

Case No:	2022-0191	Date of visit:	07/06/2022			
Time spent on site:	3hr	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0268	Site Name:	Tervine			
Business No:	FB0456	Business Name:	Dawnfresh Farming Ltd			
Case Types:	1 CNA	2	3	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):		Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed	N/A	
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	F	CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	Y	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

CNA following Escape Investigation 2022-0065, with regards to the potential escape of RTR in Loch Awe.

Paperwork completed 01/06/2022 by [REDACTED], shadowed by [REDACTED].

Water peaty and dark, difficult to observe the net below the waterline. 2 lifted empty nets examined and no repairs and holes observed. This is reflected in the records with a lot of zero return net checks. Site manager observed that from experience from the site the nets don't get as much wear on them as in seawater lochs. Majority of nets have been upgraded to 152kg breaking strength. This is significantly over what is required. All older nets that are currently on site are planned to replace when the cage are harvested out. 2 Dead fish observed in in 2 pens. Overall populations looking very healthy. Fish get harvested at 3-3.5kg mark and they aim to have all larger fish harvested over the next weeks to avoid holding large fish in the hot months over the summer, as these are more susceptible to the warmer temperatures. Water temperature can get very warm in the loch over the summer. Pipes in place for regular harvests taking place are covered in extra netting as a precautionary measure in case pipes burst. All new nets on site have a double layer of mesh at the top 1 m above the water line, extending to 1 m below the waterline. This is mostly in place to deter otters and avoid any damage they might cause near the waterline.

Net strength testing record and procedure received and checked 30/09/2022.

Case No: 2022-0191

Site No: FS0268

Date of Visit: 07/06/2022

Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Y
N

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	28	Facilities stocked	26	No facilities inspected	28
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR		
Age group	2019	2020	2021		
No Fish	40,000	210,000	20,000		
Mean Fish Wt	3.4kg	1.7kg	358g		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	none	Next Input Date (Site)	June 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		N	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:					

Movement Records

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

Y
26/11/2020
N
Y
Y
N/A

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection?
2. How are mortalities disposed of?
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Biogas - Barkip

If other detail: whole fish - check waste removal slips on site

wk 21, 200 - 0.22%, (677); wk20, 2022 - 0.24% (720); wk19, 2022 - 0.12% (360); wk18, 2022 - 0.14% (434)

If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?

If yes, detail:

If other, detail:

2. Medicines records available for inspection?

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?

4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?

5. If yes, what treatment(s)?

If other, detail:

6. Are medicines stored appropriately?

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?

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

3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any *increased (unexplained)* mortality at the site been included?4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and *how* and *when* that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?

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

6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?

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

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

If no, detail:

Results of Surveillance

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

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

3. Any significant results?

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

Records checked between:

26/11/2020-31/5/2022

Case No: 2022-0191 Site No: FS0268

Date of visit: 07/06/2022 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (FRESHWATER)				
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		N		The site does not suspect an escape has occurred, however Rainbow Trout have been caught in Loch Awe. Another Rainbow trout farm operates in the Loch from the same company but no escapes are suspected there either.
If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium		CoGP 2.4.31, 3.4.39	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low		CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium		CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed of appropriate mesh size with regard the size of the escaped fish?	Low		CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High			
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.28, 3.4.36 SSI, 2,9	Escapes Contingency Plan in place, mitigation measures considered for all operation conducted on site, details of all contact to inform in case of escape or suspected escape noted in the plan.
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site				
General records				ROV net checks try to do every 6 weeks but are done before every operation that involves crowding. Mooring checks done by diver, video provided.
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			SSI 2,1	
		Facilities	Moorings	Nets

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement		Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Y	Y	Pens and Moorings from Kames, Nets mostly Boris nets, some older Hvalpsund nets 2014 (Dyneema) these are getting replaced with Boris nets as the pens get harvested. All nest on site Dyneema.
b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y	N/A	Y	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y	
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	Y	Y	
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	Y	Y	
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y	Y	Y	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Y	Y	Y	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Y	Y	Y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	Y	Y	Y	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					Cages: no repairs required. Daily check sheets, signed off for checks on cages, moorings, net check at waterline.
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y			
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3		
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y			
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	Y			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,5		No navigational markers deployed.
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters[3]			SSI, 2,6		
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A			
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	N/A			
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A			
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	Record kept in site diary. Check on site e.g 9th March 2022 (damage to walkway, secured the same day, no risk to containment on site) No note on date of repair. Net checks, have notes on storm check by ROV checking nets after storms.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that pens and moorings are designed, manufactured and installed suitable for purpose at the location of the site?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.11	Mooring inspection: certificates seen, Cages: checked in house on daily basis all nets now sourced from Boris Nets
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.12	
2.10 Can the site demonstrate evidence that all nets have been designed and manufactured under the control of a Quality Management System to ensure they provide containment for the whole of their working life?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.13	
2.11 Are all screens inspected daily and relevant action taken? Are records maintained of inspection frequency and the outcomes?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	Replacement policy states that nets need to be sent away for full inspection and testing. Currently site uses 2 nets that are older than 7 years, these are currently in use as smaller than anticipated fish were delivered to the site. Use was risk assessed and the risk of possibly under sized fish in the population was judged to be greater than the risk of the nets having deteriorated below braking strength as these were last tested well above the breaking strength. (Net ID 2714 and 2848)
2.12 Are screens constructed from a suitably strong and robust material, and therefore fit for purpose?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.19	
2.13 Can the site demonstrate awareness of the minimum net strengths to be used at all times?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.14	
2.14 Does the site have a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.15	
2.15 Does the site use nylon nets older than 5 years?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.16	
2.16 Can site managers demonstrate awareness of the minimum fish size supplied where new stock is introduced?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.18	
2.17 Have nets been treated with UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low	Y	CoGP 3.4.20, 3.4.21	
				Normally don't store a lot of nets. Currently storing some nets as they are new acquisitions that will be deployed when this fits in with the production of the fish.

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.19 Can the site demonstrate evidence of nets being inspected and strength tested after each cycle by a competent person?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.22	Fish are on site approximately 13-14 months. SOP states annual strength testing to be done. Annual net strength test have not been done since 2019 due to COVID, thought the company would start up again but this not the case. Will start doing their net strength testing in house going forward. The nets used on site have specifications for SW sites so are many times over the required braking strength and due to them being used in FW no issues have been experienced. Nets are checked by site staff daily visually and, regular ROV inspections are done in house with their own ROV. All nets are checked before they are deployed. Company aiming to get in house strength testing in done in the next few weeks. Strength testing certificates from 2019 inspected.
2.20 Is in accordance with a detailed procedure based on manufacturer's advise and using a documented quality control system?	High	N	CoGP 3.4.22	Company has SOP in place for in-house strength testing. And net records already have a field to record these.
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23	No strength testing has taken place since 2019.
a) net base	High	N		ROV net inspections cover the entire net.
b) side wall	High	N		
c) above the waterline	High	N		
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.24	Daily inspection sheet.
2.23 Are additional inspections undertaken following adverse weather where required?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.25	Site manager can't recall a time when the site hasn't been checked daily even in poor weather.
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High	Y	CoGP 7.4.7	
3.3 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working in the site in relation to any helicopter operations?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.27, 3.4.33	No work undertaken with helicopters.
3.4 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.35 SSI 2,6,a	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37	Transfers, crowding, harvesting and escapes contingency - all staff signed off
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.6, 3.4.8, 2.4.7, 3.4.9	Site staff signed off for specific work. Mitigation measures in place.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 2.4.23, 3.4.27 SSI 2,7, b SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		Risk Assessment in place with all operations covered.
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		Escapes Contingency Plan has descriptions and mitigation measures in place for different procedures. Covers any event that may increase chance of increased risk of containment failure.
4.3 Is the integrity of all handling equipment checked, including pipelines, pumps, transport tanks, graders, counters and vaccination stations, before fish are handled?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.24, 3.4.28	Part of the checklist for grading, and harvest (this has recently been improved to include check box).
4.4 Do these checks include the suitability of the above equipment for use during adverse weather conditions where appropriate?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.25, 3.4.29	No procedures conducted in adverse weather conditions. Site located in sheltered fresh water loch so adverse weather conditions less of a factor. Nets lifted by hand, so operation limited by safety concerns for staff, before suitability of equipment becomes an issue.
4.5 Are mitigation measures such as safety nets, security devices, or bunding used at potential risk points, such as pipe connections?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.26, 3.4.30	All pipes fitted with netting. Raft for harvesting up to the handrails is netted to insure complete containment. Intake pipes are shrink wrapped for UV protection to increase the life of pipes. Transfers on site are done with swim throughs.
4.6 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	No propeller guards fitted.
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		Otter, Herons, Cormorants
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?	Medium	Y	2.4.7, 3.4.9	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.10 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including -The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed - The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,8,a	No lethal means used to control.
4.11 Where predator nets are deployed is this done in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of access by predators? For example, see requirements of Annex 7.	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	
	Low	N/A	3.5.34-37 2.5.34-37	
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N	CoGP 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.4.11	Top nets on all cages.
5.2 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the site is not located within an area likely to be affected by flood, or suitable flood defences in place?	High	N/A		
5.3 Does the site have effective measures in place to prevent fish from jumping out of holding facilities into surface waters or natural water courses?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.12	
5.4 Is the site inflow system designed to prevent any upstream escape of farm stock?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.14	
5.5 Are the screen sizes capable of containing the entire range of fish sizes within the unit in every instance?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.15	
5.6 In the case of a land-based aquaculture system, are there two screens incorporated into the outflow system of a suitable size to prevent the passage of fish in all potential water conditions?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.20	
5.7 Does the net mesh size contain the entire range of fish sizes in every instance of the species involved?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.17	
5.8 Are boat operations conducted in a manner which avoids damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.34	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 3.4.24	Based on record checks and SOPs seen on site.
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-	High		CoGP 3.4.31	No site specific procedures observed at the time of the visit.
a) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air		N/A		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
b) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.32	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
e) Collection of samples If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection	Power granted under the Act – section 5 (3) (a)	
h) Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)	

[1] An 'escape event' can be defined as any circumstances on or in the vicinity of a fish farm which are believed to have caused an escape, or which may have given rise to a significant risk of an escape of fish.

[2] FHI interpretation – Informing the SSPO is only a requirement where the site belongs to an Authorised Production Business which is signed up to the CoGP.

[3] being waters which do not form part of the sea or any creek, bay or estuary or of any river as far as far as the tide flows

Date of visit: 07/06/2022

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0456
SITE No FS0268
CASE No 20220191

DATE OF VISIT 07/06/2022
SITE NAME Tervine
INSPECTOR [REDACTED]

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

An enhanced inspection to ascertain the risk of escape from the fish farm was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of facilities, records and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures

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

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

The following recommendations are made for improvement.

It is recommended that net inspection and strength testing must be carried out following a documented procedure based on manufacturers advice and using a quality control system in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (Chapter 3, point 4.22).

It is also recommended that net testing should be undertaken from representative sections in the net base, side wall and above the waterline, in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) (Chapter 3, point 4.23).

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

b)iii) Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments

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

c) Inspection of the site and site equipment

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

R10

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

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

Further Action

The recommendations in this report should be implemented by 16/09/2022. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendations have been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendations are not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to Marine Scotland Science's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

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

Signed:



Date: 16/06/2022

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0456	DATE OF VISIT	07/06/2022
SITE No	FS0268	SITE NAME	Tervine
CASE No	20220191	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

The above site was inspected in accordance with 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 found to be inadequately maintained.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

- FS numbers must be recorded in the source/destination section of the movement record book, to allow for better traceability of stocks. It was discussed with the site manager that this would be recorded in future.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met. Records or documentation demonstrating that these points have been addressed should be sent to the Fish Health Inspectorate (contact details below) within 30 days of the date this report was issued.

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/06/2022

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0456	DATE OF VISIT	07/06/2022
SITE No	FS0268	SITE NAME	Tervine
CASE No	20220191	INSPECTOR	

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by 16 September 2022. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to Marine Scotland to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

This case will now be closed. This site may be subject to further audit and recommendations in the future.

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

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 20/10/2022

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/>