

Case No: Date of visit:

Time spent on site: Main Inspector:

Site No: Site Name:
Business No: Business Name:

Case Types: 1 2 3 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): Thermometer No: FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: HI Water type: S CoGP MA

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

Additional Case Information:

Water temperature 13.41 degrees C

Seal in pen 7 - see CNA sheet for details

Peaks in mortality: 14/11/2022 - 2.72% to 26th December 2022 - 4.26% total of 520,638 fish lost due to AGD, complex gill health, jellyfish. These were all reported to FHI. 2023: 1.2% in march but within 6 week stocking period.

Pen 2 (S0) - CMS Pen 4, 6 & 7 HSMI (PCR) but no clinical signs

Ocean matter and otterferry were the sources of lumpfish populations. Currently only 2 cages are stocked with lumpfish. Lumpfish mortality was checked and no large mortalities to note.

Ensiler has been out of action since 16th December 2022. Morts since then have gone to Invertote to be ensiled.

S0 - Gairloch (FS1061) and Clachbreac (FS0892) S1 - Gairloch hatchery (Hendric genetix) inverkerry smolt unit (FS1061)

Alphamax - 18/07/2023 to 21/07/2023 whole site due to caligus problems. Site one week late in treating due to treatment boat breakdown.

Freshwater in December 2022 for gills, middle of February for gills and end of June - for gills/lice, preventative for AGD

Currently upgrading the seal pro nets specification - extending (doubling) panel round the side. Extra patch on lock off area (hang from 5m ropes)

Seal fence is attached to 2.5m poles (7 or 8ft high) and stitched onto net. When carrying out treatments etc. the seal fence is lowered and remains stitched to the net.

During physical inspection of site, a couple of moribunds were observed on each cage. A small number of fish were jumping on each cage with the majority of the population shoaling deeper in the water column. Some 'whiteheads' were observed - lice damage due to alphamax treatment being delayed.

When sampling VMD - fish from cage 6 appeared healthy both externally and internally with approx 2-3 caligus lice load each. The fish from cage 2 also appeared healthy externally and internally with 4 caligus lice load. However it was noted that the liver colour in the fish from cage 2 was very pale. No other abnormalities noted and the site had low mortalities along with no signs of clinical disease other than the few moribunds.

Case No: **2023-0335** Site No: **FS1343**
 Date of Visit: **01/08/2023** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	5		Facilities stocked	5		No facilities inspected	5	
Species	SAL	SAL	LUM					
Age group	2022 Q4 S0	2023 Q1 S1	2023					
No Fish	38,354	453,805	23,178					
Mean Fish Wt	1.2kg	468g	486g					
Next Fallow Date (Site)	July 2024		Next Input Date (Site)	Sep 2024				
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?				Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?	Y		
If yes, detail:	CMS, HSMI							

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **16/11/2022**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **N/A**

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
- If other detail: **Mortalities have been ensiled at Invertote as the ensiler on site has been broken/getting repaired.**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **SAL: Wk 27 - 3175 fish (0.62%), Wk 28 - 856 fish (0.172%), Wk 29 - 2068 fish (0.416%), Wk 30 - 2049 fish (0.414%)**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **N**
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**
- If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
- If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. **Y**

Treatments and Medicines Records

- 1. Recent treatments (see comment)? Y
 If yes, detail: T.M.S, Optamase, Alphamax
- If other, detail:
- 2. Medicines records available for inspection? Y
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? Y
- 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? TMS, Optamase
 If other, detail:
- 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Y

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: 16/11/2022 - 01/08/2023

Case no: Site No: Date of visit/
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No													
Fish nos	1	2-3											
Pool Group													
Species	SAL	SAL											
Average weight	1.2kg	0.4680											
Sex	N/A	N/A											
Water Type	SW	SW											
Stock Details													
		Gairloch (FS1061)	Gairloch (FS1061)										
Stock Origin													
Facility No	2	6											

Site No: FS1343

Case No: 2023-0335

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No: 2023-0335 Site No: FS1343

Date of visit: 01/08/2023 Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)				
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?		Y		During inspection a seal was observed in pen 7. No holes in the net were seen from the walkway and it was assumed the seal had gained entry to the cage from over the handrail and through a gap in the top net and the handrail. Site staff lowered the net and raised the top net and the seal climbed out on its own accord before the nets were placed back in position and any gaps closed. Potential escape form completed by the company and sent to FHI the same day.
If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH Regs ⁴ 31D,E	Form completed by [redacted] and sent in to Fish Health Mailbox
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO ² and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	No fish estimated to have escaped due to method of seal entering cage.
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail		N/A		
1.5. Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7. Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		Site has Knox seal pro nets, tension froyer ring, top bird nets. Site trialing a 'seal fence' on pen 7 to see if that would be beneficial going forward. Deciding next year (summer) if it would be worth employing those across the whole site - getting through winter and then pupping season.
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	SSI, 2,9	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary	
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site					
General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14, SSI 2,1		
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			Facilities Moorings Nets		
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Y	Y	SeaQure system designed for high energy sites Seal pro nets. No special adaptations to any facilities, moorings or nets. 2019 AquaSkye conduct inspections on moorings. Gaelforce for pens.
b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y	Y	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:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2	18mm	
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y		Kilburny where they're stored cleaned and inspected.	
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y		varies 15m - 35m	
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		HDPE	
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	Y	SSI, 2,5		
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			

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	November 2021 - inner and outer tube ring on walkway broke. Cages survived storm Arwen. Fish were moved to invertote while repairs made. Sent off to Kishorn for repairs.
Pen and mooring systems				Wave and climate analysis by RPS, environmental work, benthic study. Feasibility study conducted in 2016 which included all the above.
2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	
2.9 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	
2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	
2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	
2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	
2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.16 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	
2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	N	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.19 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.20 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.22 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	
2.23 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	
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 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	
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	
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 4.4.29, 5.4.12	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		Not specific containment risk assessment but the nets etc. are checked all beforehand.
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 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	Polar boats and tin boat
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	Only work boats but not site specific
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		Yes		Seals, comes and goes
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.7 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 4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Medium Low Low	 Y N/A N/A	SSI, 2,8,a SSI, 2,8,b CoGP 4.4.27	
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site? 5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High High	N Y	CoGP 4.4.18	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	Nets not stored on site at any time Seal pro nets, weighted/tensioned froyer ring, top nets and trialing seal fence on pen 7.
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y		
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.21	
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		Y		
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA ⁵ 2010 P4, S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.31	Does not happen on site.
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) 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 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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

4 The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended)

5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0579	DATE OF VISIT	01/08/2023
SITE No	FS1343	SITE NAME	Culnacnoc Salmon Farm
CASE No	20230335	INSPECTOR	██████████

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

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 site and site equipment

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

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

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

R10

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

Signed:

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of the Fish Health Inspector.

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 07/08/2023

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at [Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science)



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0579	DATE OF VISIT	01/08/2023
SITE No	FS1343	SITE NAME	Culnacnoc Salmon Farm
CASE No	20230335	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

The above site was visited in accordance with the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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.

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

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

Signed:

Date: 15/08/2023

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at [Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)

R20