

Case No:	2024-0023	Date of visit:	07/02/2024			
Time spent on site:	3 hours	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0403	Site Name:	Meavag Hatchery			
Business No:	FB0449	Business Name:	Meavag Fish Farming			
Case Types:	1 CNA	2 VMD	3	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):		Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed	N/A	
Observations:	Region:	WI	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	N	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:**

Following a previous inspection an issue was raised in regards to containment as the secondary screen covering the water exit point for the site was damaged and an enhanced containment inspection was arranged.

Upon inspection of the site, the secondary screen has been replaced and the issue resolved.

3 fish were removed for VMD, the fish sampled appeared healthy both internally and externally.

Case No: 2024-0023 Site No: FS0403

Date of Visit: 07/02/2024

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	19	Facilities stocked	3	No facilities inspected	19
Species	RTR	KOI			
Age group	2023	2022			
No Fish	16,275	49			
Mean Fish Wt	39g	49g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Site never fallow		Next Input Date (Site)	03/2024	
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
21/11/2023
Y
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?
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

Other (detail)

Whole fish to landfill.

5 RTR and 1 KOI mort within the last 4 weeks.

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.

N

N/A

N/A

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		N/A
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?	
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 <i>increased (unexplained)</i> 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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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:

03/10/2023 - 07/02/2024

Case no: 2024-0023Site No: FS0403Date of visit/ Sampling: 07/02/202407/0

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: 15:30:0015:35:00Inspector: VMD No. 1

Environmental conditions: 1 Dry2 Sunny345

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-3											
	Pool Group												
Stock Details	Species	TRO											
	Average weight	39g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
		Trout Lodge											
	Stock Origin												
	Facility No	1											

02/2024 Additional Sample Information:

--

0

Total Tests assigned

0

[illegible]

Site No: FS0403
Case No: 2024-0023
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



Case No: 2024-0023

Site No: FS0403

Date of visit: 07/02/2024

Inspector(s):

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (FRESHWATER)</b>				
<b>a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures</b>				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		N		
<b>If yes answer 1.2-1.8:</b>				
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	Site specific contingency plan and risk assessment documentation inspected.
<b>b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site</b>				
General records				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement		Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-  a) The name of the manufacturer  b) Any special adaptations c) The name of the supplier d) The date of purchase e) Each inspection including i) the name of the person conducting the inspection ii) the date of each inspection iii) the place of each inspection iv) the outcome of each inspection f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out 2.2. In relation to each net a record of: i) The mesh size ii) The code which appears on the identification tag iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Low		SSI 2,1		Meavag Hatchery's current owner purchased the farm in 2006, previously owned by WISCO. All tanks and hatchery fish holding facilities were included in the purchase. The current owner did not receive or retain an in depth inventory of all equipment. No new fish holding facilities have been purchased since the handover of the business in 2006 therefore no further documentation relating to fish holding facilities exist. Site management have been advised to ensure all future equipment and fish holding facility purchases along with any repair or servicing works are to be documents and all invoices retained for future inspection.
		Facilities	Moorings	Nets	The equipment used at meavag hatchery is limited, as it's a small scale business most of the fish handling procedures are conducted by hand. The company own a small hand grading machine which on a rare occasion has the water pipe replaced, this is done as and when required and does not require an external service to maintain its functionality.
		Y	N/A	N/A	Following consultation with the site operator, A site inventory record was created and submitted on 25/06/2024. This record details all equipment and facilities on site and includes the following details: The name of manufacture, the name of the supplier, the date of purchase, date of construction, materials used in constction and dimensions. The record has been designed and implemented to stand as an appropriate method of documentation for any future purchases of equipment and/or facilities.
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
		Y	N/A	N/A	
		Y	N/A	N/A	
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
			SSI, 2,2		
		N/A			
	N/A				
	N/A				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	N/A		
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:				
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3	Following consultation with the site operator, A site inventory record detailing all equipment and facilities on site was created and submitted on 25/06/2024. This record details the date of construction, materials used in construction and dimensions. The record has been designed and implemented to stand as an appropriate method of documentation for any future purchases of equipment and/or facilities.
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y		Fibre glass tanks, 12 3.6 meter tanks, 2 5m tanks, 66 ova trays. No records displaying this information.
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y		
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4	
i) The date of installation	Low	N/A		
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	N/A		
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	N/A		
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	N/A	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		The site has no history of flooding.
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	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)	The site has not sustained any damage due to severe weather. Site management advised that in the event where this may occur, details of the incident and of any repairs would be recorded in the sites dairy.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	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	N/A	CoGP 3.4.11	
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.12	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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	N/A	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	Y	CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	Screens are checked daily, SOP provided.
2.12 Are screens constructed from a suitably strong and robust material, and therefore fit for purpose?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.19	Screens are made of stainless steel and are suitably strong and robust. Screens have never needed to be replaced. A few screens have been repaired however this was over 10 years ago so no documentation has been retained. In the event of damage to a tank screen, the screens will be sent to Ivor Murrays in Stornoway for repair or replacement. As only two tanks were stocked with fish during the inspection of the site, a close up visual inspection of the sites screens was conducted during the inspection with no issues identified.
2.13 Can the site demonstrate awareness of the minimum net strengths to be used at all times?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.14	
2.14 Does the site have a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.15	
2.15 Does the site use nylon nets older than 5 years?	High	N/A	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	N/A	CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low	N/A	CoGP 3.4.20, 3.4.21	
2.19 Can the site demonstrate evidence of nets being inspected and strength tested after each cycle by a competent person?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.22	
2.20 Is in accordance with a detailed procedure based on manufacturer's advise and using a documented quality control system?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.22	
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23	
a) net base	High	N/A		
b) side wall	High	N/A		
c) above the waterline	High	N/A		
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.24	
2.23 Are additional inspections undertaken following adverse weather where required?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.25	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
<b>b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training</b>				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	N/A	CoGP 7.1.8	Site is run by the owner, no staff employed. The site owner is highly experienced with over 20 years experience in the industry.
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High	Y	CoGP 7.4.7	SOP provided. The site is run by the owner who operates alone.
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	The site does not use helicopters as a method of transfer.
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	N/A	CoGP 3.4.35 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 ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37	SOP provided. The site is run by the owner who operates alone.
<b>b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments</b>				
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	
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		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
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	
4.4 Do these checks include the suitability of the above equipment for use during adverse weather conditions where appropriate?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.25, 3.4.29	
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	
4.6 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,b	The site has no history of any predator attacks. Pest control measures are in place around feed storage areas and are managed in house by the site owner.
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?	Medium	N	2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?		Y		
4.10 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including			SSI, 2,8,a	
-The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A		
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	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  CoGP 2.4.12  CoGP 2.4.14  CoGP 2.4.15  CoGP 2.4.20  CoGP 3.4.17	Following a previous inspection an issue was raised in regards to containment as the secondary screen covering the water exit point for the site was damaged, this has since been repaired.
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	Y		SEPA Flood maps - Not within a flood zone.
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		Screens in place.
5.4 Is the site inflow system designed to prevent any upstream escape of farm stock?	High	Y		
5.5 Are the screen sizes capable of containing the entire range of fish sizes within the unit in every instance?	High	Y		
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	Y		
5.7 Does the net mesh size contain the entire range of fish sizes in every instance of the species involved?	High	N/A		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.8 Are boat operations conducted in a manner which avoids damage to nets and pens?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.34	
<b>d. Inspection of site specific procedures</b>				
6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.24	
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-				
a) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.31	
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
<b>e) Collection of samples</b> 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)	
<b>h) Enforcement Notice.</b> 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

Case No: 2024-0023

Date of visit: 07/02/2024

Site No: **FS0403**

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0449	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	07/02/2024
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0403	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Meavag Hatchery
<b>CASE No</b>	20240023	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[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 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.

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.

Date: 19/07/2024

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/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/pages/1-1-introduction.aspx)



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0449	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	07/02/2024
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0403	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Meavag Hatchery
<b>CASE No</b>	20240023	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[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.

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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: 19/07/2024

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/)