

Case No: 2022-0200 Date of visit: 15/06/2022

Time spent on site: 3hrs Main Inspector: [Redacted]

Site No: FS0663 Site Name: Kerrera B  
Business No: FB0125 Business Name: Scottish Sea Farms Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNA 3 SLI 4 VMD 5 [ ] 6 [ ]

Water Temp (°C): 10.6 Thermometer No: T152 FHI 045 completed [ ]

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA: M-36

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? [N] If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
Clinical signs of disease observed? [N] If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
Gross pathology observed? [N] If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
Diagnostic samples taken? [N]

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Fish came on from Barcaldine smolt unit (FS1328) in April 22. Site had been fallow since July 21.

Tenacibaculum confirmed on site and is reported to be the main cause for any observed mortality. Mortality across the site since input has been low (<1% each month).

SLICE conducted on 03/05 and 23/05 in response to increasing Caligus numbers. Treatments were successful and had good clearance.

Site conducts live harvests to South Shian.

Farms located within FMA are stocked with multiple yearclasses. A risk assessment is in place for this and was available for inspection.

Wildcaught wrasse from Uig put in last week (9th + 16th June). None observed in cages. Site manager reported that they sit deeper following input.

Fish appeared in good physical health but were observed jumping a lot due to an increased presence of jellyfish on site over the last few days. Many were observed in the water during the inspection.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally.

Case No:  Site No:

Date of Visit:  Inspector(s):

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

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

|                                       |  |   |                                 |                                       |                                 |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Total No facilities                   | <input type="text" value="10"/>            | Facilities stocked                      | <input type="text" value="10"/> | No facilities inspected               | <input type="text" value="10"/> |
| Species                               | <input type="text" value="SAL"/>           | <input type="text" value="WRA"/>        |                                 |                                       |                                 |
| Age group                             | <input type="text" value="22S1"/>          | <input type="text" value="Wildcaught"/> |                                 |                                       |                                 |
| No Fish                               | <input type="text" value="308,000"/>       | <input type="text" value="4,995"/>      |                                 |                                       |                                 |
| Mean Fish Wt                          | <input type="text" value="277g"/>          | <input type="text" value="30g"/>        |                                 |                                       |                                 |
| Next Fallow Date (Site)               | <input type="text" value="August 23"/>     |   | Next Input Date (Site)          | <input type="text" value="April 24"/> |                                 |
| Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? |  |   | <input type="text" value="Y"/>  | Any escapes (since last visit)?       | <input type="text" value="N"/>  |
| If yes, detail:                       | <input type="text" value="Tenacibaculum"/> |   |                                 |                                       |                                 |

**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?

**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?

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection?

2. How are mortalities disposed of?

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

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

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

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

If yes, detail action:

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

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

- 1. Recent treatments (see comment)?  Y  
 If yes, detail: TMS Slice  
 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)? TMS Slice  
 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?  Y  
 If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between: 25/11/2020 - 08/06/2022

|  |   |                             |               |                 |               |               |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Case Number:   | 2022-0200   | Site No:                    | FS0663        | Insp:           |               |               |
| Date of Visit  | 15/06/2022  | No of movements/supp./dest. |               |                 | Score         |               |
| <b>Live fish movements</b>   |   | <b>0</b>                    | <b>1-5</b>    | <b>6-10</b>     | <b>&gt;10</b> |               |
| 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            |               |
|  | 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             |
| <b>Exposure via water</b>  | <b>Site contacts</b>  | <b>0</b>                    | <b>1-5</b>    | <b>6-10</b>     |               |               |
| 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               |               |               |
| <b>Management practices</b>  |   | <b>None</b>                 | <b>Secure</b> | <b>Unsecure</b> |               |               |
| 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                           |               |                 |               |               |
|  | 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                           |               |                 |               |               |
|  | 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>  | <b>1</b>                    | <b>2 or 3</b> | <b>≥ 4</b>      |               |               |
| Contacts with other sites  | Sites operating from single shorebase   | 0                           | 1             | 2               |               | 1             |
|  | Sites sharing staff and equipment   | 0                           | 1             | 2               |               | 0             |
| 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>17</b>     | <b>MEDIUM</b> |

Case No: 2022-0200 Site No: FS0663

Date of visit: 15/06/2022 Inspector(s):

| Point of compliance | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|---------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
|---------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--|

**ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)**

**a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures**

|  |        |   |                              |  |
|--|--------|---|------------------------------|--|
| 1.1. Have escape incidents or events <sup>1</sup> been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?<br><b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b> |        | N |                              | Last escape was in 2007. No escapes since. |
| 1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?   | High   |   | AAAH Regs <sup>4</sup> 31D,E |  |
| 1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO <sup>2</sup> and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?  | Medium |   | CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17          |  |
| 1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees?<br>If yes give detail   |        |   |                              |  |
| 1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT   | Low    |   | CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18          |  |
| 1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?  | Medium |   | CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18          |  |
| 1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?   | Low    |   | CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18          |  |
| 1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?  | High   |   |                              |  |
| 1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?                      | High   | Y | SSI, 2,9                     |  |

**b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site**

|   |     |   |                              |          |   |
|---|-----|---|------------------------------|----------|---|
| General records<br>2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:- |     |   | CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1 |          |   |
|   |     |   | Facilities                   | Moorings | Nets  |
| a) The name of the manufacturer   | Low | Y | Y                            | Y        | Invoices from manufacturers available for inspection. |
| b) Any special adaptations  | Low | Y | Y                            | Y        |   |
| c) The name of the supplier   | Low | Y | Y                            | Y        |   |

| Point of compliance  | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |   |
|--|------------|---------------|-------------|--|---|
| d) The date of purchase  | Low        | Y             | Y           | Y  | Net was manufactured and purchased in 2018. No invoice available but service history for the net specifying these details were in the Knox portal.  |
| e) Each inspection including   |            |               |             |  |   |
| i) the name of the person conducting the inspection  | Low        | Y             | Y           | Y  |   |
| ii) the date of each inspection  | Medium     | Y             | Y           | Y  |   |
| iii) the place of each inspection  | Low        | Y             | Y           | Y  |   |
| iv) the outcome of each inspection   | High       | Y             | Y           | Y  |   |
| f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out                  | High       | Y             | Y           | Y  | ROV Inspection of moorings undertaken on 21/03/2022. Report available for inspection.<br>KNOX online database available with inspection reports and service cards for each net on site.<br>Grid components and cages fitted by Inverlussa Marine Service in January 2022. |
| 2.2. In relation to each net a record of:  |            |               |             |  |   |
| i) The mesh size   | Medium     | Y             | SSI, 2,2    |  |   |
| ii) The code which appears on the identification tag   | Medium     | Y             |             |  |   |
| iii) The place of use, storage and disposal  | Medium     | Y             |             |  |   |
| iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring | Low        | Y             |             |  |   |
| 2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:   |            |               |             |  |   |
| i) The date of construction  | Low        | Y             | SSI, 2,3    |  |   |
| ii) The material used in construction  | Low        | Y             |             |  |   |
| iii) Its dimensions  | Low        | Y             |             |  |   |
| 2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-  |            |               | SSI, 2,4    |  |   |
| i) The date of installation  | Low        | Y             |             |  |   |
| ii) The design and weight of the anchors   | Low        | Y             |             |  |   |
| iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains   | Low        | Y             |             |  |   |
| 2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed                       | Low        | Y             | SSI, 2,5    |  |   |
| 2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters <sup>3</sup>                               |            |               | SSI, 2,6    |  |   |
| a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place   | Low        | N/A           |             |  |   |
| b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures                                       | Low        | N/A           |             |  |   |
| c) The date of any incident where the site was flood   | Low        | N/A           |             |  |   |
| d) The water course height during any such flood incident  | Low        | N/A           |             |  |   |

| Point of compliance   | Risk level   | Satisfactory?                   | Requirement  | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary  |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| 2.7 A record of-<br>a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring<br>b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage   | Medium<br><br>High                                   | <br>Y<br>Y                      | SSI, 2,7<br>SSI, 2,11 (a)<br>SSI, 2,11 (b)   | Recorded in the site diary.<br><br>Any repairs completed by the site staff above the waterline are recorded in the site diary. Any repairs made below the waterline are recorded on the diver reports.  |
| Pen and mooring systems<br>2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?<br>2.9 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?<br>2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?<br>2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?<br>2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?<br>2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with<br>a) a documented SOP<br>b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment | High<br><br>High<br><br>High<br>High<br>High<br>High | <br>Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y  | CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13<br>CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14<br>CoGP 4.4.10<br>CoGP 4.4.11<br>CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15<br>CoGP 4.4.16 | Moreknot mooring report available for inspection. Details suitability of pens and moorings based on environmental conditions experienced at the site.<br>Attestations available from manufacturers.<br><br>Pens are inspected and approved by Inverlussa Marine Services. Inspection reports available for inspection.<br>inverlussa installed pen system and carry out regular inspections at end of cycle or after every other crop.<br><br>Pens are inspected daily by site staff following an inspection checklist and SOP based on a risk assessment. All were available for inspection. Moorings are inspected by Inverlussa Marine   |
| 2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?<br>2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size<br>2.16 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?<br>2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?<br>2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?<br>2.19 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?<br>2.20 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?   | High<br>High<br>High<br>Low<br>High<br>High<br>High  | Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y<br>Y | CoGP 4.4.17<br>CoGP 4.4.19<br>CoGP 4.4.20<br>CoGP 4.4.21<br>CoGP 4.4.22<br>CoGP 4.4.22<br>CoGP 4.4.23        | Manufacturer attestations available for inspection.<br>Risk assessment details different mesh sizes required for different sizes of fish.<br>Moreknot conducted an environmental survey to determine the environmental conditions experienced at the site which was available for inspection. Knox service cards for the nets on site were also available for inspection and attest that the nets are suitable for the conditions at the site.<br>Knox service card details UV inhibitor.<br>In accordance with manufacturer guidelines, nets are sent to Knox for testing at the end of every cycle.<br><br>Daily net inspection SOP inspected. Visual inspections carried out by site staff above waterline. Underwater inspections carried out by divers at least once a month and nets sent to Knox end of every cycle for service/repairs/maintenance. |



| Point of compliance   | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement                                     | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary  |
|---|------------|---------------|---|---|
| 2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?   | High       | Y             | CoGP 4.4.23                                     | Available on KNOX portal.   |
| 2.22 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?   | High       | Y             | CoGP 4.4.24                                     | Daily checks by site staff, divers once a month and moreknot every cycle.   |
| 2.23 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?  | High       | Y             | CoGP 4.4.25                                     | Service cards on Knox portal detail any repairs that have been made to the nets.  |
| <b>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>  |            |               |   |   |
| 3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?   | High       | Y             | CoGP 7.1.8                                      | Staff training in containment procedures including crowding, uplifting nets and operating boats on the site available for inspection.   |
| 3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)                                  | High       | Y             | SSI 2,6,a                                       | All staff members hold some level of boat licence. Available for inspection.  |
| 3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish? | High       | Y             | SSI 2,7,a                                       | Training records available for inspection. SOP and RA's available for inspection. These are reviewed each crop and signed by site staff after reading and reciecing on-site training prior to the activity. |
| <b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>  |            |               |   |   |
| 4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?   | High       | Y             | CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12                             | SOPs available for different procedures. Risk assessments also available.   |
| 4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:  |            |               | CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13<br>SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c |   |
| a) a documented risk assessments  | High       | Y             |   |   |
| b) standard operating procedures  | High       | Y             |   |   |
| c) contingency plan   | High       | Y             |   |   |
| 4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of   |            |               |   |   |
| -The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site   | Low        | Y             | SSI 2,6,b                                       | Certificates for all the boats used on the site were available for inspection.  |
| - The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site   | Low        | Y             | SSI 2,6,c                                       | Prop guard fitted on workboat. Records available for inspection.  |
| 4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?   |            | N             |   | Site is located near a seal haul-out but hasn't suffered from heavy predation. Sealpro nets installed on site.  |
| 4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?   | Medium     | Y             | CoGP 4.4.26                                     | Predator exclusion plan and risk assessment available for inspection.   |

| Point of compliance  | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary   |
|--|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| 4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?   | Low        | Y             | CoGP 4.4.26 | Risk assessments reviewed every cycle.<br><br>Knox portal records location of each net. No ADD on site.<br>No seal licence.<br><br>No predator nets on site.   |
| 4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:<br>The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed | Medium     | Y             | SSI, 2,8,a  |  |
| - The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site   | Low        | N/A           | SSI, 2,8,b  |  |
| 4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?  | Low        | N/A           | CoGP 4.4.27 |  |
| <b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>  |            |               |             |  |
| 5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?  | High       | N             | CoGP 4.4.18 | Site was clean and tidy. All cages were in good condition and nets were securely fitted to cages. No containment issues were identified during the inspection. |
| 5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?  | High       | Y             |             |  |

| Point of compliance  | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement                   | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary  |
|--|------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?  | Low        | Y             | SSI 2,2 ii                    | Net numbers corresponded with the Knox portal record.<br><br>Nets are not stored on site. If they are removed from the water, they are dispatched to Knox for storage or disposal.<br>Top nets, weighted nets, seal pro nets.                         |
| Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?   | Low        | Y             |                               |   |
| 5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?   | Low        | N/A           | CoGP 4.4.21                   |   |
| 5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)   |            | Y             |                               |   |
| 5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?   | High       | Y             | CoGP 4.4.28                   |   |
| 5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?  | Low        | Y             | MSA <sup>5</sup> 2010 P4, S21 | Lighthouse board report available for inspection.<br><br>Site specific plan detailing location of navigational markers available for inspection.  |
| 5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?  | Low        | Y             | MS Marine licence             |   |
| 5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?   | Low        | Y             | SSI 2,5                       |   |
| <b>d. Inspection of site specific procedures</b>   |            |               |                               |   |
| 6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?   | High       | Y             | CoGP 4.4.31                   | Risk Assessment and SOP available for inspection detailing the requirement for visual inspections of the nets by divers prior to stocking, moving and crowding fish.<br><br>Helicopters not used to stock this site. Fish arrive in wellboats by sea. |
| 6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-   |            |               | CoGP 4.4.32                   |   |
| a) nets should be secure   | High       | N/A           |                               |   |
| b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air   | High       | N/A           |                               |   |
| c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned           | High       | N/A           | CoGP 4.4.33                   |   |
| Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes |            |               |                               |   |

| Point of compliance   | Risk level    | Satisfactory? | Requirement                                     | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary        |
|---|---------------|---------------|---|---|
| <b>Additional actions</b>   | <b>Powers</b> |               |   | <b>Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary</b> |
| <b>e) Collection of samples</b><br>If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection    |               |               | Power granted under the Act – section 5 (3) (a) | N/A   |
| <b>h) Enforcement Notice.</b><br>If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail<br>Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice |               |               | Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)     | N/A   |

1 An 'escape event' can be defined as any circumstances on or in the vicinity of a fish farm which are believed to have caused an escape, or which may have given rise to a significant risk of an escape of fish.

2 FHI interpretation – Informing the SSPO is only a requirement where the site belongs to an Authorised Production Business which is signed up to the CoGP.

3 being waters which do not form part of the sea or any creek, bay or estuary or of any river as far as far as the tide flows

4 The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

Case No:

Site No:

**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) followed 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)
- 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: 2022-0200

Site No: FS0663

Date of Visit: 15/06/2022

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?

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       | F1-5                           | F6-10                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|               | Pool Group     |                                |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stock Details | Species        | SAL                            | SAL                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|               | Average weight | 277g                           | 277g                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|               | Sex            | N/A                            | N/A                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|               | Water Type     | SW                             | SW                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|               | Stock Origin   | Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328) | Barcaldine Smolt Unit (FS1328) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|               | Facility No    | 5                              | 6                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





Site No: FS0663

Case No: 2022-0200

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

|                    |          |                      |            |
|--------------------|----------|----------------------|------------|
| <b>BUSINESS No</b> | FB0125   | <b>DATE OF VISIT</b> | 15/06/2022 |
| <b>SITE No</b>     | FS0663   | <b>SITE NAME</b>     | Kerrera B  |
| <b>CASE No</b>     | 20220200 | <b>INSPECTOR</b>     | ██████████ |

### ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

An enhanced inspection to ascertain the risk of escape from the fish farm was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of facilities, records and the provision of advice.

#### **a) Inspection of i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures**

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

#### **b)i) Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site**

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

#### **b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training**

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

#### **b)iii) Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments**

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

#### **c) Inspection of site and site equipment**

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


#### **d) Inspection of site specific procedures**

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

## Further Action

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

Please do not hesitate to contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:..........  
Fish Health Inspector

Date:....23/06/2022.....

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at [www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter)

Scotland's Marine Atlas, an assessment of the condition of Scotland's seas, is available at [www.scotland.gov.uk/marineatlas](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marineatlas)

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

|                    |          |                      |            |
|--------------------|----------|----------------------|------------|
| <b>BUSINESS No</b> | FB0125   | <b>DATE OF VISIT</b> | 15/06/2022 |
| <b>SITE No</b>     | FS0663   | <b>SITE NAME</b>     | Kerrera B  |
| <b>CASE No</b>     | 20220200 | <b>INSPECTOR</b>     | ██████████ |

### 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.

An enhanced containment 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: 23/06/2022

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/>