FHI 059, Version 13	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0238			Date of visit: 21/07/2022
Time spent on site:	.5 hours	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS0749 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Holms Geo Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNA 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 13.11	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA: S-11
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail r	eason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Fish from Barcaldine (Aquagen)

28/05/2022 - 3/06/2022 SLICE all pens treated

VMD samples taken from pens 3 and 10 by

During site inspection no dead fish were observed. Fish deeper in water but those observed looked healthy with good feed reaction.

Remote inspection carried out by on 15/07/2022, supervised by supervised

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0238		Site No:	FS0749				
Date of Visit:		21/07/2022			Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	site representa	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made to	details?						Y	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	tions)					
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	б	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	SAL							
Age group	22S1							
No Fish	370,898							
Mean Fish Wt	530g							
Next Fallow Date (S	,	August 2023	3	Next Input Da	_	Jan 2024		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records	•							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe-							17/09/2020	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	?					Y
4. Are movement re		•		•				Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered?	?					Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outv	vith GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ice of transpoi	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nenection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Incinerated -	Shetland W	aste to Energ	V
If other detail:	- Caropossa s	··			ooratoa	Onotiona 11	doto to Energ	,
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
Wk 24: 116 fish (0.0%), Wk 25: 164 fish (0.0%), Wk 26: 116 fish (0.0%), Wk								
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 27: 194 fish (0.1%)								
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?								
•	If yes, detail: At the end of previous cycle due to CMS and complex gill disease 3/5/21 to 14/06/21 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? N/A							
•	inexplained)	nortalities be	en reported to	vecor Fri?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	ents' boon ro	norted to EUI	2 If no onter	detaile on mort	ality evente ob	neet.		V
. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								

Treatments and Medicines Records
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?
T.M.S., If yes, detail: Slice
If yes, detail: Slice If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.S., Slice
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
Biosecurity records available for inspection?
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?
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?
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?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?
C. Have the break and bigger with an account insulance and between each anidomical unit to uninimize
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.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?
If no, detail:
Results of Surveillance
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
3. Any significant results?
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).
Records checked between: 17/09/2020 - 21/07/2022

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI	F	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	sued by:	FHI			
Priority samples:		Case no:	2022-02	238	Site No:		FS0749					21/	07/2022	21/0
Starts/ends: Environmental conditions: 1 Dry 2 Cloudy 3 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG				1	
Pate			12:3	0:00	12:5	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. [10
Pool/Fish No		Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2	Cloudy	3		4		5			
Pool/Fish No		Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Fish nos	Δ													
Pool Group	Н		4	•	•	4	-	•	-	•	•	40		
Species	L		1	2	3	4	5	6	1	8	9	10		
Average weight			0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41		
Sex Details Sex Details														
Dock Details Barcldine (FS1328) Barcldine (FS1328)														
barcidine (FS1328)														
		Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW		
Facility No 3 3 3 3 10 10 10 10 1		Stock Origin	Barcldine		Barcldine	Barcldine		Barcldine		Barcldine	Barcldine			
	ť	Facility No	3	3	3	3	3	10	10	10	10	10		

07/2022 Additional Sample Information:													
0	ı	Total Te	ests ass	igned	0	١							

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0238		Site No:	FS0749		Insp:	
Date of Visit	21/07/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0		18	26	0
species	compartment in Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	0
							10
Movements off	Frequency of m Number of desi		0	3	6	10 10	3
Exposure via water	INGITIDE OF GES	Site contacts	0	1-5			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through		I			
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V					
	farms upstrean	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of	4				
	_	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	•	5	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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0]			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1	1			
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	7			0
	No		2				
					T-4-1		
					Total Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2022-0238		Site No:	FS0749	
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only)				
1. Has the site experier	nced sea lice problems in the	e previous 4 years?			N
		ent) fallowed synchronously			Υ
azamethiphos and ema		in-feed and bath sea lice me s access to suitable biologica of time?			es,
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e		agreement or statement rele	evant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm	Υ
5. Are sea lice count re	cords available for inspectio	n? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex	6)		Υ
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required stand	ard specified in the SSI and t	he CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6) Y
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		e suggested criteria for treatn	nent in the C	oGP during the period t	that N
	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i> 0/6/19) during the period that) numbers per fish been at a t records are inspected?	level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6	6/19) or Y
		Inspectorate? If no, FHI see			Υ
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is cor	nsidered to cause significant	welfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.	3.50) N
		or other actions taken when tus is considered to have we			
11. Has any other actio	n been taken (where applica	able)?			Υ
•		n had a significant impact up			Υ
		cooperation between partici			Y
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where	fewer populations or part po	pulations are	e held without treatment	t for Y
	ific written lice management luring the escalation of a sea	procedure with waypoints de a lice infestation?	scribing set a	actions to deal with	Y
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflec	t sea lice count data? If no p	lease detail r	easons.	Υ
O					
Containment Inspecti		e to predators in the current o	r previous pr	roduction cycles?	
		edation experienced on site?			
2.7 No modeli co in pia	oo to magato agamet are pre	Taken experienced on elle.	(Dotall Bolo)	.,	
If other, detail below:					
	nts or events been experienc estions 4 – 9. If No skip to qu	ced on or in the vicinity of the	site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
	oorted to Scottish Ministers?	lestion to			
•		h (where they exist)? (CoGP	- 44.37.54	1.17)	
		I fisheries trusts forthwith (wh		•	4.17)
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees	? If yes give detail			
8 If all note were deale	wed was this action agreed	with local wild fish interests a	nd was norm	nission diven by Scottic	h
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		with local wild fish fillerests a	ina was penn	nosion given by Scottist	
` •		he risk of further escapes? (I	Not covered i	n code but could	
	satisfactory measures of				
	•	s to containment? If no, pleas	se detail reas	on(s)	

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0238	Site No: FS0749	
Date of Visit: 21/07/20	022 Inspector:	
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection locate	ed within a farm management area?	v
If N, no further questions require con	_	
 Has a current farm management a Is the current FMAg/S available for Does the FMAg/S identify the relevance Does the FMAg/S identify the fish 	vant farm management area? farm site(s) to which it applies? e of commencement of the agreement or st	epared? Y Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Man 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the mini farm?	nagement imum health standards for the stocks to be	introduced to the area or
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the spe	cination requirements for stocks held in the ecies of fish which may be stocked into the aximum stocking density of any pen on any	area or farm?
	angements for the storage and disposal of m?	any dead fish from any fish
Arrangements for The Managemer 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrange	nt of Sea Lice ements for the sharing of data on sea lice r	numbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the ava	ailability and the use of medicines on farms	covered by the agreement
lice on farms in the area or individual		
used on farms in the area or individu	cumstances under which biological controls al farms? angements for synchronous treatments on	
	angements for synonionous accuments on	Tarris within the area:
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circ area or farm?	cumstances when live fish may be introduc	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the armor individual farms?	angements for the movement of live fish or	n and off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptab	le harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	ividual farms?
Fallowing 21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be resto	by which the area or individual farm will be fallocked?	
agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto	
covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be ke ?	pt on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Manag 24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to become	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or of the FMAg/S? 07/03/2022	statement?

Site No: FS0749

Case No: 2022-0238

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No: 2022-0238 Site No: FS0749

Date of visit: 21/07/2022 Inspector(s):

		Inspector(s):			
Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory	? Requiremen	t	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)					
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency pr	ocedures				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? If yes answer 1.2-1.8:	е	N			
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH Regs ⁴	31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO ² and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust? 1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37	, 5.4.17	
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	
I.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to ecapture?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.38	, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission ssued 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 2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			CoGP: 4.4.9, SSI 2,1	4.4.14,	
\		Facilities	Moorings	Nets	
a) The name of the manufacturer b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y N/A	Y N/A	Y N/A	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	N/A Y	IN/A	
d) The date of purchase	Low	N/A	Y	Y	Cages transferred from Greig when SSF bought over.
e) Each inspection including		.,,,			g
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Υ	Υ	Υ	
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Υ	Υ	Υ	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	V	V	Υ	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement		Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Υ	Υ	Y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling	High	N/A	Υ	Y	No repairs have ever been needed on the cages
treatment carried out					
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		15mm
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Υ			Morenot (in Scalloway)
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the	Low	Υ			
seabed as measured at the mean low water spring					
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	Υ	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Υ			
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Υ			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	Υ	1		
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Υ	1		1 ton double spade anchors
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y			·
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5		
which fish are farmed					
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters ³			SSI, 2,6		
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood	Low	N/A	1		
prevention or flood defence measures in place					
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such	Low	N/A			
measures		N.//			
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident 2.7 A record of-	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,7		
	Medium	N/A			
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	IN/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)		
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)		
Pen and mooring systems	i iigii	14// (CCI, 2, 11 (b)		
2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the	High	V	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.	13	
selection and installation of pens and moorings?	riigii	l'	COGF 4.4.0, 4.4.	13	
	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.	14	
of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly					
installed?					
2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.10		
2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified /	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.11		
experienced person(s)?					
2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4	.15	
the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring					
systems?					

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.16	
a) a documented SOP				
b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment				
2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.17	
2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.19	
size in relation to net size				
2.16 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.20	
into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site				
and include adequate safety margins? 2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	V	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.17 Are nets treated with a 6V inhibitor? 2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	V	CoGP 4.4.21	
the state of the s	_	T V		
2.19 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.20 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.23	Every month with ROV, daily checks when walking round cages
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	· V	CoGP 4.4.23	Every month warnes v, daily shooks when walking round suges
2.22 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and	High	<u>'</u>	CoGP 4.4.24	
weighted inspected frequently?	riigii	1	0001 4.4.24	
2.23 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred,	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.25	
or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?				
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training	I I i arb	N/	0.0D 7.4.0	Discounity // huriana vafrashara Facence Drawation and December
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Biosecurity/Hygiene refreshers, Escapes Prevention and Recapture
onsite activities documented? 3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for	High	V	SSI 2,6,a	Training and RSPCA Refreshers are all done annually
each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations?	riigii	1	331 2,0,a	
(This excludes well boat operations)				
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a	High	Υ	SSI 2,7,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?				-
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk asse	ssments			
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	
considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?				
4.0 Defere weeeds wee are conducted as after one the fall of the			C=CD 4 4 30 5 4 43	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
place: a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y	331 2,7, D , 331 2, 8, C	
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	V		
c) contangency plan	riigii	· ·		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	Υ	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used	Low	Υ	SSI 2,6,c	Lily Mae has 2" steel pipe rope guards that are welded to the hull.
on the site				The Norlax has 2" flat bar basket with 1/2" enclosure bars.
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining	Medium	Υ	CoGP 4.4.26	Seal management code of good practice
the risk of predator attack?				
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.4.26	Yearly and before certain tasks
requency?				
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site			SSI, 2,8,a	
at which fish are farmed including:				
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Υ		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	No lethal means are used on site.
the site				
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7	Low	Υ	CoGP 4.4.27	
considered?				
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.18	
fish sizes present on site?				

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	Υ	SSI 2,2 ii	
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet	Low	Υ		
the inventory?				
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.21	No nets currently out of water
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site?		Υ		Seal pro nets, double nets, bird nets, rentokill for shorebase
(Provide detail if necessary)				
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents	High	Υ	CoGP 4.4.28	
damage to nets and pens?		V	5	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA ⁵ 2010 P4,	
501		V	S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
requirements?	Lave	V	00105	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	ĭ	SSI 2,5	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.31	
during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	3			
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s)			CoGP 4.4.32	
properly prepared:-				
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		No helicopter transfers are ever conducted
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	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should				
be manned				
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				

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

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

					0.1/0-1/22				
Case No:	2022-0238	J		Date of visit	21/07/2022	4			
Site No:	FS0749	1		Inspector					
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	+								
	+								
	1								
	-								
	1								
	4								
	+								
	+								
	+								
	+								
	+								
Report Summary]					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, SLI, VMD	29/07/2022								
CNA	16/08/2022								
	+								
	_								
	+								
	+								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0125
 Date of Visit
 21/07/2022

 Site No
 FS0749
 Site Name
 Holms Geo

 Case No
 20220238
 Inspector

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.

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.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/08/2022

R10

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
 FB0125
 DATE OF VISIT
 21/07/2022

 SITE NO
 FS0749
 SITE NAME
 Holms Geo

 CASE NO
 20220238
 INSPECTOR

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice) and section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites and fish farm management agreements.

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.



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/