

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------|------|
| Case No: | 2022-0477 | Date of visit: | 04/10/2022 | | | |
| Time spent on site: | 6h | Main Inspector: | | | | |
| Site No: | FS0605 | Site Name: | Creag an T'Sagairt (Loch Hourn) | | | |
| Business No: | FB0119 | Business Name: | Mowi Scotland Ltd | | | |
| Case Types: | 1 ECI | 2 CNI | 3 SLA | 4 VMD | 5 | 6 |
| Water Temp (°C): | 13.5 | Thermometer No: | T173 | FHI 045 completed | | |
| Observations: | Region: | HI | Water type: | S | CoGP MA: | M-22 |
| 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:

Additional peaks in salmon mortality in 2021 wk 30 1.32% 3604 (CMS), wk 31 1.61% 4426 (CMS), wk 32 1.90% 4139 (CMS), wk 38 3.80 4649 (transfer losses), wk 40 2.61% 6092 records detail 3538 fw to sw transfer loss, 2122 SW to SW. The FW to SW entry was confirmed to be an error when inputting data.

Additional peaks in lumpfish mortality 2020 wk 39 8594 9.23% (AGD & other non infectious causes), wk 41 7.78% 3695 AGD, handling and transport losses), wk 43 7.19% 6685 (no specific cause)

No issues reported with the new input, fish are feeding well.

Case No: **2022-0477** Site No: **FS0605**

Date of Visit: **04/10/2022** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|
| Total No facilities | 7 | Facilities stocked | 6 | No facilities inspected | 6 |
| Species | SAL | LUM | | | |
| Age group | 2022Q3 | 2022 | | | |
| No Fish | 1,126,705 | 104,535 | | | |
| Mean Fish Wt | 341g | 25g | | | |
| Next Fallow Date (Site) | Feb 2024 | | Next Input Date (Site) | Aug 2024 | |
| Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? | | | N | Any escapes (since last visit)? | N |
| If yes, detail: | | | | | |

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: **31/10/2019**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? Y
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? N/A

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? Y
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Ensiled - on site**
- If other detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **798/site last four weeks post transfer losses**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? Y
- If yes, detail: **see additional comments**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? N/A
- If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. Y

Treatments and Medicines Records

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Recent treatments (see comment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| If yes, detail: | T.M.S. SLICE | |
| If other, detail: | | |
| 2. Medicines records available for inspection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? | SLICE TMS | |
| If other, detail: | | |
| 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |

Biosecurity Records

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | y |
| 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? | <input type="checkbox"/> | y |
| 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained) mortality</i> at the site been included? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | y |
| 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | y |
| 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | y |
| If no, detail: | | |

Results of Surveillance

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? | <input type="checkbox"/> | y |
| 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 3. Any significant results? | <input type="checkbox"/> | N |
| If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). | | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Records checked between: | 31/10/19 to 4/10/2022 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|

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 | 1-7 | 8-13 | 14-19 | 20-25 | | | | | | | | |
| Pool Group | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Species | SAL | SAL | SAL | SAL | | | | | | | | |
| Average weight | 300g | 300g | 300g | 300g | | | | | | | | |
| Sex | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | | | |
| Water Type | SW | SW | SW | SW | | | | | | | | |
| Stock Details | | Loch Ness | Loch Ness | Loch Ness | Loch Ness | | | | | | | |
| | Stock Origin | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Facility No | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| Case Number: | 2022-0477 | Site No: | FS0605 | Insp: | | | |
| Date of Visit | 04/10/2022 | No of movements/supp./dest. | | | Score | | |
| Live fish movements | | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 | >10 | | |
| Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species | Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS | 0 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 0 | |
| | Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country | 0 | 9 | 18 | 26 | 0 | |
| | Number of suppliers | 0 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 0 | |
| Movements off | Frequency of movements off | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 10 | |
| | Number of destinations | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 3 | |
| Exposure via water | | Site contacts | | | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 |
| Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases) | Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole) | 0 | | | | | |
| | Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion | 1 | 2 | | 4 | 1 | |
| | Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion | 1 | 3 | | 6 | | |
| | Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion | 1 | 4 | | 8 | | |
| Management practices | | None | Secure | Unsecure | | | |
| Water contacts with processors | Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters | 0 | 1 | | 2 | 0 | |
| On farm processing within the rules of the directive | No on farm processing | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | Processing own fish (re-cycling risk) | 1 | | | | | |
| | Processing fish from MS of equivalent status | 2 | | | | | |
| | Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status | 4 | | | | | |
| | Processing fish from Category III farm | 8 | | | | | |
| | Processing fish from Category V farm | 10 | | | | | |
| Disposal of fish and fish by-products | Site's own waste only processed. | 0 | | | | 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 | | | | | |
| Biosecurity | | Number of sites | 1 | 2 or 3 | ≥ 4 | | |
| Contacts with other sites | Sites operating from single shorebase | 0 | 1 | | 2 | 0 | |
| | Sites sharing staff and equipment | 0 | 1 | | 2 | | |
| 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 | | | | | 14 | LOW | |

Case No: **2022-0477**

Site No: **FS0605**

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)
- | Bird nets | HDPE nets | Tensioned with froya ring |
|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|
| | | |
- 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: 2022-0477

Site No: FS0605

Date of Visit: 04/10/2022

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: 2022-0477 Site No: FS0605

Date of visit: 04/10/2022 Inspector(s):

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

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|--|
| 1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection? | Medium | Y | CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2, Annex 6 SSI 1,2, SSI 1,2(g) | |
| 1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ? (Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed and correct stages recorded ⁴) | Low & Medium | Y | | |
| 1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated? | Low | Y | | |
| 1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail. | Low | Y | | |
| 1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? | | N | Detail if necessary: | |

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

| | | | | |
|---|--------|-----|---------------------------------|--|
| 2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where: | | | | |
| a) <i>L. salmonis</i> record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment? | High | Y | CoGP Annex 6 | |
| b) <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems | High | N/A | CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50 | |
| 2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required? | Medium | Y | CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84 | |
| 2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of : | | | VMD ¹² 19 SSI 1,3 | |
| the name / identity of the product | High | Y | | |
| the date of administration | High | Y | | |
| the quantity (concentration and amount) administered | High | Y | | |
| the method of administration of the product | High | Y | | |
| the identification of the fish / facilities treated | High | Y | | |
| name of the person administering the treatment | Low | Y | | |
| the withdrawal period | Medium | Y | | |
| 2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon: | | | VMD 18 | |
| the name of the veterinary surgeon | High | N/A | | |
| name of the product | High | N/A | | |
| batch number | High | N/A | | |

| Point for consideration | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|--|------------|---------------|----------------------|--|
| the date of administration | High | N/A | | |
| amount administered | High | N/A | | |
| identification of fish treated | High | N/A | | |
| withdrawal period | Medium | N/A | | |
| 2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? | High | Y | | |
| Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site average <i>L.salmonis</i> numbers (all stages) | | | | |
| 2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their impact is there a record of: | Low | Y | SSI, 1,4 | |
| the nature and date of the method employed; the identification number of all facilities subjected to the method; the name of the person employing the method | | | | |
| 2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of: | | | VMD 19 | |
| proof of purchase of the medicine concerned | Medium | Y | VMD 17 | |
| name of the product | High | Y | | |
| batch number | High | Y | | |
| the date of purchase | Medium | Y | | |
| the quantity purchased | High | Y | | |
| the name and address of the supplier | Medium | Y | | |
| 2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of: | | | VMD 19 | |
| the date of disposal | Medium | N/A | | |
| the quantity of product involved | Medium | N/A | | |
| how and where it was disposed of | Medium | N/A | | |
| 2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice? | Medium | Y | CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83 | |
| Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments conducted on site | | | | |
| 2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed? | Medium | Y | CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88 | |
| 2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89 | |
| 2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89 | |
| 2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use, available to those responsible for treatment administration? | Medium | Y | CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87 | |

| Point for consideration | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|--|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice? | | Y | Detail if necessary: | |
| c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and farm management agreements or statements | | | | |
| 3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm? | Low | Y | SSI 1,5,b CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44 | Only site in management area however weekly health meeting conducted with area and regional manager with input from biology department, decision on treatments to be used will be made through his process. Minutes of these meetings are maintained and available for inspections Only site in management area however company wide discussions occur to make decisions on appropriate treatments and strategies to mitigate sea lice. |
| 3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the provisions of the NTS ⁶ ? | Low | Y | CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45 | |
| 3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 | |
| 3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider: -agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -coordinated monitoring and treatment -co-operation between participating farms This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c | |
| 3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites? | Low | N/A | SSI 1, 5, c | |
| 3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy? For example, the principles of ISLM include: Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD. The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice) Appropriate discharge consent in place Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary Monitoring lice numbers Using an array of treatments where possible Treating all stocks on site at the same time Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and certainly not on the same cohort of lice | Medium | Y | 4.3.82, 5.3.51 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Point for consideration | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|---|--------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities. | | | | |
| 3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area? | High | Y | CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47 | |
| 3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment'? | High | Y | CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48 | |
| 3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO? | Low | Y | CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49 | |
| 3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria? | High | Y | CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52 | |
| 3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)? | | Y | AFSA ¹³ 4A | Only site in area |
| 3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA? | Medium | N/A | Detail if necessary: CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57 | |
| 3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58 | |
| 3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59 | |
| 3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection? | Medium | Y | AFSA 4B | |
| 3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy? | Medium | Y | CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60 | |
| 3.17 If the FMA has been redefined , is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal? | High ¹⁰ | N/A | CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61 | |
| 3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) followed synchronously on a single year class basis? | High | Y | CoGP 4.3.100 | |
| 3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101? | High | N/A | CoGP 4.3.101 | |
| d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures | | | | |
| 4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site? | High | Y | CoGP 7.1.8 | Company has developed 'Mowi Academy' which details training in relation to sea lice identification and treatments |
| 4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to: | | | CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1 | |
| parasite identification | High | y | CoGP 4.3.84-86, | |
| counting parasites (procedures for) | High | y | 5.3.53-55 | |
| recording counts | High | y | | |
| biology and life cycle of parasites | Low | Y | | |
| symptoms of parasite infection in fish | Low | Y | | |

| Point for consideration | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|--|------------|---------------|--|--|
| <p>4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?</p> <p>N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this</p> <p>Where records exist regarding SOPs and site procedures these should be inspected to confirm suitability</p> | High | Y | CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53 | Two members of staff trained to administer treatments, certificate available. |
| e. Inspection of site and site stock | | | | |
| <p>5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?</p> | Medium | Y | VMD schedule 5 | |
| <p>5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?</p> | High | Y | | |
| <p>Refer to section e) of guidance notes</p> | | | | |
| <p>5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating to sea lice infestation?</p> | High | Y | | |
| f. Inspection of farm count procedures | | | | |
| <p>6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?</p> | Low | Y | CoGP Annex 6, | The company policy is to aim to sample all pens each week however, if factors such as staff availability/weather/time prevent this, the pens and fish would effectively be sampled at random as per the NTS. |
| <p>6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording?</p> <p>(Cross reference to training records – Section d)</p> | High | Y | 4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55 | |
| <p>6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?</p> | High | Y | CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54 | |
| <p>6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)?</p> <p>N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice</p> | Medium | Y | Annex 6 | |
| <p>6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct?</p> <p>Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are: for Caligus elongatus all identifiable stages and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)¹¹</p> | High | Y | Annex 6 | |
| <p>6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?</p> | Medium | Y | | |
| | | | | |
| g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures | | | | |
| <p>7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner?</p> <p>Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations, appropriate product used</p> | High | N/A | | |

| Point for consideration | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|---|------------|---------------|----------------------|--|
| 7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation? | High | N/A | CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85 | |
| 7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication? | | N/A | | |
| 7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this? | Medium | N/A | CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86 | |
| 7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment? | High | N/A | CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87 | |

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

- [1] Scottish Statutory Instrument – The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008
- [2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture
- [3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be
- [4] Recording requirements:- for C. elongatus – all identifiable stages and for L. salmonis - mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)
- [5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately
- [6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS
- [7] FMA = Farm Management Area
- [8] FMS = Farm Management Statement
- [9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement
- [10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18

| Point for consideration | Risk level | Satisfactory? | Requirement | Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary |
|--|------------|---------------|-------------|--|
| [11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate – for <i>Caligus elongatus</i> : mobiles; and for <i>Lepeophtheirus salmonis</i> : non-gravid mobiles and gravid females. | | | | |
| [12] VMD - The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033) | | | | |
| [13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended) | | | | |

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| BUSINESS No | FB0119 | DATE OF VISIT | 04/10/2022 |
| SITE No | FS0605 | SITE NAME | Creag an T'Sagairt (Loch Hourn) |
| CASE No | 20220477 | INSPECTOR | [REDACTED] |

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION

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

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

a) Inspection of sea lice records

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

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

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

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

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

d) Inspection of records relating to training and procedures

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

e) Inspection of site and site stock

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

f) Inspection of farm count procedures

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

g) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

No treatments were being administered at the time of inspection therefore, an appropriate assessment could not be made on administration procedures.

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

Signed:



Date: 11/10/2022

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 | FB0119 | DATE OF VISIT | 04/10/2022 |
| SITE No | FS0605 | SITE NAME | Creag an T'Sagairt (Loch Hourn) |
| CASE No | 20220477 | 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.

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.

R25

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 fish farm management agreements and statements, containment and escapes.

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

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 11/10/2022

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/>