

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2022-0529"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="26/10/2022"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text" value="4 Hours"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text" value=""/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS0948"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Easter Score Holms"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0125"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Scottish Sea Farms Ltd"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNA"/>	3 <input type="text" value="SLI"/>	4 <input type="text" value="VMD"/>	5 <input type="text" value=""/>	6 <input type="text" value=""/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="11.27"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="T309"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value=""/>	
Observations:	Region:	SH	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	S-11
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="N"/>					

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Site inspection and paper work conducted by [REDACTED], observed by [REDACTED].

Site inspected in rough weather, visibility was poor and fish were residing deep within the pen. No moribund or lethargic fish observed during the physical inspection of the site.

Routine sea lice counts were being conducted during the time of visit, externally no clinical signs of disease was observed.

Moderate to severe gill damage was observed in most fish checked during the lice counts with most fish checked scoring high for PGD. There was a bloom of muggiaea atlantica (micro jellyfish) confirmed at the site in early October which has compromised gill health along with a touch of seasonal AGD. Staff have been monitoring the site daily for plankton levels and has confirmed that jellyfish counts in recent weeks have decreased. With the water temperature on site decreasing the site is hopeful to see an improvement in gill health in the coming weeks. Mortality has remained low and below reporting threshold for this production cycle.

The site treated with FW in week 42, Pen 3 suffered a treatment loss of 5,904 fish resulting from a handling error. Site still below reporting threshold for the week despite this loss.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy from internal examination with the exception of the gills.

Case No: **2022-0529** Site No: **FS0948**  
 Date of Visit: **26/10/2022** 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	12	Facilities stocked	11	No facilities inspected	12
Species	SAL				
Age group	2022				
No Fish	777,798				
Mean Fish Wt	1.6kg				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	09/2023	Next Input Date (Site)	01/2024		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:	Seasonal AGD, CGD bloom of Muggiaea Atlantica				

**Movement Records**

- 1. Movement records available for inspection?  Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: **20/10/2020**
- 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)?  N
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?

**Mortality Records**

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection?  Y
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
- If other detail: **Whole fish removal by SEM and / or Pelagia**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?  Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **Week 41 (0.2%, 1596), Wk 40 (0.3%, 2627), Wk 39 (0.1%, 961), Wk 38 (0.1%, 1030)**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?  Y
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:  
**Pen 3, Week 42 - Total mortality was 5,904 out of a total facility stock of 70,000. Mortality attributed to treatment loss, occurring from a handling error resulting in the over crowding of fish post FW treatment.**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?  N
- If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 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.                   |   |
| 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)?                  | T.M.S                    |   |
| 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)</i> mortality 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"/> | Y |
| If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).                           |                          |   |

Moderate to severe , acute to chronic gill damage reported by Vet on 05/10/2022

Records checked between: 20/10/2020 - 21/10/2022

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	1	2	3	4	5							
Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5							
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL							
Average weight	1.6kg	1.6kg	1.6kg	1.6kg	1.6kg							
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW							
Stock Details		Langa Isle (East)	Langa Isle (East)	Langa Isle (East)	Langa Isle (East)	Langa Isle (East)						
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	2	3	5	6	9							



Case Number:	2022-0529	Site No:	FS0948	Insp:		
Date of Visit	26/10/2022	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		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
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	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		
<b>Management practices</b>		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 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				
	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				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	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				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>21</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>



Case No: **2022-0529**

Site No: **FS0948**

**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)

Top nets, Double

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: 2022-0529

Site No: FS0948

Date of Visit: 26/10/2022

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?



Site No: FS0948
Case No: 2022-0529
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



Case No: 2022-0529 Site No: FS0948

Date of visit: 26/10/2022 Inspector(s):

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

**ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)**

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

1.1. Have escape incidents or events <sup>1</sup> been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? <b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b>		N		
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH Regs <sup>4</sup> 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO <sup>2</sup> and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? 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	See on site - Risk assessment seen.

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

General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1		
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			Facilities	Moorings	Nets
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Y	Y	Nets manufactured by Knox Hvalasund. Gael Force - Manufacture for Moorings. AKVA Pens 120m.  Same as manufacture - Hvalasund bought over by Gael force potentially. Moorings supplied by geal Force. AKVA Pens.
b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y	Y	Y	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	Y	Y	Hvalpsund nets deployed to sea 01/08/2022, purchased 30/08/2019. Double netting onsite, Hvalpsund net is on the outer, Knox net on the inner. Knox nets deployed to sea 22/08/2022, purchased 26/07/2022. Manufactured 01/09/2017. Moorings purchased 17/06/2021. Pens manufactured 01/10/2018.
e) Each inspection including I) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	N	Y	Y	Ocean Kinetics divers contracted to inspect nets. [REDACTED] Ocean Kinetics, [REDACTED] also inspect the moorings by ROV survey. Last inspection 30th June - 1st July. Inspected twice annually. The site is currently looking for pen inspection records, they are aware that AKVA did the inspections prior to the change of business ownership but they don't not have the reports to hand. This was due to the changeover from Grieg to SSF, information stored on a old system that they don't have access to. Plan is to get AKVA to conduct inspections in future, they recon the pens were last inspected 08/21 in Skye at Grieg sites before the turnover. The site has the correct system in place on Aquacom for recording pen inspections when they next are due to take place.
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	N	Y	Y	Nets last inspected 16/08/2022, inspected every month.
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	N	Y	Y	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	N	Y	Y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	N	Y	Y	Outcome recorded on Aquacom for net inspections. Outcome of any repairs stored on aquacom for moorings within the ROV survey reports.
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
I) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		HDPE nets 15mm on the Knox net and 20mm Hvalpsund nets.
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y			Used to store with Mornaut, renting a sizable storage facility in scalloway for any nets not in use.
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 29 m, water depth 55m.
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
I) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3		Constructed 1st June 2022 at Easter Score Holms.
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y			Plastic
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y			120m cages
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
I) The date of installation	Low	Y			14/05/2022
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y			

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5	
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters <sup>3</sup>			SSI, 2,6	
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A		
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	N/A		
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A		
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A		
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	Site diary or aqua com if any event was to occur.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)	Recorded in aquacom if any damage was to occur.
<b>Pen and mooring systems</b>				Pen systems inspected daily by suitably trained site staff.
2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	
2.9 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	Nets tested every 18 months to 2 years, every production cycle.
2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
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?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
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	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	Divers inspect visually every month, also checked daily by site staff and recorded in the site dairy.
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>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Signed copy - see onsite for SOPs
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	Y	SSI 2,7,a	
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	8m Catermarin, Leco Marine Small open boat. Cater Marin has a propeller guard fitted.  Held onsite
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:	High		CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13	
a) a documented risk assessments		Y	SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
b) standard operating procedures		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	Low			
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site		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		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
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:			SSI, 2,8,a	



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
The type and location of each net, fence and scarcer deployed - The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site 4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,8,b  CoGP 4.4.27	
	Low	N/A		
	Low	N/A		
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site? 5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	N	CoGP 4.4.18	
	High	Y		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags? Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	Two of the nets checked, Pen 2 and Pen 6 were missing identification tags on outer net. Issue raised onsite during the time of inspection and the site has agreed to replace the missing tags,
	Low	N		
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 <sup>5</sup> 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	
<b>d. Inspection of site specific procedures</b>				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.31	Nets inspected minimum of 3 days prior of any movement and 5 days post. Divers, visual inspection.
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>Additional actions</b>	<b>Powers</b>			<b>Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary</b>
<b>e) Collection of samples</b> 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)			
<b>h) Enforcement Notice.</b> 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

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0125	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	26/10/2022
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0948	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Easter Score Holms
<b>CASE No</b>	20220529	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[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 site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice however historical inspection records for pens were unable to be inspected. This was due to the current site owners not having access to the previous records.

**It is advised that to meet the requirements of schedule 2, section 1 (e – f) of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 a record should be maintained in relation to the inspection of pens, including the following information :**

**(e) each inspection including –**

- (i) the name of the person conducting the inspection;**
- (ii) the date of each inspection;**
- (iii) the place of each inspection; and**
- (iv) the outcome of each inspection; and**

**(f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out.**

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

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

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

R10

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 net ID tags that were missing on two of the nets, this was raised and resolved while on site, no 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 do not hesitate to contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.



Signed:.....

Date : 15/12/2022

Fish Health Inspector

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

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

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0125	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	26/10/2022
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0948	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Easter Score Holms
<b>CASE No</b>	20220529	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[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 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), section 4A regarding 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: 02/11/2022

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/>

