

Case No:  Date of visit:

Time spent on site:  Main Inspector:

Site No:  Site Name:   
 Business No:  Business Name:

Case Types: 1  2  3  4  5  6

Water Temp (°C):  Thermometer No:  FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: OR Water type: S CoGP MA: O-1

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Clinical signs of disease observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Gross pathology observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Diagnostic samples taken?

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Fish on site will not be harvested. The site is used for smolt production before fish get moved off around 2.5kgs to neighbouring sites for final on-growing and harvest.

Fish have been performing well so far with no significant health challenges. No medicinal treatments on this crop (with the exception of tricaine used for weekly sea lice counts); only FW baths combined with a flush have been completed on site and is reportedly resulting in 80-95% clearance.

Companies biologist will be visiting the site in wk32 to perform gill and lice checks along with water sampling.

Mortality events above reporting threshold:

Wk45 2022: 2,260 (1.15%), wk47: 5,390 (2.78%), Wk48: 3,712 (1.97%), Wk49: 2,892 (1.56%), Wk50: 10,289 (5.66%), Wk51: 2,426 (1.41%), Wk52: 2,607 (1.54%) - all attributed to poor gill health combined with seal ice treatments and early maturation. 2023 wk31 3% (13489) recorded as handling.

FMA is not followed synchronously on a single year class basis, however a risk assessment was available and was deemed acceptable at the time of inspection.

Mortalities for the last few weeks, wk35 796 (0.21%), wk 34 (723 (0.19%), wk 33 817 (0.22%), wk 32 794 (0.21%) attributed mainly to environmental, handling and transport and other.

Water temperature at 14.3 so REG only completed. Full inspection of the site conducted including completing checks for CNA. Stocks seemed in good general health, one dead and two runts noted across the site.

CNA paperwork and remote inspection completed by [REDACTED] with records checked up to 4/8/2023 but site inspection cancelled due to changing priorities. [REDACTED] completed on site CNA and inspected mortality, medicine and sea lice records from 4/8/2023 to 3/9/2023.

Case No: 2023-0351

Site No: FS1080

Date of Visit: 12/09/2023

Inspector(s):

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

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

**Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)**

Total No facilities	16, 80 metre circle pens	Facilities stocked	16	No facilities inspected
Species	SAL			
Age group	23 S1			
No Fish	372,804			
Mean Fish Wt	939g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Jan 24	Next Input Date (Site)	April 24	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	
If yes, detail:				

**Movement Records**

1. Movement records available for inspection?
2. Date of last inspection:
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?
5. Are records complete and correctly entered?
6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?

**Transport Records**

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

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records available for inspection?
  2. How are mortalities disposed of? Other (detail)
- If other detail: transported in sealed mort bins Kirkwall Dounby, bulk carrier to Pelagia
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
  4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): see additional information
  5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?
- If yes, detail: See additional information.
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?
- If yes, detail action:
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?

If yes, detail: TMS

If other, detail:

2. Medicines records available for inspection?

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?

4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?

5. If yes, what treatment(s)?

TMS

If other, detail:

6. Are medicines stored appropriately?

**Biosecurity Records**

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?

2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?

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?

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 included and *how* and *when* that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?

5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status certification if required)?

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.)?

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals on site?

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

If no, detail:

**Results of Surveillance**

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

3. Any significant results?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

2/12/2020 - 3/09/2023



		Y
		Y
		Y
		Y
		Y
		Y
		Y
ted been		Y
s,		Y
on of		Y
Is held on		Y
		Y
		Y
		Y
		N

Case Number:	2023-0351	Site No:	FS1080	Insp:		
Date of Visit	12/09/2023	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		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				
	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		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		2
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>22</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No: **2023-0351** Site No: **FS1080**  
 Date of visit: **12/09/2023** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

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		Farm containment and escape response procedure available. All equipment checked daily, nets inspected monthly and moorings inspected annually.
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? <b>If yes give detail</b>				
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	

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

General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1			Nets were manufactured and supplied by Knox. Attestation was available for inspection. Grid and moorings manufactured and supplied by Gaelforce. Attestation and invoice available. Fusion marine manufactured and installed the cages. Attestation available.
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		
b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y	Y	Y		
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y		
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	Y	Y		
e) Each inspection including						



Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	Y	Knox service summaries available
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y	Y	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Y	Y	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Y	Y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	Y	Y	Site also has access to mortality removal ROVs that are deployed twice per week.
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:				
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2	Site plan in Aquacom
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y		
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y		
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y		
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:				
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3	Net lengths recorded and cross-checked with admiralty charts.
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y		
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y		
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4	
i) The date of installation	Low	Y		
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y		
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y		
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5	Site plan details location and type of navigational marker.
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)	Recorded in site diary.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	Repair work completed by site staff would also be included in site diary and any remedial action i.e. divers called to site or net removed and returned to Knox for repair.
Pen and mooring systems				
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	Environmental survey, hydro graphic reports supplied to manufacturers to select equipment that is suitable for the conditions on site.

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	All equipment on site was manufactured and supplied by industry experts based on the results of the environmental and hydro graphic survey results from the site. Fusion Marine manufactured and installed cages on site. Equipment installed by industry leaders. Any repair work is either completed by Cooke engineers or by equipment manufacturer.
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	Yes supplied by Knox following environmental surveys. Fish size recorded in fishtalk and mesh size recorded in aquacom.  Stored out of direct sunlight when not in use, however rarely stored. Always in water or at Knox. Every fallow, so before each production cycle. Nets are sent back to Knox for servicing and repairs.  Daily inspections by site staff and with regular ROV dives. Nets inspected by Knox before each cycle.  Inspected annually by ROV  Divers carry out small repairs. Larger repair works are completed by Knox.
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	N	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	
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
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	Y	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	Training records and SOPs available for various handling activities conducted on site. Training covers containment and escape response, crowding events, harvesting and boat handling etc. powerboat licence and day skipper tickets held by certain members of staff.  Staff are trained in containment and escapes and SOPs available for handling activities.
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	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<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	Site staff in containment and escapes, SOPs for various activities, RA available for site activities.  SCMS workboat certificate available on Aquacom.  List of work boats used at the site cross-examined with photos of the boats at dry dock showing propellers and guards (if installed).  RA developed before each individual movement.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	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				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	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	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	
<b>c. Inspection of site and site equipment</b>				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.18	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y		
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		
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	N/A	CoGP 4.4.31	No onsite procedures ongoing at time of 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

Case No:

2023-0351

**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, 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?
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 available?
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) at any time during the period that records are available? 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? (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?
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)
- 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? (Detail below)
  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: 2023-0351

Site No: FS1080

Date of Visit: 12/09/2023

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

Y

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?

Y

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

Y

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

Y

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

Y

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

Y

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

Y

**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?

Y

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

Y

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

Y

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

Y

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?

Y

**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?

Y

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

Y

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?

Y

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?

Y

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

Y

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

Y

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

Y



**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:  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	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Pool Group													
Species	sal	sal	sal	sal	sal	sal	sal	sal	sal	sal			
Average weight	850g	850g	850g	850g	850g	850g	850g	850g	850g	850g			
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW			
Stock Details		Loch Garasdale	Loch Garasdale	Quoys	Quoys	Loch Garasdale	Loch Garasdale	Loch Garasdale	Loch Garasdale	Loch shin	Loch shin		
	Stock Origin												
Facility No	1	1	5	5	16	16	17	17	21	21			







# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0095	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	12/09/2023
<b>SITE No</b>	FS1080	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Bay of Cleat (North)
<b>CASE No</b>	20230351	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██████████

## 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. No recommendations made or further action required.

### **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**

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**

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

### **d) Inspection of site specific procedures**

No site-specific procedures were observed during the inspection.

## Further Action

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

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

Signed:

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the Fish Health Inspector.

Date: 21/9/2023

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at [Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science)



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0095	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	12/09/2023
<b>SITE No</b>	FS1080	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Bay of Cleat (North)
<b>CASE No</b>	20230351	<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.

Due to the water temperature being above 14°C, an inspection to determine the presence of listed disease could not be completed as clinical signs may not be present at such temperatures, an inspection will be rescheduled at a later date.

### 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 Directorate 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 and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements.

An enhanced sea 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: 21/9/2023

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at [Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)