FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/20				
Case No: 2021-0466			Date of visit: 03/11/2021				
Time spent on site:	n	Main Inspect	or:				
Site No: FS0462	Site Name:	Kames Bay (east)					
Business No: FB0134	Business Name:	Kames Fish Farming Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 SLI 3	55	6				
Water Temp (°C): 13.2	Thermometer No:	T205	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-40				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed	•	N If yes, see additional info					
Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional info	mation/clinical score sneet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

Additional Case Information:

See case 2020-0240 for majority of paperwork for visit. Previous case carried out as REG, CNI and SLI as water temperature too high for ECI. Biosecurity records, FMA and surveillance frequency, harvest & lice strategy not checked again - site manager confirmed no changes.

Treated in August at Kames Bay West. Confirmed traceability of withdrawal period on stock.

Slight difference in reported sea lice numbers for weeks 29 - reported 0.17 - 0.35 on record. Wk 30 - reported 0.40, 0.43 on record. Confirmed figured previously submitted were incorrect, this has now been corrected.

Harvesting is carried out on one cage at a time to enable treatments to be carried out on other cages if necessary.

Paperwork completed remotely by 29/10/21, Site visit by 29.

Low numbers of mortalities observed in a few pens. No moribund or lethargic fish observed. In some pens there appears to be some issues with the feed digestibility causing some red coloured oil from the feed to swim at the surface. Company is looking into it and hope to resolve this as soon as possible.

FHI 059, Version 13			Iss	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0466		Site No:	FS046	2			
Date of Visit:		03/11/2021]		Inspector(s	s):		
Registration/Autho								_
 Business/site det Changes made to 		checked by s	ite represent	tative?			Y N	}
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		б	Facilities st	ocked	4	No facilitie	es inspected	6
Species	RTR	RTR					T .	
Age group	2021	2020						
No Fish	60,000	200						
Mean Fish Wt	1.1kg	4.1kg						
Next Fallow Date (S		August 2022		Next Input D	ate (Site)	Oct 2022	_	•
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl			_		es (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						•	•	
 Are movement re Are records comp Are health certific Transport Records Are any moveme 	olete and corrected to the corrected to	ectly entered? ductions (outw	? vith GB) avai	lable?	cing a STR)?	,		Y Y N/A
If yes, is there a sys		• •		•				Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records								Y
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed o	f?			Ensiled - o	n site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	•	correctly enter						Y
4. Recent mortality	•			%, 0.49%, 0.66	%			
5. Evidence of recei								N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facilit	y/reason:				
			1 10					
6. Any other peaks	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								K1/4
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported t	to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		named to EVII	0 K		ut = 1:4	-1		NI/A
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.							N/A	

Treatments and Medicines Records					
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	N				
If yes, detail:					
If other, detail: 2. Medicines records available for inspection?	N/A				
Are records complete and correctly entered?	IN/A				
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N/A				
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	N/A				
If other, detail:					
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A				
o. Are medianes stored appropriately:					
Biosecurity Records					
Biosecurity records available for inspection?					
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposa	Il been considered? N/A				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or vet	erinary professional of any				
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	N/A				
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the	e presence of a listed disease				
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Minis					
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher N/A					
health status, certification if required)?					
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epid					
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live	*				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the phy	sical containment of N/A				
aquaculture animals held on site?	N/A				
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	INA				
ii iio, detaii.					
Results of Surveillance					
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business.	ness?				
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: 28/07/2021-29/10/202	21				

Case No:	2021-0466		Site No:	FS0462			
Sea Lice Inspection (S	Seawater Sites Only						
• •	-				Υ		
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 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 equivalent)?							
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 (<i>L. salme</i> records are inspected?		elow the suggested criteria for tr	reatment in the C	oGP during the period tha	at N		
		Imonis) numbers per fish been iod that records are inspected?	at a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/1	9) or Y		
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI	see comment.		Υ		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	n is considered to cause signific	ant welfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.8	50) N		
•		nistered or other actions taken we elongatus is considered to have					
11. Has any other actio		•	·	,	N/A		
•	· ·	ns taken had a significant impac	ct upon the lice le	evels recorded?	Y		
•		d out in cooperation between pa	•		N		
		, where fewer populations or pa					
sea lice?							
	_	ement procedure with waypoint of a sea lice infestation?	s describing set a	actions to deal with	Y		
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.							
Containment Inspection	on						
1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?							
2. Are measures in place	ce to mitigate against	the predation experienced on s	ite? (Detail below	v)			
If other, detail below:							
2. Hava assama insidas	nto au avanto basa as		f the cite cines th	a last Elli inspection?	IN:		
		perienced on or in the vicinity o	Tine site since th	le last FHI inspection?	N		
If Yes proceed with que		•					
4. Have these been rep			OD 4427 F	4.47\			
· ·		orthwith (where they exist)? (Co			7)		
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	y) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail					
8. If aill nets were denic	oved was this action a	agreed with local wild fish interes	sts and was perm	nission given by Scottish			
Ministers? (Legal, CoG		J. T. H. H. J. Com. H.	and point	given by cooking			
, -		nimise the risk of further escape	s? (Not covered i	in code but could			
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) Output							
		regards to containment? If no, p	lease detail reas	on(s)			
The the sale mepodice	and contractory with			(-)			

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2021-0466			Date of visit:	03/11/2021			
Site No:	ES0462	1		Increater				
Sile NO.	FS0462	ı		Inspector:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	ļ							
Report Summary Case Type ECI, SLI								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI, SLI	20/12/2021							
	1							
	t							
	1							





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0134Date of Visit03/11/2021Site NoFS0462Site NameKames Bay (east)Case No20210466Inspector

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 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.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

On this occasion, this site was satisfactory with regards to records of sea lice counts.

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

Signed:

Date: 20/12/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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/