

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: WI Water type: S CoGP MA W-8

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	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:**

Scotasay is currently stocked with fish from Applecross, Barcaldine and Landcatch. So far, they have had a good start to the cycle, mortality on site has remained low since input. In mid August of this year the site experienced a bloom of micro jellyfish which has lead to some environmental damage to the gills. Pens 6 and 8 were worst affected and are displaying some elevated scores for PGD. The site treated with freshwater on 27/08/2023 (Ronja Star) and again on 18/09/23 (Ronja Fisk) which has had a successful impact on treating the gills. Sea lice infestations have remained below the treatment threshold for the duration of this cycle thus far, the site conducted a precautionary SLICE treatment from 28//08/23 - 04/09/23.

The site has been continually stocking with wild caught ballan wrasse between 16/09/23 - 22/09/23. Two cleanerfish mortality events were observed occurring during the inspection of the sites records for this production cycle. These mortality events occurred during the two freshwater treatments the site has conducted this cycle, the first being on 27/08/23, 1766 (26.07%) and 3,521 (49.63%). For 24 hours prior to each FW treatment the site deployed 3 - 4 baited creels into each stocked pen in attempt to remove cleanerfish prior to treatment. The site also tried to separate the salmon stock from the cleaner fish stock using the well boats however this proved difficult due to the wrasse being of similar size to the salmon stocks.

Upon the physical inspection of the stock, fish were observed shoaling well and responding positively to routine feeding regimes. No clinical signs of disease were observed during the inspection of the stocks.

Fish removed for VMD sampling appeared healthy, with no gross pathology observed.

Cleanerfish : Week 39 (32, 0.90%), Week 38 (3,521, 49.63%), Week 37 (21, 0.35%), Week 36 (80, 1.31%).

Case No: **2023-0449** Site No: **FS0502**

Date of Visit: **02/10/2023** 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	<b>8</b>	Facilities stocked	<b>8</b>	No facilities inspected	<b>8</b>
Species	SAL	Wrasse			
Age group	2023 Q2	Wild caught			
No Fish	822,449	3,415			
Mean Fish Wt	758.3g	200g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Feb 2025		Next Input Date (Site)	May 2025	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					

**Movement Records**

- 1. Movement records available for inspection?  Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: **15/12/2021**
- 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 waste stored in skips and taken to whiteshore cockles.**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?  Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **Week 39 (1,959, 0.24), Week 38 (2,470, 0.30), Week 37 (1,675, 0.20%), Week 36 (1864, 0.22%). Cleaner fish mortality - see additional info.**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?  Y
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **See additional information relating to cleanerfish mortality.**
- 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:	Optomease	
If other, detail:	SLICE	
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)?	Optomease	
If other, detail:	SLICE	
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).	AGD and PGD.	

Records checked between:	15/12/2021 - 02/10/2023
--------------------------	-------------------------

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	F1 - F3	F4-F6	F7-F9	F10-F12								
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
Average weight	758g	758g	758g	758g								
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
Stock Details		Applecross Smolt Unit(FS0500)	Couldoran Hatchery (FS0301)	Ormsary Smolt Unit (FS0575)	Ormsary Smolt Unit (FS0575)							
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	4	5	6	7								



Case Number:	2023-0449	Site No:	FS0502	Insp:		
Date of Visit	02/10/2023	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>&gt;10</b>	
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>	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>		
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>		<b>None</b>	<b>Secure</b>	<b>Unsecure</b>		
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>	<b>1</b>	<b>2 or 3</b>	<b>≥ 4</b>		
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: 2023-0449

Site No: FS0502

**Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)**

- |  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?   | <input type="text" value="N"/>   |
| 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?   | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 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? | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?   | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)   | <input type="text" value="N"/>   |
| 8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) 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?  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)  | <input type="text" value="N"/>   |
| 10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)                                      | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?  | <input type="text" value="N/A"/> |
| 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?   | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?   | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 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?  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |
| 16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  | <input type="text" value="Y"/>   |

**Containment Inspection**

- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles? | <input type="text" value="N"/> |
| 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)              | <input type="text" value="Y"/> |

**Seal pro nets, bird poles**

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?   | <input type="text" value="N"/> |
| If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10   |                                |
| 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?   | <input type="text"/>           |
| 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  | <input type="text"/>           |
| 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)   | <input type="text"/>           |
| 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail  | <input type="text"/>           |
| 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) | <input type="text"/>           |
| 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) | <input type="text"/>           |
| 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)  | <input type="text" value="Y"/> |



Case No: 2023-0449

Site No: FS0502

Date of Visit: 02/10/2023

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?





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0169	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	02/10/2023
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0502	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Scotasay
<b>CASE No</b>	20230449	<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 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.

R25  
UKAS accredited testing laboratory No. 1964  
Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB  
Tel - 0131 244 3498      Email - [ms.fishhealth@gov.scot](mailto:ms.fishhealth@gov.scot)  
Website - <https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/>

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 and containment and escapes.

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

Signed:

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the Fish Health Inspector.

Date: 27/10/2023

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 \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)