FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0544			Date of visit: 08/11/2022
Time spent on site:	2.5 Hours	Main Inspec	tor:
Site No: FS0907 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch na Thull Loch Duart Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.06	Thermometer No:	T309	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site inspection and paper work conducted by **setting**, supervised by **setting**.

Site recently stocked with fish from Duartmore Hatchery on 28th October.

Fish have had a successful input, mortality across the site is low and the fish have taken to their feed well. Upon physical inspection of the site, fish were observed shoaling well and responding positively to routine feeding operations. No clinical signs of disease observed.

Historically the site has experienced some predation from cormorants, scare scrows have been installed on site to try mitigate future predation.

FHI 059, Version 13	3		Issued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0544	Site No:	FS090	7			
Date of Visit:		08/11/2022		Inspector(s):	:		
	tails summary	ails checked by site repres	entative?			Y	1
2. Changes made to) details?					Y	
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis						
Total No facilities Species		6 Facilities	s stocked	6	No facilitie	es inspected	6
Age group	SAL 2023						
No Fish	2023 180,960						
Mean Fish Wt	79g						
Next Fallow Date (S		March 2023	Next Input D	Date (Site)	October 2	023	
Recent (last 4 wks)	· ·			N Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:					·		
 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certific Transport Records 1. Are any movement 	ection: plete and corre ecords availabl plete and corre cates for introd s ents carried out stem in place fo	ectly entered? ble for dead fish and wa	ivailable? ie business (not us			09/12/2019	Y N Y N/A
1. Mortality records		nspection?					Y
2. How are mortalitie		•		Other (detail	l)		
If other detail:		waste collection point at	Badcall office.				
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly entered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (· /		4 (24, 0.01%) Fish	n input 28/10/2	.022		
5. Evidence of recer							N
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality per	r facility/no stock per fac	cility/reason:				
							N
• •	in mortality du	uring period checked?					N
If yes, detail:		talities keen report					N/A
•	• • •	mortalities been reporte	ad to vet of FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action: 8 Have 'mortality ev		ported to FHI? If no, en	ster details on mo	rtality events s	shoet		N/A
0. Have mortanty c	Chilo Deenne	pulled to r m m mo, er	Itel ucialis on mo	Itality Events 5	AICCL.		

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Ν
If yes, detail:	
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?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(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	y
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 dis	ease
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	r Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimi	se Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
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: 09/12/2019 - 07/11/2022	

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

		Issued by. I Th			Date	01 100000	. 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2022-0544		Site No:	FS0907		Insp:	
Date of Visit	08/11/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	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	5	10	14	0
Mayamanta off		•					
Movements off	Frequency of n Number of des		0	3	6	10 10	3
Exposure via water	Number of des	Site contacts		1-5			
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	e or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		e or in a coastal zone with category III	1	3	6		
	•	n or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V		3	0		
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	ocessing	0	1			
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)					0
	-	n from MS of equivalent status	1				
	-	n from zone or compartment of	2				<u> </u>
	equivalent stat		4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	•	5				<u> </u>
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				1
CoGP/Regulator	•			1			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		13
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0544	Site No:	FS0907
	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single y	
-	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or med of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
 Are sea lice count records available for insp Do records adequately reflect the required s 	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (I	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels belorecords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the perio	nonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or ad that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which i	ealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> <i>longatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication	
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	•• •	
•	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le out in cooperation between participating farms	
	where fewer populations or part populations are	
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice in	ment procedure with waypoints describing set a nfestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail r	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
•	ge due to predators in the current or previous p	roduction cycles?
	he predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
Top nets Scare Crows		
If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site since th	ne last FHI inspection? N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minist		
	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	I local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	reed with local wild fish interests and was pern	nission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and minir	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measured		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re-	egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s) Y

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2022-0544			Date of visit:	08/11/2022			
Site No:	FS0907	1		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	_			te of Notifica		-	
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-	-		_				
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI, CNI	26/01/2023	3	





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS No
 FB0398

 SITE No
 FS0907

 CASE No
 20220544

DATE OF VISIT08/11/2022SITE NAMELoch na ThullINSPECTOR

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 inadequately 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.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

FS numbers not recorded in the movement book, site manager has agreed that this will be done in future.

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.



Date: 26/01/2023

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/