FHI 059, Version 13	Iss	ued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0523			Date of visit: 25/10/2022
Time spent on site:	1 Hour 30 Minutes	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS1095	Site Name:	Cliff Site	
Business No: FB0095	Business Name:	Cooke Aquaculture Scotland I	_td
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.96	Thermometer No:	T309	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observe	ed?		rmation/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	y out intended visit detail re	ason below:	

FHI 059, Version 13 Issued by: FHI Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Additional Case Information:

Site inspection and paper work conducted by , observed by

1 VMD sample collected and sampled by _____.

Visibility was very poor during the time of inspection, fish were observed responding well to routine feeding operations. Some fish were clearly observed when caught in a hand net for removal for VMD sampling and appeared healthy. Mortality onsite has been very low since the date of input.

Some Blue Green algae was observed on the waters surface within an empty pen and a small amount in Pen 3. Historically the Loch has been heavily affected by blooms of blue green algae however the fish have never suffered any health issues as a result

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0523		Site No:	FS1095				
Date of Visit:		25/10/2022]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho								
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	details?						Y	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)			_		
Total No facilities		6	Facilities sto	cked	5	No facilitie	s inspected	6
Species	SAL							
Age group	2023							
No Fish	300,000							
Mean Fish Wt	30g							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	November 2	022	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	July 2023		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						Ì	,	
Movement Records	•							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		i inopeodon.					15/10/2019	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered?	>				10/10/2010	Y
4. Are movement re				,				Ÿ
5. Are records comp								
6. Are health certification				able?				N/A
			02, 4,4					
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen								N
If yes, is there a syst	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities	es disposed of	f?			Whole fish -	TWMA (She	etland)	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
			Week 42 (59	9, 0.02%), Wee	ek 41 (71, 0.02	2%), Week 4	40 (45, 0.02%), Week 39
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		(62, 0.02%).					
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	typical mortal	lities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								
7. Have increased (u	ınexplained) ı	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

To the said Medicines Decode		
Treatments and Medicines Records		N
Recent treatments (see comment)? If yes, detail:		IN
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection?		
Are records complete and correctly entered?	-	V
Are fish in a withdrawal period?	-	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		-
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
o. Are medicines stored appropriately:	_	
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	g and safe disposal been considered?	Y
Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottist		
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	, procession of the same	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence	e or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified		Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked or	n the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?		
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented by	between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visito	rs, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to	o maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented	ed 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?	-	T NI
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Records checked between: 15/	/10/2019 - 25/10/2022	
Necolus checked between.	110/2019 - 25/10/2022	

THE 055, VEISION 15								ueu by. i				
Case no:	2022-05	23	Site No:		FS1095			Date of Samplin		25/1	10/2022	25/
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA	=	MG	Sampiin	g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	12:3	0:00		Inspecto	r:			VMD No). 	1
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	=	5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1											
Pool Group												
Species	SAL											
Average weight	50g											
Sex	N/Ă											
Water Type	FW											
Stock Origin Facility No	യ Quoys Hatchery											

10/2022 Additional Sample Information:														
0 Total Tests assigned 0														
				-										

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	f issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0523		Site No:	FS1095		Insp:	
Date of Visit	25/10/2022		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	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	3
Movements on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through corehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V 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		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	•	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent statu	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	Ī			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised 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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0]			0
	No		2	1			
					Total		13
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2022-0523	Site No:	FS1095	
 Is the CoGP Farm M Does the site have a azamethiphos and ema 	Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? flanagement Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously of access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice mediamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological in a reasonable period of time?	dications (in	cluding deltamethrin,	<u>,</u>
4. Is there a signed doo Management Area (or e	cumented farm management agreement or statement rele- equivalent)?	vant to the s	site and CoGP Farm	
	ecords available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6 ely reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and th	•	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatme? (CoGP Annex 6)	ent in the C	coGP during the period that	
	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a le 0/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	evel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	
•	n reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see o			
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered to cause significant w	elfare probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
suggested criteria for tr	reatments been administered or other actions taken when reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have well on been taken (where applicable)?			
•	reatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon	on the lice le	evels recorded?	
	ere conducted, carried out in cooperation between particip ng strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations	_		
	ific written lice management procedure with waypoints des scalation of a sea lice infestation?	cribing set	actions to deal with recognised	d
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ease detail ı	reasons.	
	ion nced equipment damage due to predators in the current or ce to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (N Y
If other, detail below:				
If Yes proceed with que 4. Have these been rep 5. Have these been rep	ents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 ported to Scottish Ministers? ported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – ported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where	- 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	N
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deplo	oyed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests ar	nd was pern	nission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoG				
	r satisfactory measures of the Act)	or covered	iii code put codid	
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please	e detail reas	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Site No: FS1095

Case No: 2022-0523

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2022-0523			Date of visit:	25/10/2022						
Site No:	FS1095	1		Inspector:							
Site IVO.	1 0 1093			mspecior.							
Results Summary	Freq.			tion							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, VMD	16/11/2022										





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0095
 DATE OF VISIT
 25/10/2022

 SITE NO
 FS1095
 SITE NAME
 Cliff Site

CASE NO 20220523 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 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.

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.

R04

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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/