FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2020-0022			Date of visit: 29/01/2020					
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Ins	spector:					
Site No: FS0432 Business No: FB0134	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Tay Kames Fish Farming Ltd						
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 5.5	Thermometer No:	T275	FHI 045 completed N/A					
Observations:	Region: TA	Water type: F	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Clinical signs of disease observed?  Gross pathology observed?  Diagnostic samples taken?  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	l reason below:						

### **Additional Case Information:**

No mortality events reported

Some issues with side swimming fish on some fish, unknown cause, although it does not affect mortality.

Send new movement book

Dead fish waste sent to Energen Biowaste, transported by Billie Bowie/Ferguson

Predator nets for cormorants.

VMD fish appeared healthy when sampled.

Accompanied by and internal SG auditors.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018			
Case No:	2020-0022 Site No: FS0432										
Date of Visit:	Visit: 29/01/2020 Inspector(s):										
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails									
<ol> <li>Business/site deta</li> <li>Changes made to</li> </ol>	•	checked by	site representa	ative?			Y N	}			
Site Details											
Total No facilities	14 Facilities stocked 12 No facilities inspected 14										
Species	RTR	RTR									
Age group	2018	2019									
No Fish	81,466	87,082									
Mean Fish Wt	1.45 Kg	150g									
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans	_	Next Input Da	te (Site)	November	2021				
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N			
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?  N Any escapes (since last visit)?  If yes, detail:											
Movement Records	s										
Movement record		r inspection?	?					Y			
2. Date of last inspe		. поросиот					01/03/2017				
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	l?					Y			
4. Are movement re				•				Y			
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered	l?					Y			
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	ductions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A			
Transport Records											
Are any movement		t by (or on b	ehalf) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ing a STB)?			Y			
If yes, is there a sys				•	_			Y			
Mortality Records											
•	available for i	nspection?						Y			
Mortality records available for inspection?     How are mortalities disposed of?  Ensiled - on site											
If other detail:											
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?											
4. Recent mortality (	4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): WK52 157, WK1 - 103 WK2 115 WK3 112 fish across the site										
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?											
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no st	ock per facility	/reason:							
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?											
If yes, detail:	Very slight in										
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	mortalities b	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A			
If yes, detail action:		L	10.12			P					
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet.											

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?  If yes, detail:  If other, detail:  2. Medicines records available for inspections.  3. Are records complete and correctly entered. Are fish in a withdrawal period?  5. If yes, what treatment(s)?  If other, detail:  6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y Y N
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspecti 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortal 3. Has the manner and period in which the increased (unexplained) mortality at the si 4. Has the action that will be taken in the exist detected been included and how and what is detected been included and how and what is the health status of aquaculture anii	lity removal, recording and safe disposal bee APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterina	esence of a listed disease Y
health status, certification if required)?		
transmission of disease been covered (mo	asures implemented between each epidemic vement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or d e measures in place to maintain the physical	lead fish etc.)?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been ad fine, detail:	dequately implemented on site?	Y
Results of Surveillance		

01/03/2019 - 29/01/2019

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

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

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

٠,	111 000, Version 12							133	ueu by. i				
	Case no:	2020-00	)22	Site No:		FS0432			Date of v		29/0	01/2020	29/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	g. HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	15:0	0:00	15:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	1
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
ı	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Δ	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	150 g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
Stock Details		CO Torhouse mill											
V.	l acility NO	C0											

O Total Tests assigned O															
	01/2020 Additional Sample Information:														
Total Tests assigned 0															
	0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 08/10/2018
Case Number:	2020-0022		Site No:	FS0432		Insp:	
Date of Visit	29/01/2020		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	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	$\overline{}$
5,000	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0		10	14	-
Movements off	Frequency of m	•	1 0		6	10	2
iviovements on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		ш
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		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				ш
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				ш
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	unpasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				ш
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		T 0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				Ш
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2	1			
					Total		9
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2020-0022	:	Site No:	FS0432						
•	(Seawater Sites Only) enced sea lice problems in the pi	revious 4 years?								
2. Is the CoGP Farm	Management Area (or equivalent	) fallowed synchronously on	a single ye	ear 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										
5. Are sea lice count i	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 ( <i>L. sali</i> records are inspected	monis) record levels below the signal (CoGP Annex 6)	uggested criteria for treatmer	nt in the Co	oGP during the period t	hat					
	t female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) no 10/6/19) during the period that re	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6	/19) or					
If yes, have these bee	en reported to the Fish Health Ins	pectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.							
9. Is C. elongatus infe	estation at a level which is consid	lered to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3	3.50)					
	treatments been administered or treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>									
11. Has any other act	ion been taken (where applicable	e)?								
12. Have therapeutic	treatments or the actions taken h	ad a significant impact upon	the lice lev	vels recorded?						
13. Are treatments, w	here conducted, carried out in co	operation between participat	ting farms?	,						
14. Is there a harvesti sea lice?	ing strategy for the site, where fe	wer populations or part popu	lations are	held without treatment	for					
	cific written lice management pro escalation of a sea lice infestation		ribing set a	ections to deal with reco	gnised					
16. Do the sea lice lev	vels observed on stocks reflect s	ea lice count data? If no plea	se detail re	easons.						
Containment Inspec	tion									
1. Has the site experie	enced equipment damage due to	predators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in pl	ace to mitigate against the preda	tion experienced on site? (De	etail below	)	Υ					
Top nets	Predator nets									
If other, detail below	v:									
0 11	I		1	- I FIII ! # 0	N					
	lents or events been experienced	•	te since the	e last FHI Inspection?	IV.					
	uestions 4 – 9. If No skip to ques eported to Scottish Ministers?	tion 10								
5. Have these been re	eported to local DSFB forthwith (	where they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)						
6. Have these been re	eported to the SSPO and local fis	heries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)					
7. Were methods (if a	any) used to recover escapees? I	f yes give detail								
8 If all nets were den	ployed was this action agreed wit	h local wild fish interests and	was nerm	ission given by Scottish						
Ministers? (Legal, Co			Jus poini							
9. What action was ta	ken to prevent and minimise the	risk of further escapes? (Not	t covered in	n code but could						
be considered unde	er satisfactory measures of the	e Act)								
10. Is the site inspect	ed as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Υ					

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Site No: FS0432

Case No: 2020-0022

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0022	Date of visit: 29/01/2020								
Site No:	FS0432	]		Inspecto						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp		
			_	-						
	_				_		+	_		
	_		4	+	_		-			
				+		+	_			
				+		+	_			
						-	+			
	_		+	+	+	+	+	+		
	_		+	+	+	+	+			
			+	+	_	+	_			
			+	+		+	+			
			+	+		+	+			
			+	+		+	+			
			+	+	+	+				
			+	+	<u> </u>	+	+	_		
			_	1						
				<del>1</del>		1				
	•		_							
Report Summary Case Type										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp							
ECI, CNI, VMD	05/02/2019									





Kames Fish Farming Ltd Kilmelford Oban Argyll PA34 4XA

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0134
SITE NO FS0432
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 29/01/2019
SITE NAME Loch Tay
CASE NO 20200022

# Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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.

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.

R04

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.

## 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.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter">www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter</a>

Date: 05/02/2020