addition, SAV detected in house via RTPCR 22/03/2022 with 3/4 positive. Further screen conducted via histology, noting that mild IPN and SAV observed but inconclusive of Pancreas disease (PD).

Records checked between:

07/02/2019-08/06/2022

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												
Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5							
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL							
Average weight	2.5kg	2.5kg	2.5kg	2.5kg	2.5kg							
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW							
Stock Details												
	Stock Origin	Gob a Bharra (FS0683)	Gob a Bharra (FS0683)	Gob a Bharra (FS0683)	Gob a Bharra (FS0683)	Gob a Bharra (FS0683)						
Facility No	1	6	8	9	10							

06/2022 Additional Sample Information:

Total Tests assigned

Case Number:	2022-0184	Site No:	FS0894	Insp:		
Date of Visit	08/06/2022	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		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	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water	Site contacts	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				
	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		
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 processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	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				
	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				
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					20	MEDIUM

Case No: **2022-0184**

Site No: **FS0894**

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? N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y

Seal pro nets, top

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? N
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) Y

Case No: 2022-0184

Site No: FS0894

Date of Visit: 08/06/2022

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

Y

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?

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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?

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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

Y

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?

Y

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?

Y

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

Y

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?

Y

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?

Y

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

Y

Live Fish Movements

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

Y

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

Y

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?



Case No: **2022-0184** Site No: **FS0894**

Date of visit: **08/06/2022** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
-------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records				
1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium	Y	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2,	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ? (Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed and correct stages recorded ⁴)	Low & Medium	Y	Annex 6 SSI 1,2,	
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated?	Low	Y	SSI 1,2(g)	
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail.	Low	Y		
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?		N	Detail if necessary:	2017 numbers were above 2 from wk 5 to wk 17. Below the then-reporting threshold. Reporting levels came in to affect in July 2017, counts above 2 were before this period.
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice				
2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where: a) <i>L. salmonis</i> record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment? b) <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High	Y	CoGP Annex 6	Caligus levels have been low on site
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	
	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of: the name / identity of the product the date of administration the quantity (concentration and amount) administered the method of administration of the product the identification of the fish / facilities treated name of the person administering the treatment the withdrawal period	High	Y	VMD ¹² 19 SSI 1,3	
	High	Y		
	High	Y		
	High	Y		
	High	Y		
	Low	N/A		
	Medium	Y		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon: the name of the veterinary surgeon name of the product batch number the date of administration amount administered identification of fish treated	High	N/A	VMD 18	
	High	N/A		
	High	N/A		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<p>withdrawal period</p> <p>2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?</p> <p>Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site average <i>L. salmonis</i> numbers (all stages)</p> <p>2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their impact is there a record of:</p> <p>the nature and date of the method employed; the identification number of all facilities subjected to the method; the name of the person employing the method</p> <p>2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:</p> <p>proof of purchase of the medicine concerned</p> <p>name of the product</p> <p>batch number</p> <p>the date of purchase</p> <p>the quantity purchased</p> <p>the name and address of the supplier</p> <p>2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:</p> <p>the date of disposal</p> <p>the quantity of product involved</p> <p>how and where it was disposed of</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>High</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>High</p> <p>High</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>High</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>SSI, 1,4</p> <p>VMD 19</p> <p>VMD 17</p> <p>VMD 19</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87</p> <p>Detail if necessary:</p>	<p>No lice problems so sea lice procedures are effective</p>
<p>2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice?</p> <p>Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments conducted on site</p> <p>2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed?</p> <p>2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?</p> <p>2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances?</p> <p>2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use, available to those responsible for treatment administration?</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p>	<p>CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87</p>	
<p>2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?</p>		<p>Y</p>	<p>Detail if necessary:</p>	
<p>c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and farm management agreements or statements</p>				
<p>3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?</p> <p>3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the provisions of the NTS⁶?</p> <p>3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?</p>	<p>Low</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Medium</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p>	<p>SSI 1,5,b</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45</p> <p>CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46</p>	<p>Treatment call twice a week with area manager and biology team</p>

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<p>3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -coordinated monitoring and treatment -co-operation between participating farms <p>This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine</p>	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	Emails available regarding outcome of treatment call.
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?	Low	Y	SSI 1, 5, c	
<p>3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy?</p> <p>For example, the principles of ISLM include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD. The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice) Appropriate discharge consent in place Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary Monitoring lice numbers Using an array of treatments where possible Treating all stocks on site at the same time Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and certainly not on the same cohort of lice Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities. 	Medium	Y	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	Regular meetings held to discuss sea lice
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?		Y	AFSA ¹³ 4A	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium	N/A	Detail if necessary: CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium	Y	AFSA 4B	
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined, is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?	High ¹⁰	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.100	
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.101	
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures				
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6	
parasite identification	High	Y	SSI, 1,1	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
recording counts	High	Y	5.3.53-55	
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Y		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Y		
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	Y	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	only two individuals on site that are able/trained to do it. Restrictive training.
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this				
Where records exist regarding SOPs and site procedures these should be inspected to confirm suitability				
e. Inspection of site and site stock				
5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?	Medium	Y	VMD schedule 5	
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High	Y		
Refer to section e) of guidance notes				
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating to sea lice infestation?	High	Y		
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Y	CoGP Annex 6,	All pens sampled weekly
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording? (Cross reference to training records – Section d)	High	Y	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54	
6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)?	Medium	Y	Annex 6	
N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<p>6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct? Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are: for <i>Caligus elongatus</i> all identifiable stages and for <i>Lepeophtheirus salmonis</i> chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)¹¹</p>	High	Y	Annex 6	
<p>6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?</p>	Medium	Y		
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
<p>7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner? Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations, appropriate product used</p>	High	N/A		
<p>7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation?</p>	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	fish are only in withdrawal for T.M.S
<p>7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?</p>		N		
<p>7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?</p>	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
<p>7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment?</p>	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<p>h. FHI sea lice counts If necessary conduct a sea lice count in accordance with the protocol of the CoGP. Indicate where this procedure has been done and make a record of results within the comments box</p>	Power granted under the Act – section 3 (2) (a)	
<p>i. Collection of samples If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection</p>	Power granted under the Act – section 3 (3) (a)	
<p>j. Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice</p>	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
[1] Scottish Statutory Instrument – The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008				
[2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture				
[3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be s				
[4] Recording requirements:- for <i>C. elongatus</i> – all identifiable stages and for <i>L. salmonis</i> - mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)				
[5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately				
[6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS				
[7] FMA = Farm Management Area				
[8] FMS = Farm Management Statement				
[9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement				
[10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18				
[11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate – for <i>Caligus elongatus</i> : mobiles; and for <i>Lepeophtheirus salmonis</i> : non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.				
[12] VMD - The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)				
[13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)				

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	08/06/2022
SITE No	FS0894	SITE NAME	Rubha Stillaig
CASE No	20220184	INSPECTOR	████████████████████

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION

An enhanced sea lice inspection to ascertain the levels of sea lice and for assessing the measures in place for the prevention, control and reduction of sea lice was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of records with regards to sea lice, site procedures with regards to sea lice and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of sea lice records

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

b) Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

c) Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and area management agreements.

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made and no further action is required.

d) Inspection of records relating to training and procedures

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made or further action required.

e) Inspection of site and site stock

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

f) Inspection of farm count procedures

An inspection of site staff conducting and recording a sea lice count was carried out. This met the requirements of The Fish Farming Business (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 and CoGP. No further recommendations or further action required.

g) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

An inspection of treatment administration procedures was carried out. The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No further recommendations made, or further action required.

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



Signed:

Date: 13/06/2022

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	08/06/2022
SITE No	FS0894	SITE NAME	Rubha Stillaig
CASE No	20220184	INSPECTOR	[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. 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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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.

R25

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 fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

An enhanced sea lice inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

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



Signed:

Date: 16/06/2022

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/>