

Case No:	2022-0360	Date of visit:	25/08/2022			
Time spent on site:	4 hours	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS1053	Site Name:	Hogan			
Business No:	FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNA	3 SLI	4 VMD	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	13.4	Thermometer No:	T309	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region:	SH	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	S-10
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 inspection and paperwork conducted by [REDACTED], supervised by [REDACTED].
VMD samples collected by [REDACTED].

Site recently stocked with fish transferred from Burrastow (FS0666) and Cloudin (FS0088). Mortality has been very low since the date of input. All epidemiological units were inspected onsite with no clinical signs of disease observed. Fish appear to be in good health, shoaling well and were observed responding positively to feed. Only 3 moribund / lethargic fish observed across the site during the time spent on site.

Mortality levels on site have not exceeded reporting levels since last inspection.

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="12"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="12"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="12"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="2021 S0"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="399,708"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="2.168Kg"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="March / April 2023"/>	Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="April / May 2024"/>		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	<input type="text" value="N"/>		Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
If yes, detail:	<input type="text"/>				

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

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? Y
 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? Y
 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any *increased (unexplained)* mortality at the site been included? Y
 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and *how* and *when* that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? Y
 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)? Y
 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)? Y
 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? Y
 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? Y
 If no, detail:

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? Y
 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? Y
 3. Any significant results? N
 If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between: 04/10/2018 - 25/08/2022

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										
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL										
Average weight	2.2Kg	2.2Kg										
Sex	N/A	N/A										
Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details												
Stock Origin	Cloudin	Burrastow										
Facility No	6	12										

08/2022 Additional Sample Information:

Total Tests assigned

Case Number:	2022-0360	Site No:	FS1053	Insp:		
Date of Visit	25/08/2022	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	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	0
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				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	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					8	LOW

Case No: **2022-0360**

Site No: **FS1053**

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

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

Containment Inspection

- 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)
- 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: 2022-0360

Site No: FS1053

Date of Visit: 25/08/2022

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

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

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

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

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

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

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

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

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

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

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

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

Live Fish Movements

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

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

Harvesting

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

Fallowing

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

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

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

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

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

Management and operation

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

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

Site No: FS1053

Case No: 2022-0360

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No: 2022-0360 Site No: FS1053

Date of visit: 25/08/2022 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 ¹ been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? If yes answer 1.2-1.8:		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?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? 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	Provided.

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

General records	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Facilities: Y Moorings: Y Nets: Y	Manufactured and supplied by Gael Force, Moorings installed as standard. NETS : Deployed in sea 01.07.2022, 100m, 12 m deep nets KX - W.&J Knox Ltd Pens 100m, Fusion Marine.
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A	N/A	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y	Nets purchased 01/06/2022
d) The date of purchase	Low	N	N	Y	
e) Each inspection including					New nets, Moranot Scalloway. Inspection notes to be checked for previous cycle / generation of nets.
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	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					Moorings inspected by ROV - Roving eye, last inspection 16th September 2020. Pens all inspected by internal staff via daily checks. New nets have just been installed on site. Pens routinely (weekly) inspected by trained members of staff. Site staff follow a documented SOP for the inspection of the pen group and all trained staff have signed the SOP to confirm their competence in this role.
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			Nets checked daily and any notes of damage and or repair are noted on AquaCom within the daily check sheets.
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					25mm abature net, 12 meters deep.
i) The date of construction	Low	N	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y			
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y			Moramount, Scalloway. Same for net disposal.
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-					Depths recorded in the sites hydrographic survey report.
i) The date of installation	Low	Y	SSI, 2,4		
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y			Cages thought to vary in ages, dating back between 2012 - 2016. No exact date of construction provided.
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 ³					Black plastic, Fusion Marine Ocean flex - Polyethylene pens. 100m
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			500kg SeaQure Anchors, 42.5 m 40mm SeaQure Rope.
					One on the barge and one on pen 7, navigation lights.

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low Low	N/A N/A	SSI, 2,7 SSI, 2,11 (a)	Comments added Fish talk if any weather were to prevent any work procedures on site. Any damage to site from weather would be noted on Aqua Com under daily checks. To date no damage has been caused to the site by any severe weather events.
2.7 A record of- a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	N/A		
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A		
Pen and mooring systems 2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings? 2.9 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed? 2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines? 2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)? 2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems? 2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High High High High High High	Y Y Y Y Y Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13 CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14 CoGP 4.4.10 CoGP 4.4.11 CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15 CoGP 4.4.16	Site modelled and inspected by Gael force prior to installation of pens and moorings. There are signed documented SOPs in place for inspecting pen systems.
2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards? 2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size 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? 2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor? 2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High High High Low High	Y Y Y N Y	CoGP 4.4.17 CoGP 4.4.19 CoGP 4.4.20 CoGP 4.4.21 CoGP 4.4.22	Mesh break strain is 154K/g. Nets onsite at the time of inspection were recently installed at the beginning of the cycle (07/22) and are yet to be inspected. Based on previous generations of nets used at the site they have been inspected every cycle. Evidence of previous net inspection notes has been seen.

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.19 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	Recorded on AquaCom. Daily checks, and checked through the annual ROV survey. No damage nets or associated fittings has occurred to date. New nets installed this cycle.
2.20 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.22 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.23 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.25	

b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training

3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	No completed training record for staff members in relation to containment and prevention of escaped fish, and recovery of escaped fish were 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	
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	N	SSI 2,7,a	

b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments

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	3 Catamaran, 2 small work boats.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 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	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,c	
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	Live document, updated regularly as and when required.
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including: The type and location of each net, fence and scarcer deployed	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,8,a	
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.27	
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 fish sizes present on site?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.18	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags? Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low Low	Y N	SSI 2,2 ii	Two of the net tag identification numbers on site did not match that of shown on the site plan. This was raised with site management on the date of inspection and has since been resolved. Seal pro nets, top nets
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	Y	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 ⁵ 2010 P4, S21	
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	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
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	Divers check done prior to any live fish movements.
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
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 and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection	Power granted under the Act – section 5 (3) (a)			
h) Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)			

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0095	DATE OF VISIT	25/08/2022
SITE No	FS1053	SITE NAME	Hogan
CASE No	20220360	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

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 following recommendations are made for improvement.

To meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 1(d) of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 farmers should hold on record the date of purchase for the facilities and moorings.

To meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 3(i) of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 farmers should hold on record the date of construction in relation to each facility (pen) on site.

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

The following recommendations have been made for improvement.

It is recommended that in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (Chapter 7, point 1.8) training should be an integral part of the operation of all finfish aquaculture businesses, with programmes and plans relevant to the various activities being documented. This should include training in relation to containment and prevention of the escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish in relation to any transfer of, or handling of fish.

To meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 7(a) of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 a record must be kept of all training of each person working there in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish.

R10

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

A minor issue was raised regarding site specific equipment. Two of the pen identification tag numbers on site did not match what was recorded on the site plan. This was raised with site representative and has since been corrected. No further action is 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.

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by 06/03/2023. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Date: 015/09/2022

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	FB0095	DATE OF VISIT	25/08/2022
SITE No	FS1053	SITE NAME	Hogan
CASE No	20220360	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 low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

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

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

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

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

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

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

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

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

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: 01/09/2022

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/>