| FHI 059, Version 13 | ls | sued by: FHI | Date of issue: 12/05/2020 |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Case No: 2022-0545 | | | Date of visit: 10/11/2022 |
| Time spent on site: | 2.5 Hours | Main Inspect | tor: |
| Site No: FS0890 Business No: FB0341 | Site Name: Business Name: | Jubilee Loch Shin Migdale Smolts Ltd | |
| Case Types: 1 ECI | 2 CNI 3 VMD | 4 5 | 6 |
| Water Temp (°C): 9.06 | Thermometer No: | Т309 | FHI 045 completed |
| Observations: | Region: HI | Water type: F | CoGP MA |
| Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease obser 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 car | ry out intended visit detail r | eason below: | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Dead/weak/abnormally behavir Clinical signs of disease obser Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? | ng fish present? ved? | N If yes, see additional info N If yes, see additional info N If yes, see additional info N | ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. |

Additional Case Information:

Site inspection and paper work conducted by setting, observed by

Visibility was poor due to dark and peaty water. A few fish were observed with light fungus in a few pens but the vast majority of fish observed appeared healthy. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally.

Fish are currently in withdrawal for AQUACEN (Formalin).

| FHI 059, Version 13 | | | lssu | ed by: FHI | | | Date of issu | e: 12/05/2020 |
|---|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Case No: | 2022-0545 |] | Site No: | FS0890 |] | | | |
| Date of Visit: | | 10/11/2022 | 2 | | Inspector(s): | | | 1 |
| Registration/Autho 1. Business/site deta | | | ite representa | ative? | | | Y | 1 |
| 2. Changes made to | - | | | | | | Y | 1 |
| Site Details (includ | e cleaner fis | h for all sect | ions) | | | | | |
| Total No facilities | | 32 | Facilities sto | cked | 18 | No facilitie | s inspected | 32 |
| Species | SAL | | | T | | | 1 | |
| Age group | 2023 | | | | | | | |
| No Fish | 990,023 | | | | | - | | |
| Mean Fish Wt | 85g | | | | | - | | |
| Next Fallow Date (S | | 03/2023 | | Next Input Da | ate (Site) | 07/2023 | | |
| Recent (last 4 wks) | | | | | Any escapes | | visit)? | N |
| If yes, detail: | | iems. | | | Any cooupes | | viole): | |
| n yes, actan. | | | | | | | | |
| Movement Records | 5 | | | | | | | |
| 1. Movement record | | r inspection? | | | | | | Y |
| 2. Date of last inspe | | | | | | | 07/12/2021 | |
| 3. Are records comp | | ectly entered? | 7 | | | | | Y |
| 4. Are movement re | | • | | , | | | | Y |
| 5. Are records comp | | | | | | | | Y |
| 6. Are health certific | | • | | able? | | | | N/A |
| | | | , | | | | | |
| Transport Records | ; | | | | | | | |
| 1. Are any movemen | nts carried ou | t by (or on be | half) of the bu | isiness (not us | ing a STB)? | | | N |
| If yes, is there a syst | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Mortality Records | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Mortality records a | | • | | | | | | Y |
| 2. How are mortalitie | es disposed o | of? | | | Incinerated - | on site | | |
| If other detail: | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Mortality records of | complete and | correctly ente | | | | | | Y |
| | | | | 9, 0.40%), Wk | 43 (2923, 0.39 | %), Wk 42 (* | 1700, 0.2%), | Wk 41 1593, |
| 4. Recent mortality (| · · · · · | | 0.2%). | | | | | |
| 5. Evidence of recen | | | | | | | | N |
| If yes, facility nos/no | mortality per | Tacility/no sto | ock per facility | /reason: | | | | |
| | | · · · · · | | | | | | N |
| 6. Any other peaks in | n mortality du | iring period ch | necked? | | | | | N |
| If yes, detail: | | | | | | | | NI/ A |
| 7. Have increased (u | unexplained) | mortalities be | en reported to | o vet or FHI? | | | | N/A |
| If yes, detail action: | | | 0.14 | | | | | |
| 8. Have 'mortality ev | ents' been re | ported to FHI | ? If no, enter | details on mor | tality events sl | neet. | | N/A |

| Treatments and Medicines Records | |
|--|---|
| 1. Recent treatments (see comment)? | N |
| 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? | Y |
| 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? Aquacen | |
| If other, detail: T.M.S | |
| 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? | Y |
| | |
| Biosecurity Records | |
| 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? | Y |
| 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? | Y |
| 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any | |
| increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included? | Y |
| 4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease | |
| is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? | Y |
| 5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher | Y |
| health status, certification if required)? | |
| | |
| 6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise | 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: 07/12/2021 - 10/11/022 | |

| F | HI 059, Version 13 | | | | | | | lssu | led by: F⊦ | 11 | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|------|--------|-----------|------|-------------|----|--------|-------------|------------------|
| | Case no: | 2022-0 | 545 | Site No: | F | FS0890 | | | Date of vis | | 10/1 | 11/2022 | 10/ ⁻ |
| l | Priority samples: | VI | | BA | | PA | | MG | Sampling: | н | | | |
| | Time sampling starts/ends: | 12:3 | 0:00 | 13:0 | 0:00 | | Inspector | r: | | | VMD No | р. [| 6 |
| | Environmental conditions: | 1 | Indoors | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | | |
| | Summary samples | HIST | | BA | | MG | | VI | | PA | | Total Sa | mples |
| A | dd Fish/Pools - click | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pool/Fish No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Fish nos | 1-6 | 7-12 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pool Group | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Species | SAL | SAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Average weight | 80g | 80g | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sex | N/A | N/A | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Water Type | FW | FW | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stock Details | Stock Origin Facility No | Mill Burn (Old Mill) (FS0831) | 6 Mill Burn (Old Mill) (FS0831) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0) | | 12 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | |

| 11/2022 | Additio | nai Sam | pie intor | mation: | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | I | Total T | ests ass | igned | 0 | I | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

| FRI 059, Version 15 | | Issued by. FHI | | | Date | JI ISSUE | . 12/05/2020 |
|---|------------------------------------|---|----------|------------|---------------|----------|--------------|
| Case Number: | 2022-0545 | | Site No: | FS0890 | | Insp: | |
| Date of Visit | 10/11/2022 | | No of m | ovements/s | supp./dest. | | Score |
| Live fish movements | | | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 | >10 | |
| Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible | | novements on from equivalent MS | 0 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 0 |
| species | | novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country | 0 | 9 | 18 | 26 | 0 |
| | Number of sup | | 0 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 0 |
| Movements off | Frequency of n | novements off | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 3 |
| | Number of des | tinations | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 3 |
| Exposure via water | | Site contacts | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 | | |
| Water contacts with other farms (holding species | disinfection or | | 0 | | | | |
| susceptible to same diseases) | farms upstrear | or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 1 |
| | | 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 | g plant discharging into adjacent waters | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 0 |
| On farm processing within the rules of the directive | No on farm pro | cessing | 0 | | | | 0 |
| the rules of the directive | Processing ow | n fish (re-cycling risk) | 1 | | | | |
| | Processing fish | n from MS of equivalent status | 2 | | | | |
| | Processing fish equivalent stat | n from zone or compartment of us | 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 |] | | | 0 |
| products | Common proce | esses with other farms | 3 | | | | |
| | Collection poin | t for waste from other farms | 5 | | | | |
| Use of unpasteurised feeds | No feeding of u | inpasteurised feed | 0 | | | | 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 | Yes | | 0 | 1 | | | 0 |
| between sites, use of 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 | | | | |
| | | | | | Total Rank | | 9 LOW |
| | | | | | | | 2011 |

| FHI 059, Version 13 | Issued by: FHI | Date of issue: 12/05/2020 |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Case No: 2022-0545 | Site No: | FS0890 |
| Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e | s in the previous 4 years? quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single y | year class basis? |
| | enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or med d 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 |
| 5. Are sea lice count records available for ins 6. Do records adequately reflect the required | 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 be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) | low the suggested criteria for treatment in the C | CoGP during the period that |
| 8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. sali</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period | <i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or od 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 | lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare probl | lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) |
| suggested criteria for treatment or where C. e | stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications | |
| 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, | applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le lout in cooperation between participating farms where fewer populations or part populations are | ? |
| sea lice? 15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice i | ement procedure with waypoints describing set a | actions to deal with recognised |
| - | reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail i | reasons. |
| Containment Inspection | | |
| Has the site experienced equipment damage Are measures in place to mitigate against t | ge due to predators in the current or previous p the predation experienced on site? (Detail belov | |
| Top nets tensioned nets If other, detail below: | small mesh | |
| Have escape incidents or events been explicitly for the second sec | • | ne last FHI inspection? N |
| • | orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4 d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist | |
| 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc | apees? If yes give detail | |
| 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) | greed with local wild fish interests and was pern | nission given by Scottish |
| 9. What action was taken to prevent and mini be considered under satisfactory measure | mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered res of the Act) | in code but could |
| 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re | egards to containment? If no, please detail reas | son(s) Y |
| | | |

Site No: FS0890

Case No: 2022-0545

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

FHI 059, Version 13

| Case No: | 2022-0545 |] | | Date of visit: | 10/11/2022 | 2 | | |
|-----------------|-----------|----------|------|----------------|----------------|---------|------|----------------------|
| Site No: | FS0890 |] | | Inspector: | | | | |
| Results Summary | Freq. | | | | te of Notifica | ition | | |
| | | Database | Insp | Phone | Insp | Writing | Insp | 2 nd Insp |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | = | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | = | | | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Report Summary | | | |
|----------------|------------|------|----------------------|
| Case Type | Date | Insp | 2 nd Insp |
| ECI, CNI, VMD | 15/11/2022 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0341 SITE NO FS0890 CASE NO 20220545 **DATE OF VISIT** 10/11/2022 SITE NAME INSPECTOR

Jubilee Loch Shin

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.



Date: 15/11/2022

Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

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/