FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0536			Date of visit: 08/12/2021
Time spent on site:	hour	Main Inspec	tor:
Site No: FS0100 Business No: FB0336	Site Name: Business Name:	Carse of Ae Trout Farm Brow Well Fisheries Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4	Thermometer No:	T146	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed 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 carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

### **Additional Case Information:**

Salt used in tanks in summer for white spot. - No other treatments last year.

Mortalities currently very low with no reported issues and no medicine required in over a year.

Netting over ponds for herons. Top nets on tanks

All fish are moved to Ae fishery where they are moved off to Fisheries. No table production.

Fish on site supplied by other Brow Well sites in England as fingerlings. No ova held on site.

FHI 059, Version 1	3		ls	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-053	6	Site No:	FS01	100			
Date of Visit:		08/12/20	21		Inspector(s	3):		
Registration/Auth	norisation D	etails						
1. Business/site de			y site represer	ntative?			Υ	7
2. Changes made	to details?						Υ	
Site Details (inclu	ıde cleaner	fish for all se	ections)					
Total No facilities		47	Facilities s	stocked	11	No facilitie	es inspected	47
Species	rtr	rtr	rtr	rtr	tro		Ī	
Age group	2021	2020	Aug-20	2020	growers			
No Fish	15,000	12,000	10,000	13,000	1,200			
Mean Fish Wt	55g	190g	350g	450g	1kg			
Next Fallow Date (	` '	none		Next Input	Date (Site)	not knowr		
Recent (last 4 wks	s) disease pro	oblems?			N Any escape	es (since last	visit)?	N
3. Are records con 4. Are movement of 5. Are records con 6. Are health certif  Transport Record 1. Are any movem If yes, is there a sy	records avail nplete and co ficates for inte ds ents carried	able for dead orrectly entere roductions (or out by (or on	fish and wasted? utwith GB) ava behalf) of the	ailable? business (not	•			Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Boords			·					
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records		r inspection?						Y
2. How are mortali		•			Other (deta	ail)		
If other detail:			to Oak Bank,	Dumfries -		,		
3. Mortality records								Y
4. Recent mortality	y (last 4 wks)	:	less than 2	20/week/site fo	or last 4 weeks			
5. Evidence of rec	ent increased	d/atypical mo						N
If yes, facility nos/r	no mortality p	er facility/no	stock per facil	ity/reason:				
6. Any other peaks	s in mortality	during period	checked?					Y
If yes, detail:		<u> </u>		morts/day in p	oond of 8000 fi	sh. 900/wk fo	r pond EC5.	
7. Have increased								N/A
If yes, detail action	n:							
8. Have 'mortality	events' been	reported to F	HI? If no, ente	er details on m	nortality events	sheet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	-	NII.
Recent treatments (see comment)?  If you detail:		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:  2. Medicines records available for inspection?		V
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	-	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	-	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		N/A
	•	
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, reco	ording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify S	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 pres		
is detected been included and how and when that will be n	otified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stock	ed on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?	_	
	_	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemen		Y
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, v	· ·	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in pla	ace to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	_	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implen	nented on site?	Y
If no, detail:		
Described Comments		
Results of Surveillance		V
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, o	or on behall of, the business?	ĭ
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?		N
3. Any significant results?		IN
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems)  EA section 30 checks 2020 - no controlled species found		
Records checked between:	14/11/18- 8/12/21	

rni 059, version 15							155	ueu by. i	-111			
Case no:	2021-05	36	Site No:		FS0100			Date of Samplin		08/1	2/2021	08/18/20
Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:	10:0	0:00	10:1	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b> </b>	1
Environmental conditions:	1	Cloudy	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1											
Pool Group												
	RTR											
Average weight	300g											
Sex												
Water Type	FW											
Ok Details Stock Origin	DD Brow Well											

021	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
	Killed w	ith blow	to head	ł							
0	1	Total To	ests ass	igned	0						
	_					_					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0536		Site No:	FS0100		Insp:	
Date of Visit	08/12/2021		No of me	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	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	14	
DA							10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Trambol of door	Site contacts			6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			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 pro		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	equivalent statu		4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V 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				
	Collection poin	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
,	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	ı 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		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
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	1			0
	No		2				
					Total		16
					Rank		MEDIUM

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 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. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  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?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  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)  10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 t	FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of iss	sue: 12/05/2
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 emametrin benzoste) 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 (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from wh 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? 11 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 or when C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (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 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 managem	Case No:	2021-0536		Site No:	FS0100	
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 emametrin benzoste) 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 (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6) 8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wb 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from wh 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected? 11 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 or when C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (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 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 managem	Sea Lice Inspection (Se	eawater Sites Only)				
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azzamethiphos and enamerciin 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. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wib 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from who 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infostation 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 <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)  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 scenarics during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  16. Do the	-		4 years?			
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azzamethiphos and enamerciin 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. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wib 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from who 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infostation 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 <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)  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 scenarics during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  16. Do the	·	•	•	on a single y	ear class basis?	
can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?  A 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. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to wib 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from wib 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  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)  10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  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?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. The proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10  18. Have these been report			-			
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. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  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?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  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)  10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. It is the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  18. It is sea site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised products and taken and netting over pounds.  18. It is sea to the			o suitable biological	and/or med	chanical control measures, and	d
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. salmonis</i> ) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)  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?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  9. Is <i>C. eiongatus</i> 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 <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 during the escalation of a sea lice intestation?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. Are treatment in place to mittigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  18. It has the experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?  19. Are measures in place to mittigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  19. The proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10  19. Has the separate to local DSFB borthwith (wh			nt or statement relev	ant to the s	ite and CoGP Farm	
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)  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?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  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)  10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  18. 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)  18. The proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10  2. A processive separate to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  3. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  4. Have these been report	5. Are sea lice count rec	ords available for inspection? (Legal	SSI, CoGP Annex 6	)		
R. 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?  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  If yes, have there are the seen reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  If yes, have there are the seen reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  If yes, have there are the seen reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.  If yes, have there peutic treatments are administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)  In Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?  In Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?  In Has the shard peutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?  In Has there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?  In It 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?  If ye is the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  If the sea is the septement of the sea lice with the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  If ye is proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10 yes and netting over ponds.  If other, detail below:  If yes proceed with questions 4 - 9. If No skip to question 10 yes and netting over ponds with the second process of the yes the sea been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (	6. Do records adequatel	y reflect the required standard specifi	ied in the SSI and th	e CoGP? (L	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  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 or where C. elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  17. Vere measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  18. The province of the provin			ed criteria for treatm	ent in the C	oGP during the period that	
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)  10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 seal lice?  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?  16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.  27. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  28. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  39. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  19. If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10  40. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  59. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  60. Have these been reported to prevent and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  19. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail  19. 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)	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	evel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) o	r
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> 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)  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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  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?  N 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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 local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  16. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  17. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail  18. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers?  19. 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)		•				
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 harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice? 16. 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? 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) 1. The place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 1. The place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 1. The place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 1. The place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) 1. The proceed with questions a sea of the process of the site since the last FHI inspection? 1. The proceed with questions and place to Scottish Ministers? 1. The proceed with questions and place to Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 1. The proceed with local base permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 1. 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)	9. Is C. elongatus infest	ation at a level which is considered to	cause significant w	elfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  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)  17. To nets on tanks and netting over ponds  18. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  19. Have these been reported to Scotish Ministers?  19. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  20. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  21. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail  22. If juncts 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)  23. Have such as the second of the second						
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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  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?  N  2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  17. To the set on tanks and netting over ponds  18. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  19. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  20. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  21. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  22. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  23. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  24. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  25. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  26. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)  27. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail  28. 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)  28. 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)	•					
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 during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?  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?  N  2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  Top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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 Scottish Ministers?  6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts 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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	•		* .			
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?  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)  Y top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)				_		
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?  4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  5. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  6. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	sea lice?	strategy for the site, where fewer pop	pulations or part pop	oulations are	e neid without treatment for	
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)  You top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)			e with waypoints des	cribing set a	actions to deal with recognised	d
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)  top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	16. Do the sea lice level	s observed on stocks reflect sea lice	count data? If no ple	ease detail r	easons.	
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)  top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	Containment Inspectio	on				
top nets on tanks and netting over ponds  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	1. Has the site experience	ced equipment damage due to predat	tors in the current or	previous pr	roduction cycles?	N
and netting over ponds  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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)		e to mitigate against the predation ex	perienced on site? (I	Detail below	v)	Υ
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	•					
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)						
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)						
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	ii otilor, actail bolow.					
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	3. Have escape inciden	its or events been experienced on or	in the vicinity of the	site since th	e last FHI inspection?	N
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•		·	
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	•	·				
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? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	5. Have these been repo	orted to local DSFB forthwith (where t	hey exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)	
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)  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)	6. Have these been repo	orted to the SSPO and local fisheries	trusts forthwith (whe	ere they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  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)	7. Were methods (if any	) used to recover escapees? If yes gi	ve detail			
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)			wild fish interests an	nd was perm	nission given by Scottish	
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	9. What action was take	n to prevent and minimise the risk of	further escapes? (N	ot covered i	in code but could	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nment? If no, please	e detail reas	on(s)	Υ

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2021-0536	J		Date of vis	sit: 08/12/20	)21						
Site No:	FS0100	]		Inspect	or:							
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification									
•	· ·	Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup>				
			_									
Report Summary												
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp									
ECI, CNI, VMD	17/01/2022											
	+											
-												





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0336 Date of Visit 08/12/2021

SITE No FS0100 SITE NAME Carse of Ae Trout Farm

Case No 20210536 INSPECTOR

## 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.

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.

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

Treatment 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/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/</a>

Date: 17/01/2022