

From: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Sent: 19 May 2016 09:12
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Thanks for this <REDACTED>. It was discussed in Ireland in March as <REDACTED> notes and it was mentioned yesterday at the DEFRA stakeholder meeting. It seems like an entirely sensible approach.

Thanks,
<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 19 May 2016 09:00
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED>
Cc: <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED>
Subject: FW: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Hi

I spoke with <REDACTED> yesterday about the wish to certify lumpfish as originating from a VHS, IHN and Gs source although they are not listed by the EU as a susceptible species. I understand that discussions are currently ongoing in the EU about listing wrasse and lumpfish as susceptible to VHS in the future.

Although we could not insist on imports of cleaner fish being certified as free from VHS, IHN and Gs, the Norwegian authority is volunteering to provide this and any exported fish will be from negatively tested parents and not direct from the wild. I understand from the update provided from <REDACTED> on 20 April that Cefas have obtained a similar agreement from the Icelandic authorities.

We haven't had any trade of cleaner fish out of Scotland yet, but we should have no issue with certifying any export as free from VHS, IHN and Gs. As it seems likely that cleaner fish will be listed as susceptible to VHS, <REDACTED> proposal seems acceptable and a forward thinking approach. As we have a high health status I usually include on the health certificate that fish are from a country free from VHS, IHN, ISA and Gs even if not strictly required due to their susceptibility or the health status of the destinations. I think this is an approach generally followed by the rest of the UK and Ireland as I often receive certificates with a higher certification standard than required.

We have two consignments of lumpfish arriving in Scotland in the next couple of days. Grieg Seafood are importing 150,000 lumpsucker fry from Norway on Sunday to be held at the NAFC in Scalloway and FAI Aquaculture are importing 50,000 lumpsucker ova from Iceland tomorrow to be held at Loch Duart's facility at Loch Laxford shorebase.

I will reply to <REDACTED>, but please let me know if you have any queries or comments you wish me to pass on.

Thanks

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no

Sent: 18 May 2016 12:42

To: <REDACTED>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk'

Cc: <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk'

Subject: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

1. Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

There has recently been some confusion about requirements for the certification of cleaner fish, lumpfish in particular, placed on the market between EEA- countries. VHS has been found on lumpfish in Iceland and the European Commission is working to list lumpfish as a susceptible species. The situation is that there are no requirements in the present EU-legislation for issuing a health certificate for non-susceptible species. This will change as soon as lumpfish is listed as a susceptible species.

We are all worried about the health situation in cleaner fish and want to be proactive to prevent the spread of diseases. As I told you on the phone, we have discussed this challenge for a long time in the Norwegian Food Safety Authority (NFSA) and also in the fish health group meeting between our countries in Ireland in March 2016. To prepare for the listing of lumpfish and to avoid any misunderstandings, The NFSA has decided to declare a policy for the placing on the market of cleaner fish. We want you to confirm if this is acceptable.

First of all I would like to take the opportunity to remind you of the fact that Norway according to the EEA-agreement is to be treated as an EU member state and not third country, when the requirements of Directive 2006/88/EC are to be enforced. I have registered that import has been mentioned in the correspondence between the countries concerning placing on the market of lump fish. All movement of aquaculture animals between Norway and EU-countries is placing on the market.

The whole territory of Norway is considered free for VHS, IHN and *Gyrodactylus salaris* according to Directive 2006/88/EC.

The NFSA have decided that the new policy for the placing on the market of cleaner fish to other EEA-countries and from other EEA-countries to Norway will cover all species of cleaner fish, including lumpfish and wrasse. We include all species to take into account the lack of knowledge of the health status in this group of aquatic animals.

1.1 Norwegian policy for the placing on the market of cleaner fish to and from other EEA-countries

1. Only first or later generation cleaner fish from parent fish that has been tested negative for VHS and IHN is allowed to be placed on the market to other EEA-countries.

2. Only first or later generation cleaner fish from parent fish that has been tested negative for VHS and IHN is allowed to be placed on the market from other EEA-countries to Norway.
3. The cleaner fish must be accompanied by a health certificate certifying that the fish come from an area free of VHS, IHN and *Gyrodactylus salaris*.

Please read through the draft and give me a feed back as soon as possible. I hope this is an acceptable approach to you all.

Best regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Fiskehelsebiolog

Avdeling for fisk og sjømat / Department of Fish and Seafood

Seksjon for fiskehelse og fiskevelferd / Section for Fish Health and Fish Welfare

Mattilsynet, Hovedkontoret / Norwegian Food Safety Authority, Head Office

Address: Ullevålsveien 76, Oslo

Postal address: P.O. Box 383

N-2381 BRUMUNDDAL

Phone: <REDACTED>

Mob.: <REDACTED>

Fax: <REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>

Sent: 19 May 2016 16:25

To: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Cc: <REDACTED>@marine.ie>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Subject: SV: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Dear <REDACTED>

Thank you for your reply. I will instruct our inspectors of the new policy as soon as I have got a response from everybody.

Best regards

<REDACTED>

Fra: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <a href="mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk"><REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk

Sendt: 19. mai 2016 13:43

Til: <REDACTED>

Kopi: <REDACTED>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot'; <REDACTED> (Cefas)

Emne: RE: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Dear <REDACTED>

Sorry that I missed your call yesterday, I was in a meeting all day, so did not retrieve your message until this morning.

Thank you for sending us your proposals for dealing with lumpfish trade. We are pleased that you are tackling the VHS issue, ahead of the Commission listing lumpfish as a susceptible species.

We are happy to receive lumpfish stock from Norway on the basis of the test history you describe below, and that they will be officially certified VHS free to show that the source is subject to such control.

As regards trade from England and Wales to Norway (an unlikely scenario at present due to the state of development of our lumpfish industry), we would be happy to adopt the same position, as we have plans to test lumpfish stocks for VHS this season.

Yesterday I handed a draft document on proposed lumpfish farm management in England and Wales, to colleagues in Scotland and Northern Ireland, with a view to developing a common position regarding, site inspection, testing and trade control across the UK. It is therefore too early for us to give a whole UK position, but I am sure <REDACTED> will provide details of the current situation in Scotland. There is no lumpfish culture in Northern Ireland at present.

I note your comment regarding placing on the market as opposed to import, and can assure you that we do acknowledge that trade from Norway is managed in accord with intra community trade rules. Unfortunately the Directive's terminology does not fit with common use of the term import in the UK, so persons bringing stock into England from another country are called importers and their business is import, irrespective of whether it is in EU terms a third country import or the result of someone placing fish on the market from another EU member state. The net result is that we naturally use the single term import in correspondence with our industry, and it then strays into correspondence where we perhaps should make the distinction. I am sure you can forgive us.

Best regards - <REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@marine.ie>

Sent: 20 May 2016 16:58

To: <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk'

<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Cc: <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk' <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Hi <REDACTED>,

Thank you for your email.

We are content with the proposal outlined below and are grateful for the clarification in relation to future consignments from Norway. I doubt very much if we will have any trade going the opposite direction, but we will of course, be happy to implement a reciprocal approach should such movements occur in the future.

Have a nice weekend,

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>
Sent: 24 May 2016 14:44
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@marine.ie; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk
Cc: <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk
Subject: SV: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Thank you, <REDACTED>,
We do not expect much cleaner fish from other countries into Norway, but we have decided that the policy must apply both ways.

Best regards,
<REDACTED>

Fra: <REDACTED>@gov.scot
Sendt: 24. mai 2016 15:27
Til: <REDACTED>; <REDACTED>@marine.ie; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk
Kopi: <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk
Emne: RE: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Dear <REDACTED>

Thanks for your email outlining your proposal on trade of cleaner fish. As the susceptibility status of cleaner fish is currently being discussed with a view to adding them to the list of species susceptible to VHS, it is very much appreciated that Norway has offered to produce health certificates and test broodfish prior to any legislative changes being implemented.

In Scotland we have a few cleaner fish production sites, but at the moment they are mainly reliant on either locally wild caught broodstock or imported ova/fry from Norway and Iceland. The newest lumpfish production company is hoping to have a captive bred broodstock population within the next 5 years or so. I don't think there will be any excess production available for export for a number of years, but we will certainly provide a health certificate if any such trade starts up.

Best regards

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu
Sent: 14 November 2018 17:17
To: <REDACTED> (DEFRA)
Cc: <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu
Subject: RE: Compartment Declaration Rimstad Norway

Dear Colleague,

Thank you for your e-mail. I would like to ask you whether you have stated your question 1 and 2 vis-à-vis Norway as required by the Directive 2006/88/EC (Art 50(2)(c)). I ask you please to do so unless you have already done. I trust that you will have all the answers from Norway on those. In fact we have been under the impression that their presentation has already addressed at least the issue of the 26 fish.

As per the Directive (Art 50(2)(d)) the declaration shall take an effect unless “significant objective concerns” are indicated by at least one Member State. We take that your e-mail below is not yet one as your position seems to be depending on answer from Norway which, if arrives fast, may satisfactorily address your questions.

To assist your speedy bilateral contacts with Norway, I also forward your mail to the contact we have from the competent authority (the person who came to do the presentation) and will ask them to contact you. Please keep us in copy of your subsequent bilateral contacts with them.

We will answer your third question shortly, you do not need to state that to Norway. We have made extensive efforts back in July, in Sept and also in writing between those dates to explain but will try it again.

We took note of you asking us to respond quickly and we try our best while we tend to believe that your inquiry could have been better handled, had it been stated before, i.e. when 50+ days not yet elapsed.

Best regards:

<REDACTED>
<REDACTED>



European Commission

Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety (DG SANTE)
Animal Health and Welfare Unit (Unit G2)

F101 03/58
B-1049 Brussels, Rue Froissart 101.
<REDACTED>
<mailto:<REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu>

https://ec.europa.eu/food/animals_en

This message represents solely the views of its author and can not in any circumstances be regarded as the official position of the Commission. It is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please notify me as soon as possible.

From: <REDACTED> (DEFRA)
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 1:49 PM
To: <REDACTED> (SANTE) <mailto:<REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu>; <REDACTED> (SANTE) <mailto:<REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu>
Cc: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <mailto:<REDACTED>@cefaf.co.uk>; <mailto:<REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: Compartment Declaration Rimstad Norway
Importance: High

Dear <REDACTED> and <REDACTED>

Please find below the UK's comments on the Norwegian proposed declaration of freedom for the compartment Rimstad that is due to the Commission by the 19th November to be within the 60 day period.

We are not in support of this declaration.

The comments combine concerns raised by Cefas and Marine Scotland, which Defra supports. We do not support the declaration pending the clarification of a number of issues.

Please note that this is a critical issue for Scotland in particular, as there is an export of ova from Rimstad to a Scottish farm due on 21st November 2018, only two days after the 60 day consultation period.

We therefore require clarification from the Commission either through SCoPAFF or as with our last objection directly from you as to the status of the site and its ability to trade as disease free post the 60 day period if there are unresolved issues raised by Member States. Until our concerns have been adequately addressed by the Norwegian CA we would support Marine Scotland to object to the import of salmon ova from this site.

This declaration was highlighted by the Commission during the AHL meeting in July with regard to how the site is seeking freedom and we are aware that other MS's have issues with the declaration.

Therefore, we would appreciate the Commission to be prepared for objections to the declaration and respond quickly.

Your sincerely,

<REDACTED>

Senior FHI – <REDACTED> comments

'On reviewing both the declaration and the PowerPoint presentation they appear to contradict each other with regard to the 26 fish that were not sampled. The presentation has them as mortalities that did not show pathological changes or signs of autolysis at autopsy. Whereas the declaration refers to them in section 5.4 as fish that were sorted out and disposed of before the operator decided to start screening and that they were not stripped. No information on their clinical condition or autopsy is provided and it could be presumed that this was not conducted. Section 7.5 of the declaration states that

“Every brood fish that dies in the last 9 months before stripping and in the stripping period is obliged to autopsy”. The contradictory information regarding the 26 fish that were/were not mortalities does not help the case as moribund or freshly dead fish should be part of the priority selection of samples for surveillance as detailed in EC Decision 2015/1554 Annex I, part 3, point I.1.

The site is stated to be an ova production site for rainbow trout as well as salmon but no reference is made to rainbow trout. We would therefore ask for clarification as to if rainbow trout are held and if so where they originate from and details of any testing.

With regard to the perceived conflict between 2006/88 Annex V and 2015/1554 this was raised in the July meeting by the Commission and we presume the Norwegian CA are progressing this under 2015/1554 Part 3 I.2.2.2. However it would be useful to have clarification on which method to regain status has been applied in this case so we can make an assessment against the appropriate criteria.

We appreciate that the site has undergone clearance, disinfection and fallowing, the source of brood stock is from Category 1 land based sites and the high level of testing on the remaining fish is above that normally required.

But we cannot support the declaration unless we receive satisfactory clarification of the following points:

- 1/ - the status of rainbow trout on the site.
- 2/ - of the failure to test 26 fish and if they were actual mortalities or fish sorted from the rest of the stock and the reason why they were sorted out.
- 3/ - on which method is being applied to regain status.'

[For further comments, please see attached excel files.](#)

Regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>Aquatic Animal Health | Animal & Plant Health | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

<REDACTED> | 2nd Floor, **Foss House** Kings Pool 1-2, Peasholme Green, York, YO1 7PR.

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Sent: 15 November 2018 11:23
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Questions regarding declaration for 18000 Rimstad

Hi All

I discussed with <REDACTED> and it would appear that this is Ok from our perspective but please raise any concerns you may have.

Regards

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 15 November 2018 10:44
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>
Subject: FW: Questions regarding declaration for 18000 Rimstad

As promised from the NFSA...

From: <REDACTED> <REDACTED@mattilsynet.no>
Sent: 15 November 2018 10:30
To: <REDACTED@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu' <REDACTED@ec.europa.eu>; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu' <REDACTED@ec.europa.eu>; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu' <REDACTED@ec.europa.eu>; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu' <REDACTED@ec.europa.eu>; <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk' <REDACTED@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk' <REDACTED@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED@gov.scot>; <REDACTED><REDACTED@mattilsynet.no>; <REDACTED><<REDACTED@mattilsynet.no>>
Subject: Questions regarding declaration for 18000 Rimstad

Dear Colleagues,

Please find attached note.

Kind regards,

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

NFSA, Head Office – Fish Health and Welfare Section

<REDACTED>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

QUESTIONS REGARDING DECLARATION FOR 18000 RIMSTAD

Dear Colleagues,

NFSA would like to answer the questions from UK regarding the declaration for 18000 Rimstad.

1. The status of rainbow trout on the site

All fish landed at Rimstad has been accounted for. That is, 2747 brood fish were transferred from ISA-free compartment 12917 Sjølseng to restock Rimstad. 2721 of the transferred fish were sampled, and Annex V (data on testing animals at Rimstad) and Annex 3b identifies these individuals as Atlantic salmon. However, the declaration does only refer to the term “brood fish” regarding the fish transferred from 12917 Sjølseng.

NFSA hereby confirms that only Atlantic salmon has been landed at Rimstad.

Still, the purpose of the land base 18000 Rimstad is to produce eyed salmon and rainbow trout eggs, and hence the plant will receive both Atlantic salmon and rainbow trout brood fish for stripping in the future.

2. The failure to test 26 fish

The wording in the declaration under point 5.4, stating that 26 individuals were “sorted out” and “not stripped” is based on a misunderstanding.

The 26 fish not tested were dead fish. All dead fish at the site, including the 26 individuals in question, were autopsied.

The reasoning for 26 dead fish not being tested, is given in the presentation at pages 23 – 25.

Two sampling periods with different test regimes have been performed at Rimstad:

a) 19.02.2018 – 30.04.2018 – risk based sampling and screening

In risk based sampling only live fish with clinical symptoms / abnormal behavior (moribund fish) would be selected for sampling. Also, any freshly dead fish with pathological changes would be tested.

In this period, 26 dead fishes were autopsied, but not sampled, either because:

- 1) Autopsy did not show any pathological changes
- 2) Autopsy revealed signs of autolysis, meaning that the individual was not suitable for sampling with respect to freshness

In period **a)** we have a total of 67 dead fish, all autopsied. 41 of the dead fishes were tested; 26 dead fishes were not tested due to criterion 1 and 2 above.

Note: none of the 41 dead fishes sampled did show any pathological changes at autopsy. Still, the operator sampled a certain number of freshly dead fish in this period for screening purposes.

b) 01.05.2018 – 15.08.2018 – **100 percent testing**

As the “Rimstad case” evolved, and the operator became aware of the discrepancy between the Directive 2006/88/EC and Decision 2015/1554, the sampling shifted from risk based sampling / screening to 100 percent testing.

--

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>— NFSA – Head Office - Fish Health and Welfare Section
Bergen, Norway - 15.11.2018

From: <REDACTED><<REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>
Sent: 19 November 2018 13:53
To: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>
Cc: <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk' <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk';
<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk' <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk'; <REDACTED>
(MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>;
<REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: SV: Rimstaad compartment declaration

Dear <REDACTED>

Of course, NFSA will not certify the movement of ovas before the issues concerning the Rimstaad declaration are fully solved.

Best regards,

<REDACTED>

Fra: <REDACTED>@gov.scot
Sendt: mandag 19. november 2018 13:44
Til: <REDACTED><REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no;
<REDACTED><<REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>
Kopi: <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk; <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk;
<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk;
<REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot;
<REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot;
<REDACTED>@gov.scot
Emne: Rimstaad compartment declaration

Dear <REDACTED>and <REDACTED>

Thank you for addressing the concerns raised on the Rimstaad declaration by the UK last week. The Commission has confirmed that the Rimstaad declaration is currently on hold until concerns raised by other Member States are addressed.

We have received a TRACES notification for the movement of 2.5 million ova from Rimstaad to Scotland, planned for 21 November. I would be grateful if you could confirm that this movement will not take place until confirmation of the declaration has been received. I know this is a rapidly evolving situation and you might expect to resolve concerns today. Grateful to be kept updated.

Best regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Scottish Government – Aquaculture, Crown Estate, Recreational Fisheries, EMFF
and Europe

Tel: <REDACTED>

E-mail: <REDACTED>@gov.scot

Web: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

Mail: Scottish Government, 1B North, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ



From: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>

Sent: 19 November 2018 12:42

To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: PAFF Committée on 19th September 2018; re: A.11 Information concerning declaration from Norway on disease free status for Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA) of an independent compartment Rimstad in Tingvoll

FYI

Will get in touch with Norway.

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Marine Scotland – Aquaculture, Crown Estate, Recreational Fisheries, EMFF and Europe

Tel: <REDACTED>

E-mail: jill.barber@gov.scot

Web: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

Mail: Scottish Government, 1B North, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ



From: <REDACTED>

Sent: 19 November 2018 12:30

To: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Subject: RE: PAFF Committée on 19th September 2018; re: A.11 Information concerning declaration from Norway on disease free status for Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA) of an independent compartment Rimstad in Tingvoll

Hi <REDACTED>

Thanks for chasing this. I will alert our FHI that the declaration is currently on hold, but I will also make contact with necessary colleagues in Norway to ask that they keep us up to date in specific reference to the planned movement to Scotland.

Best regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Marine Scotland – Aquaculture, Crown Estate, Recreational Fisheries, EMFF and Europe

Tel: <REDACTED>

E-mail: <REDACTED>@gov.scot

Web: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

Mail: Scottish Government, 1B North, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ



From: <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu
Sent: 19 November 2018 11:35
To: <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: <REDACTED>@bmel.bund.de; <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk; <REDACTED><REDACTED>@gov.scot'; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk; SANTE-CONSULT-G2@ec.europa.eu; SANTE-CONSULT-G5@ec.europa.eu
Subject: RE: PAFF Committée on 19th September 2018; re: A.11 Information concerning declaration from Norway on disease free status for Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA) of an independent compartment Rimstad in Tingvoll

Dear <REDACTED>,

We are working with Germany and Norway on the way ahead while the declaration is put on hold. Norway will know what the status of this compartment is and how it may change after exchanges and what to certify and what not. You can rely on their certification and if ever you have a question, feel free to contact them bilaterally.

Best regards: <REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 11:24 AM
To: <REDACTED> (SANTE); <REDACTED> (SANTE); <REDACTED> (CEFAS); <REDACTED>@gov.scot'; <REDACTED> (CEFAS); SANTE CONSULT-G2; SANTE-CONSULT-G5@ec.europa.eu
Cc: <REDACTED>@bmel.bund.de; <REDACTED> (DEFRA); <REDACTED> (SANTE)
Subject: PAFF Committée on 19th September 2018; re: A.11 Information concerning declaration from Norway on disease free status for Infectious Salmon Anaemia (ISA) of an independent compartment Rimstad in Tingvoll

Dear <REDACTED> and <REDACTED>,

Can you please clarify whether the declaration has now been approved by the commission, or whether the queries made by Germany on Friday has put this on hold?

We were content with the responses we received from Norway last week. However, our main concern is now that if we accept the eggs and are not completely sure of the declaration status – we could potentially jeopardise the Scottish disease free status should we find out a later date the declaration was put on hold. Furthermore, the company will be preparing the eggs today – if they are sent over and the declaration has not been officially approved, Scotland would have to destroy them. We would want to avoid both these eventualities.

Aside from this these eggs are destined for a brand new recirculation facility which was opened by Ministers two weeks ago. We would like to be certain that we are taking the correct course of action.

Below outlines the concerns raised by Germany.

With thanks

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 November 2018 12:49
To: <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu; <REDACTED>@ec.europa.eu
Cc: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <REDACTED>@cefafas.co.uk>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: Compartment Declaration Rimstad Norway
Importance: High

Dear <REDACTED> and <REDACTED>

Please find below the UK's comments on the Norwegian proposed declaration of freedom for the compartment Rimstad that is due to the Commission by the 19th November to be within the 60 day period.

We are not in support of this declaration.

The comments combine concerns raised by Cefas and Marine Scotland, which Defra supports. We do not support the declaration pending the clarification of a number of issues.

Please note that this is a critical issue for Scotland in particular, as there is an export of ova from Rimstad to a Scottish farm due on 21st November 2018, only two days after the 60 day consultation period.

We therefore require clarification from the Commission either through SCoPAFF or as with our last objection directly from you as to the status of the site and its ability to trade as disease free post the 60 day period if there are unresolved issues raised by Member States. Until our concerns have been adequately addressed by the Norwegian CA we would support Marine Scotland to object to the import of salmon ova from this site.

This declaration was highlighted by the Commission during the AHL meeting in July with regard to how the site is seeking freedom and we are aware that other MS's have issues with the declaration.

Therefore, we would appreciate the Commission to be prepared for objections to the declaration and respond quickly.

Your sincerely,

<REDACTED>

Senior FHI – <REDACTED> comments

‘On reviewing both the declaration and the PowerPoint presentation they appear to contradict each other with regard to the 26 fish that were not sampled. The presentation has them as mortalities that did not show pathological changes or signs of autolysis at autopsy. Whereas the declaration refers to them in section 5.4 as fish that were sorted out and disposed of before the operator decided to start screening and that they were not stripped. No information on their clinical condition or autopsy is provided and it could be presumed that this was not conducted. Section 7.5 of the declaration states that “Every brood fish that dies in the last 9 months before stripping and in the stripping period is obliged to autopsy”. The contradictory information regarding the 26 fish that were/were not mortalities does not help the case as moribund or freshly dead fish should be part of the priority selection of samples for surveillance as detailed in EC Decision 2015/1554 Annex I, part 3, point I.1.

The site is stated to be an ova production site for rainbow trout as well as salmon but no reference is made to rainbow trout. We would therefore ask for clarification as to if rainbow trout are held and if so where they originate from and details of any testing.

With regard to the perceived conflict between 2006/88 Annex V and 2015/1554 this was raised in the July meeting by the Commission and we presume the Norwegian CA are progressing this under 2015/1554 Part 3 I.2.2.2. However it would be useful to have clarification on which method to regain status has been applied in this case so we can make an assessment against the appropriate criteria.

We appreciate that the site has undergone clearance, disinfection and fallowing, the source of brood stock is from Category 1 land based sites and the high level of testing on the remaining fish is above that normally required.

But we cannot support the declaration unless we receive satisfactory clarification of the following points:

- 1/ - the status of rainbow trout on the site.
- 2/ - of the failure to test 26 fish and if they were actual mortalities or fish sorted from the rest of the stock and the reason why they were sorted out.
- 3/ - on which method is being applied to regain status.’

For further comments, please see attached excel files.

Regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED> | Aquatic Animal Health | Animal & Plant Health | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

<REDACTED> | 2nd Floor, **Foss House** Kings Pool 1-2, Peasholme Green, **York**, YO1 7PR.

From: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED@cefas.co.uk>
Sent: 08 November 2018 17:22
To: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED@defra.gsi.gov.uk>
Cc: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> <REDACTED@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>
Subject: Approved Compartment Declaration Rimstad Norway

Dear <REDACTED>

Attached is our response to the Norwegian Rimstad declaration which needs to be with the Commission by the 19th November to be within the 60 day period. The comments are a combination of Cefas and Marine Scotland's and as you will see we do not support the declaration pending the clarification of a number of issues.

You will have seen the concerns raised by <REDACTED> (attached) regarding the intended export of ova from Rimstad to a Scottish farm only two days after the 60 day consultation period. We therefore require clarification from the Commission either through SCoPAFF or as with our last objection direct from <REDACTED> as to the status of the site and its ability to trade as disease free post the 60 day period if there are unresolved issues raised by Member States. Until our concerns have been adequately addressed by the Norwegian CA we would support Marine Scotland in refusing the import of salmon ova from this site.

This declaration was highlighted by the Commission during the AHL meeting in July with regard to how the site is seeking freedom and we are aware that other MS's have issues with the declaration. Therefore we expect the Commission to be prepared for objections to the declaration and respond quickly.

Regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Senior Fish Health Inspector
Barrack Road, Weymouth, Dorset, DT4 8UB, UK
Tel: <REDACTED>| Mob: <REDACTED>| Email: <REDACTED@cefas.co.uk>
Web: www.gov.uk/cefas/fhi



Follow us on:



This email and any attachments are intended for the named recipient only. Its unauthorised use, distribution, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you have received it in error, please destroy all copies and notify the sender. In messages of a non-business nature, the views and opinions expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of Cefas. Communications on Cefas' computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. All messages sent and received by the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science may be monitored in line with relevant [UK legislation](#).

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 11 July 2017 15:08
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>
<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>
(MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>
(MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>;
<REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> <REDACTED>@gov.scot>;
<REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>;
<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: ISA suspected at AquaGen Tingvoll

<http://aquagen.no/en/2017/07/10/ila-mistanke-hos-aquagen-tingvoll/>

Please see report from AquaGen that ISA has been detected at one of their broodfish production sites at Tingvoll. I have spoken with <REDACTED> and there has been no associated mortality, this is from their routine surveillance testing. Results in April, May and June were negative. Fish are likely to be culled out, but the result has not been confirmed yet by the competent authority (PCR only).

Scottish producers have received salmon and rainbow trout ova during the 2016/2017 season which originated from broodstock held at Tingvoll. The 2017/2018 season ova will be sourced from their other broodstock population held at Hemne.

<REDACTED>
From: <REDACTED>@hendrix-genetics.com>
Sent: 12 July 2017 11:45
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: ISA in Norway

Thanks <REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@gov.scot
Sent: 12 July 2017 11:17
To: <REDACTED>
Subject: RE: ISA in Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

The only source I know is the website for Mattilsynet (https://www.mattilsynet.no/language/english/fish_and_aquaculture/fish_health/) but it doesn't look like there have been any updates for a while. Also it only has lists of the ISA free areas, not those that are declared infected. The EU commission website has links to Member State websites with health status declarations, but the Norwegian link takes you to a dead page.

Sorry!

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@hendrix-genetics.com)>@hendrix-genetics.com
Sent: 12 July 2017 10:59
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Subject: RE: ISA in Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

I was just wondering if you know of any website which would show where all the ISA outbreaks are in Norway. I just want to get a feel for where they are in relation to other Aquagen sites. I had a quick look on the map yesterday and the Hemne site didn't appear to be that far from Tingvoll.

Thanks

<REDACTED>

From: <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@gov.scot)>@gov.scot
Sent: 11 July 2017 15:29
To: <REDACTED>
Subject: RE: ISA in Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

I've spoken with <REDACTED> and Aquagen have another other broodstock site at Hemne which would be able to continue supplying ova to Scotland as it is in an ISA free compartment. As long as the ova are sourced from this population there shouldn't be any issues as the competent authority will still be able to attest that the source is free from ISA so I don't think there will be an impact on their ova supply to Scotland this year.

Cheers

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@hendrix-genetics.com)>@hendrix-genetics.com
Sent: 11 July 2017 13:19
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Subject: ISA in Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

I was just wondering if the ISA outbreaks in Norway, in particular Aquagen, would have any effect on their ability to export eggs into Scotland this year. Where does Marine Scotland stand on this issue.

Any information would be gratefully received.

Kind Regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>
Atlantic Salmon

T <REDACTED>
M <REDACTED>
<REDACTED>
W www.landcatch.co.uk



Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd
Ormsary Fish Farm, Lochgilphead
Argyll, PA31 8PE, Scotland, UK-EU

Disclaimer:

This e-mail is sent for the sole attention of the identified addressee and its contents are provided for information purposes only.

If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message and any attachments without retaining a copy.

Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s) make(s) no warranty or representation as to the accuracy and completeness of any information and do(es) not assume whatever commitment hereby.

Legally binding obligation can only arise for, or be entered into on behalf of, Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s) by means of a written instrument signed by an authorized representative of Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s).

Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s) exclude(s) any liability whatsoever for any direct/indirect or consequential loss arising from the use, or reliance on, this e-mail or its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been received from an external party and
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 09 August 2017 12:10
To: <REDACTED>@hendrix-genetics.com>
Subject: RE: Aquagen eggs

Hi <REDACTED>

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you, <REDACTED>

Below is a link to the Mattilsynet page about the areas declared free of ISA following two years of testing in 2013/14, but it doesn't provide specific details about the testing programme implemented. To be declared free of a disease countries need to follow the criteria detailed in Annex V of Directive 2006/88 which requires targeted surveillance (150 fish twice per year for two years). The details of the programme are then submitted to SCoFCAH (now SCoPAFF) and scrutinised by Member States. If no issues are raised, the area is declared disease free and will be listed in the appropriate legislation.

https://www.mattilsynet.no/language/english/fish_and_aquaculture/fish_health/areas_declared_free_from_infectious_salmon_anaemia_isa.19431

I don't have any specific information on the setup of the site at Vestseora and how it has been registered. It may be that the site is split up into separate halls like Ormsary Hatchery was split into three units for a few years. Aquagen would have to demonstrate that there was no contact via water between the halls and appropriate biosecurity measures in place such as footbaths and separate gear.

The EU health certificate used for imports into Scotland requires susceptible animals to originate from a country, zone or compartment declared free of ISA in accordance with directive 2006/88 or the relevant OIE standard in the case of consignments from third countries (certificate templates are detailed in Regulation 1251/2008). The wording of the certificate for movements within the EU is below;

I, the undersigned official inspector, hereby certify that the aquaculture animals referred to above originate from a Member State, zone or compartment declared free from (1)[VHS] (1)[IHN] (1)[ISA] (1)[KHV] (1) [Marteilia refringens] (1)[Bonamia ostreae] (1)[White spot disease] in accordance with Chapter VII of Directive 2006/88/EC.

We are unable to receive consignments of ISA susceptible species unless they originate from an ISA free area. As long as a country or compartment has been declared free of ISA (and any other relevant diseases) then no additional testing is required.

Scotland follows the testing requirements of the EU. The EU standards for surveillance and diagnostic testing are laid out in decision 2015/1554. The inspection and testing requirements to demonstrate freedom from ISA are laid out in table 3.A. Sites are subject to 6 inspections per year with sampling of 75 fish twice per year over the two year surveillance period.

If a whole country is declared free, such as Great Britain, continued testing (targeted surveillance) can be discontinued as long as conditions are conducive to clinical expression of the disease (article 52 of directive 2006/88). If targeted surveillance is required to maintain the ISA free zone (i.e. disease free compartments within non-disease free countries) then inspections and testing are conducted in accordance with table 3B in decision 2015/1554. The frequency and number of inspections and tests are determined by the risk level attributed to the site with high risk sites sampled twice per year, medium risk once per year and low risk sites once every two years. The sample size is 30 fish and the screening method is RT-qPCR.

I hope I've answered your questions, but I don't have all of the information about the setup in Norway. <REDACTED> would hopefully be able to supply more info about the setup of the Vestseora.

Thanks

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> <REDACTED>@hendrix-genetics.com
Sent: 26 July 2017 11:16
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Subject: RE: Aquagen eggs

Hi <REDACTED>

I was just wondering how the Norwegians classify their disease free areas for ISA. From their website Aquagen mention fish going into different broodfish halls on what appears to be the same site and that if fish in the different halls are negative then the eggs can be exported? Or am I getting that wrong? Is it possible to get clarification on what they consider separate sites for ISA status.

Could you please also clarify what the exact wording is for the requirements of Scotland as a receiving country as far as ISA testing is concerned.

Thanks

Kind Regards

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@gov.scot
Sent: 20 July 2017 10:30
To: <REDACTED>
Subject: RE: Aquagen eggs

Hi <REDACTED>

From the information available, this shouldn't have an impact on the ova imported over the 2016/2017 season as the movement to the Hemne area only occurred in June this year after the ova had been exported. I don't know what impact this will have on the 2017/2018 season as I don't have information on how the affected site, Vestseora, links to the sea water sites or hatchery in the Hemne area, but no movements can occur from the site while it is under restrictions.

We cannot ask for additional testing of the broodfish. Customers could request this additional testing from Aquagen, but they would be under no legal obligation to carry this out if restrictions are lifted and the site is listed as free from ISA. The Norwegian authority can only issue health certificates for consignments that meet the requirements of the receiving country. If their investigations do not find ISA in the Hemne area, restrictions are lifted and their ISA free status is confirmed, exports can resume from this area.

We will hopefully have a clearer idea of the potential impact of these restrictions once Mattilsynet have completed their investigations and we will let the Scottish industry know if the outcome will have an impact on sources of ova for 2017/18 as soon as we have that information.

Cheers

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> <REDACTED>@hendrix-genetics.com
Sent: 19 July 2017 10:02
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Subject: Aquagen eggs

Hi <REDACTED>

I was just wondering what your thoughts are on the Aquagen situation now that the site at Hemne also seems to be affected. Can MS ask for 100% testing for ISA on all broodfish parents of eggs destined for Scotland or are you still reliant on the Norwegians to say they are free of the disease.

Kind Regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>
Atlantic Salmon

T <REDACTED>
M <REDACTED>475
<REDACTED>
W www.landcatch.co.uk



Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd
Ormsary Fish Farm, Lochgilphead
Argyll, PA31 8PE, Scotland, UK-EU

Disclaimer:
This e-mail is sent for the sole attention of the identified addressee and its contents are provided for information purposes only.
If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message and any attachments without retaining a copy.
Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s) make(s) no warranty or representation as to the accuracy and completeness of any information and do(es) not assume whatever commitment hereby.
Legally binding obligation can only arise for, or be entered into on behalf of, Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s) by means of a written instrument signed by an authorized representative of Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s).
Hendrix Genetics B.V. and/or its affiliate(s) exclude(s) any liability whatsoever for any direct/indirect or consequential loss arising from the use, or reliance on, this e-mail or its contents.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been received from an external party and
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadaichte a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo le gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh, leig fios chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil.

Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 14 November 2018 14:15
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED> @gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED> @gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>;

<REDACTED>@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Approved Compartment Declaration Rimstad Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

Just to answer a couple of your questions from a few emails ago.

I replied to <REDACTED> at AquaGen on 7 November when I received his initial email letting us know of the plan export and asked him for an update on the approval process as queries had been raised about the application. I haven't received a reply from him yet and I have sent him a further email today (copied to <REDACTED> at AquaGen) asking him for an update. If the UK's query has only been submitted today then maybe issues have yet to be raised with AquaGen or Mattilsynet.

I have emailed SSF today to make arrangements to inspect the consignment on arrival (we inspect a percentage on arrival) and to inform them that the ISA free declaration for Rimstad has not gone through yet and if there are any delays in the process then the import cannot proceed next week as the site would not meet the standard to export to the UK.

If the declaration is not confirmed on Monday then the export should not proceed as Mattilsynet cannot issue a health certificate that meets the health requirements of the UK. If the eggs arrive and the declaration isn't confirmed, we could issue a notice under Regulation 30(2) of TARP as the animals do not comply with the requirements of article 3 of Directive 90/425. They would fail to satisfy the requirements of Directive 2006/88 as per article 3 (1a) (movement from Category II to Category I is not allowed). This notice requires the ova either to be destroyed or returned to source (with approval of Mattilsynet).

Thanks

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED@cefas.co.uk](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)>

Sent: 08 November 2018 17:22

To: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <[REDACTED@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk)>

Cc: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <[REDACTED@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk)>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED@cefas.co.uk](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)>; <REDACTED> <[REDACTED@gov.scot](mailto:<REDACTED>@gov.scot)>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <[REDACTED@gov.scot](mailto:<REDACTED>@gov.scot)>

Subject: Approved Compartment Declaration Rimstad Norway

Dear <REDACTED>

Attached is our response to the Norwegian Rimstad declaration which needs to be with the Commission by the 19th November to be within the 60 day period. The comments are a combination of Cefas and Marine Scotland's and as you will see we do not support the declaration pending the clarification of a number of issues.

You will have seen the concerns raised by <REDACTED> (attached) regarding the intended export of ova from Rimstad to a Scottish farm only two days after the 60 day consultation period. We therefore require clarification from the Commission either through SCoPAFF or as with our last objection direct from <REDACTED> as to the status of the site and its ability to trade as disease free post the 60 day period if there are unresolved issues raised by Member States. Until our concerns have been

adequately addressed by the Norwegian CA we would support Marine Scotland in refusing the import of salmon ova from this site.

This declaration was highlighted by the Commission during the AHL meeting in July with regard to how the site is seeking freedom and we are aware that other MS's have issues with the declaration. Therefore we expect the Commission to be prepared for objections to the declaration and respond quickly.

Regards

<REDACTED>_____

<REDACTED>

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Barrack Road, Weymouth, Dorset, DT4 8UB, UK

Tel: <REDACTED>| Mob: <REDACTED>| Email: <REDACTED>@cefasc.co.uk

Web: www.gov.uk/cefasc/fhi



Follow us on:



This email and any attachments are intended for the named recipient only. Its unauthorised use, distribution, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you have received it in error, please destroy all copies and notify the sender. In messages of a non-business nature, the views and opinions expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of Cefas. Communications on Cefas' computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. All messages sent and received by the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science may be monitored in line with relevant [UK legislation](#).

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED@cefasscot.gov.scot>
Sent: 29 October 2018 15:12
To: <REDACTED> <REDACTED@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED@cefasscot.gov.scot>
Subject: Rimstaad Declaration

All

I have tried to combine all of our comments and concerns and have stated we will not support the declaration pending the clarification of three points. Please have a look at the attached document and feel free to comment etc

Regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Senior Fish Health Inspector
Barrack Road, Weymouth, Dorset, DT4 8UB, UK
Tel: <REDACTED>| Mob: <REDACTED>| Email: <REDACTED@cefasscot.gov.scot>
Web: www.gov.uk/cefasscot/fhi



Follow us on:



This email and any attachments are intended for the named recipient only. Its unauthorised use, distribution, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you have received it in error, please destroy all copies and notify the sender. In messages of a non-business nature, the views and opinions expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of Cefas. Communications on Cefas' computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Approved Compartment Declaration

EU reference

Farm Name Rimstaad

Member State Norway

Region

1. Geographical Detail.

Single compartment comprising one farm supplied with freshwater from a lake.

2. Plan of Facility

Basic plan which does not clearly show the two biosecure units or give any ideas of the water flow within the facility.

3. Structure of and Production at the Farm: Species Present

On shore farm receiving salmon brood fish from Cat 1 sites for stripping and production of eyed ova. NO ongrowing

4. Source of eggs, gametes and/or fish.

Salmon broodstock from ISA free sites only. Currently only from landbased broodfish.

5.1 Water source/inlet.

Freshwater piped from a depth of 10m from the lake above the site into the facility through screening and UV disinfection.

5.2 Outlet

There is no description of how the water is discharged.

5.3 Protection against flooding and infiltration

No mention of flooding.

6. Additional measures (against introduction of disease)

Strict biosecurity and strict separation between broodstock facility and ova hatchery.

7.1 Existing farms: surveillance, monitoring etc.

N/A

7.2 New farm / restocked farms.

Farm positive for ISA in July 2017 and whole site cleared and disinfected and fallowed from September 2017 to February 2018. All broodstock 2721 except 26 unexplained fish, were tested after stripping. All testing was on individual animals and tissues leading to 5442 samples and all testing proved negative.

Summary comments.

- On reviewing both the declaration and the powerpoint presentation they appear to contradict each other with regard to the 26 fish that were not sampled. The presentation has them as mortalities that did not show pathological changes or signs of autolysis at autopsy. Whereas the declaration refers to them in section 5.4 as fish that were sorted out and disposed of before the operator decided to start screening and that they were not stripped. No information on their clinical condition or autopsy is provided and it could be presumed that this was not conducted. Section 7.5 of the declaration states that “Every brood fish that dies in the last 9 months before stripping and in the stripping period is obliged to autopsy”. The contradictory information regarding the 26 fish that were/were not mortalities does not help the case as moribund or freshly dead fish should be part of the priority selection of samples for surveillance as detailed in EC Decision 2015/1554 Annex I, part 3, point I.1.
- The site is stated to be an ova production site for rainbow trout as well as salmon but no reference is made to rainbow trout. We would therefore ask for clarification as to if rainbow trout are held and if so where they originate from and details of any testing.
- With regard to the perceived conflict between 2006/88 Annex V and 2015/1554 this was raised in the July meeting by the Commission and we presume the Norwegian CA are progressing this under 2015/1554 Part 3 I.2.2.2. However it would be useful to have clarification on which method to regain status has been applied in this case so we can make an assessment against the appropriate criteria.
- We appreciate that the site has undergone clearance, disinfection and fallowing, the source of brood stock is from Category 1 land based sites and the high level of testing on the remaining fish is above that normally required.
- But we cannot support the declaration unless we receive satisfactory clarification of the following points:
 - 1/ - the status of rainbow trout on the site.
 - 2/ - of the failure to test 26 fish and if they were actual mortalities or fish sorted from the rest of the stock and the reason why they were sorted out.
 - 3/ - on which method is being applied to regain status.



From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 07 November 2018 15:34
To: <REDACTED> <REDACTED@gov.scot>;
<REDACTED><REDACTED@gov.scot>
Subject: Imports from Aquagen Rimstad

Hi

I have had notification that Aquagen Norway plan to export salmon ova from Rimstad to Scotland on 21 November, 2 days after their 60 day assessment period is completed for the reinstatement of their ISA free status.

I am aware that there have been some questions raised by the UK and other countries. Do you know if these have been resolved? I am very wary of an export happening so soon after the end of the assessment period when I know that queries have been raised.

Thanks

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Marine Scotland Science

Scottish Government | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen AB11 9DB

Tel: <REDACTED>

Mob<REDACTED>

Fax: +44 (0)131 244 0944

S/B: +44 (0)131 244 2500

e: <REDACTED@gov.scot>

w: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine>

From: <REDACTED> <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Sent: 07 November 2018 16:47
To: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk; <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>
Cc: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Rimstaad declaration.
Importance: High

Hi <REDACTED>

Many thanks for pulling this together. We don't have anything further to add.

However please be aware that Scottish Government FHI have had notification that Aquagen Norway plan to export salmon ova from Rimstad to Scotland on 21 November, 2 days after their 60 day assessment period is completed for the reinstatement of their ISA free status.

Obviously this is concerning to us as questions remain unanswered regarding contradictory information supplied as part of the declaration. Are you able to advise on next steps the process might be should we not receive suitable clarification?

Best regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Marine Scotland – Aquaculture, Crown Estate, Recreational Fisheries, EMFF and Europe

Tel: <REDACTED>

E-mail: <REDACTED>@gov.scot

Web: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

Mail: Scottish Government, 1B North, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ



From: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>
Sent: 05 November 2018 09:11
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED><REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: Rimstaad declaration.

All

Please can you have the comments to me by Wednesday this week as we need to get them to Defra then the Commission by the 19th but I am working in the field all next week so I need to submit them by close of play Thursday 8th November.

Thanks

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Barrack Road, Weymouth, Dorset, DT4 8UB, UK

Tel: <REDACTED>| <REDACTED>| Email: <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk

Web: www.gov.uk/cefas/fhi



Follow us on:



This email and any attachments are intended for the named recipient only. Its unauthorised use, distribution, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you have received it in error, please destroy all copies and notify the sender. In messages of a non-business nature, the views and opinions expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of Cefas. Communications on Cefas' computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. All messages sent and received by the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science may be monitored in line with relevant [UK legislation](#).

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>

Sent: 10 August 2018 14:17

To: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Cc: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>;

<REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

<REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: For information: PAFF AHW-CIC July 2018 - Norway

Hi both

Sorry, just to add for future reference and/ or discussion, we had a slight disagreement here with regards to the comment made regarding to Part II Annex V (2006/88/EC). Our interpretation of point 4.2 is that all of points a), b) and c) must be met.

This doesn't affect the below/ acceptance regarding the way forward.

Cheers

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>

Sent: 10 August 2018 14:10

To: <REDACTED> (Cefas)'; <REDACTED> (DEFRA); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (Cefas)

Cc: <REDACTED> (Cefas); <REDACTED> (Cefas); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

Subject: RE: For information: PAFF AHW-CIC July 2018 - Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

I think that we had a deadline to provide any comments on the Rimstad declaration by CoP today. With thanks to FHI colleagues;

We agree that the pragmatic approach outlined by the Commission, and summarised post 12-13 July ScoPAFF meeting document, is acceptable.

We agree with the comments made by <REDACTED> that the Directive and the Implementing Decision seem to be at odds with each other, as the Directive requires a 2 year period of surveillance whilst the Implementing Decision allows for immediate reinstatement of the health status. The Implementing Decision having come in 2015 was presumably allowed following debate on an improvement in knowledge/evidence that continental farms could regain status after a comprehensive C, D & F programme.

We also agree that that the individual testing of all stocks transferred on to site would provide assurances on the health status of the site, providing that the time period,

sampling, detection method(s) and environmental conditions between stocking and sampling allowed for the expression of the disease. The potential risk to the transfer of disease should become apparent, should the C, D & F have been inadequate, thus protecting receiving sites. The continued targeted surveillance required under Article 52 would presumably be done and continue to provide this level of assurance.

The suggested pragmatic solution should be acceptable, where appropriate biosecurity controls and continued surveillance have been implemented, whilst the discrepancy between the Directive and the Implementing Decision are resolved.

Cheers

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)@cefas.co.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2018 17:05
To: <REDACTED> (DEFRA); <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (Cefas)
Cc: <REDACTED> (Cefas); <REDACTED> (Cefas)
Subject: RE: For information: PAFF AHW-CIC July 2018 - Norway

Hi <REDACTED>

We discussed this scenario with <REDACTED> when we were in Brussels last week. I was surprised to see their opinion that the Directive and implementing Regulation were at odds.

On reading the Directive I would suggest that the Commission must have disregarded or forgotten about Article 4.2 of Part II of Annex V to the Directive, as this lays down specific provisions for individual farms that are recommencing operations. This allows such sites to avoid the two year programme of sampling operations where such sites have been cleaned disinfected and fallowed. I would equate the term 'sampling' used here with 'targeted surveillance' as referenced in Article 2 of part 1 of the Annex.

I would argue that this provision is pretty much in line with the implementing regulation, and would suggest that The Norwegians should have been able to re-declare their farm disease re without additional surveillance following disinfection.

Having said that I would therefore suggest that the testing of the 3000 broodfish should give adequate assurances about the health status of the farm. In practice I would suggest that these broodstock, despite being from a nominally ISA free zone/compartments pose a greater risk of ISA introduction to the site than the risk of ISA remaining active on the site following a well conducted disinfection procedure.

Regards - <REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk)@defra.gsi.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 July 2018 16:19
To: <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@gov.scot)@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>t@cefas.co.uk)t@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)@cefas.co.uk>
Subject: FW: For information: PAFF AHW-CIC July 2018 - Norway

Hi all,

This just arrived in my inbox.

Best regards,

<REDACTED>

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within Defra systems we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Defra's computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

This email and any attachments are intended for the named recipient only. Its unauthorised use, distribution, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you have received it in error, please destroy all copies and notify the sender. In messages of a non-business nature, the views and opinions expressed are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of Cefas. Communications on Cefas' computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

SCoPAFF meeting 12-13 July 2018-Section AHW- Agenda Item A. 13 – Information and discussion in relation to a declaration of freedom from ISA-HPR deleted compartment 18000 Rimstad, Norway.

Dear colleagues,

Following the discussions on the above mentioned subject at the SCoPAFF meeting of July the Commission would appreciate to get your views on a possible way forward on this matter.

The EU current legal provisions relevant for the declaration of freedom of independent continental compartments after confirmation of an outbreak of certain fish diseases seem to contain some discrepancies. While Directive 2006/88/EC requires a two year surveillance programme (Annex V) and SCoPAFF involvement (Art 50 and 53), Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2015/1554 allows regaining of freedom immediately after under certain conditions (its Annex I, Part 3).

In view of the above and until this matter is addressed in the legal acts under development in the framework of the Animal Health Law, the Commission considers that a pragmatic approach on how an independent continental compartment can regain its disease free status should be agreed.

In the particular case of the outbreak of infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) reported in Rimstad last summer the following should be taken into account:

- The outbreak and its follow up, depopulation, cleaning, disinfection and fallowing, have been dealt with in accordance with the EU rules.
- The establishment has been restocked with almost 3,000 adult fish from an ISA free compartment and testing of each individual animal (including mortalities) has commenced. It is expected that all animals will have been tested before the declaration is presented.
- From the Commission's point of view the testing of such a large number of sentinel animals, using sensitive methods and carried out in an official laboratory provides a robust view of the current health status of the establishment

As explained at the Committee meeting the Commission would like to propose a pragmatic approach which offers a 'middle ground' between the two year programme required under the Directive and the 'no testing' approach set out in the Commission Decision as follows:

- To accept the current short but intensive surveillance carried out on almost 3,000 individual animals as fit for the purposes of regaining freedom of this compartment,
- Invite Norway to present the declaration to the SCoPAFF meeting of 18-19 September and stick to the legal deadlines foreseen in the Directive , i.e. 60 days from the presentation of the declaration,
- An assessment on a case by case basis in the same spirit of transparency, common understanding and peer review, should be applied to deal with similar situations which may arise before April 2021,
- All these issues should be addressed in the future rules that are being developed under the Animal Health Law.

MS are invited to send their comments by-e-mail on the above proposed approach by 15 August 2018. If no comments are received by this date the Commission will understand that the above proposed way forward could be supported by MSs.

Please do not hesitate to contact László Kuster or Pierangelo Bernorio, in copy to this e-mail, if you need any additional clarification.

Best regards

From: <REDACTED> (Defra) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>

Sent: 20 April 2016 12:20

To: <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (DARD) <REDACTED>@dardni.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED>@dardni.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (DARD) <REDACTED>@dardni.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED>@Wales.GSI.Gov.UK; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>

Cc: <REDACTED> (Defra) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (DEFRA) <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (CEFAS) <REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk>

Subject: RE: VHS lumpfish

Hi <REDACTED>

Thank you very much for this very useful update. Good to know that we are all in agreement.

To update you:

In reference to shipments from Iceland in the pipeline for approximately 2 weeks- time, FHI colleagues have succeeded in gaining agreement from <REDACTED> at the Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority to "analyze the broodfish to be able to certify future exports safely and issue all certificates via TRACES and after targeted inspections"

A similar approach has been made to Norway. We will keep you updated and I am sure you will do the same.

Attached is a conversation which updates on the situation at an EU level. If you start from the bottom of the message stream and work your way up you will see that <REDACTED> raised this issue with <REDACTED> from the Commission yesterday. Whilst there is some good news such as <REDACTED> of the EURL requesting a review of VHS in 'cleaner fish' in order to make a case for listing them as VHS susceptible, there are some areas in which <REDACTED> and <REDACTED> views are somewhat divergent from our own.

I have permission from FHI to share this exchange but please keep it in confidence (for UK official views only) and let us know if you have further comments and updates.

We are currently collating our comments on our legal position as we want to proactively set out our position to <REDACTED> rather than waiting for his policy paper.

We will be in touch on this regularly as we very much want to continue this partnership working model.

Many thanks

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED> | <REDACTED> | Aquatic Animal Health | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |
Area 5A, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square | London SW1P 3JR | Tel:
<REDACTED> | E-mail: <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk

From: <REDACTED>@gov.scot

Sent: 20 April 2016 09:53

To: <REDACTED> (Defra); <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED> (DARD); <REDACTED>@dardni.gsi.gov.uk; <REDACTED> (DARD); <REDACTED>@Wales.GSI.Gov.UK; <REDACTED>@gov.scot

Cc: <REDACTED> (Defra); <REDACTED> (DEFRA); <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot; <REDACTED>@gov.scot

Subject: RE: VHS lumpfish

Hi <REDACTED>

We do receive imports of lumpfish from both Iceland and Norway. Imports from Iceland have historically entered with health certification. Imports from Norway have been recorded in the TRACES system and entered without health certification as permitted.

There have been no imports of lumpfish since the identification of VHS in Iceland however there is a desire from industry to resume imports, which will potentially increase in number considering industry development. A company within Scotland has approached the FHI this week enquiring about bringing in fish from Norway. It is the FHIs intention to advise that the company seek documentation from the provider.

Colleagues at the marine laboratory have also raised the issue of Wrasse – considering this an appropriate time to discuss assurances for both species?

Thanks,

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (Defra)

Sent: 18 April 2016 11:08

To: <REDACTED>; <REDACTED>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB); <REDACTED> (DARD); <REDACTED> (<REDACTED>@dardni.gsi.gov.uk); <REDACTED> (DARD); <REDACTED>@Wales.GSI.Gov.UK; <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

Cc: <REDACTED> (Defra); <REDACTED> (DEFRA)

Subject: VHS lumpfish

Hi All

You may be aware of the VHS outbreak reported in a lumpfish farm in Iceland, which turned out to be a genotype IV VHS. Genotype IV is of course the type that was considered exotic to European waters, prior to this event, and which has caused significant problems in the N American Great Lakes. It is not the same strain as that in the Great Lakes and will probably form a new sub group of genotype IV, but it has been shown to be pathogenic to salmonids, by injection, in early work by the EU reference laboratory.

You will also be aware that lumpfish is currently considered to be a non-susceptible species to VHS, and other diseases notifiable in GB, and so its import can take place from countries such as Iceland [and Norway] without health certification.

We contacted <REDACTED> at the commission for an update on listing lumpfish as a VHS susceptible species, he confirmed that he is in agreement and that this is in motion. He is going to call an ad hoc meeting to discuss this very briefly at the co-ordination meeting in Brussels tomorrow, to be followed up by a teleconference of interested countries e.g. UK, Ireland, Norway and Iceland.-We will keep you updated.

In the meantime, (whilst we wait for listing) we must decide with some urgency whether we should seek animal health certification for lumpfish on a unilateral/bilateral basis. From a Cefas perspective this is urgent as all of the farms they deal with relevant to lumpfish are currently trying to find new sources of fish or eggs from the above listed countries. We understand that they produce lumpfish [from imported broodstock or eggs] for use as cleaner fish in the **Scottish salmon industry**. Obviously the UK must protect itself from VHS.

Do you receive imports of lumpfish? If so, have you taken any action to seek clarification, or documentation, of the health status of the fish, since the finding of VHS in Iceland? If not, we would still appreciate your opinions on our suggested approach which is to request documentation from the competent authorities in Iceland and Norway (of VHS freedom), on the simple basis that we are aware that lumpfish pose a risk. And if this fails, we will ask our importers to seek official certification for VHS freedom from the source farms, and see what response we get. We

anticipate that our counterparts will understand the request and be willing to supply certification even though this is not required while the lumpsuckers are not listed as a susceptible species.

If you would like to discuss our approach more fully then I would be happy to arrange a teleconference, just let me know your availability.

Many thanks & Kind regards

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED> | <REDACTED> | Aquatic Animal Health | Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |

Area 5A, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square | London SW1P 3JR | Tel: <REDACTED> | E-mail: <REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk

From: <REDACTED> (CEFAS)

Sent: 19 April 2016 19:13

To: <REDACTED> (CEFAS)

Cc: <REDACTED> (CEFAS); <REDACTED> (CEFAS); <REDACTED> (DEFRA); <REDACTED> (Defra); <REDACTED> (Defra)

Subject: Re: VHSEU Co-ordination working group meeting LUMPFISH

Thank-you <REDACTED>,

While I understand <REDACTED> (and <REDACTED>) reasoning behind the application of 'emerging disease' to something new/ not widely known, I did struggle in the application of this to the current VHS situation - because officially nothing is formally declared that appears to reflect this view, eg it's only now in line with the lumpsuckers case that they are going to review the evidence to make a case for listing the wrasse too as susceptible, even though the outbreak in Scotland was 5 years ago. Hence my query about the lack of declared VHS positive marine areas, given that genotype III and IV are considered to be widespread in the marine environment.

I didn't feel I was in a position to debate this further with <REDACTED> today - firstly not being involved in the discussions around the implementation of 2006/88 and also because it was only myself and <REDACTED> present in the end. As <REDACTED> is going to put together a policy document to initiate further discussions between all affected parties, I felt the best I could do today was ensure our views on pursuing listing of wrasse and lumpsuckers as VHS susceptible was appropriately raised and bring back an update.

What is the next step - will you wait on <REDACTED> policy note to initiate discussions or take this up further now?

Thanks
<REDACTED>

Sent from my iPad

On 19 Apr 2016, at 18:25, <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)>@cefas.co.uk> wrote:

<REDACTED>

Thanks for the report. I think <REDACTED> and <REDACTED> argument as regards emerging disease is inaccurate. The discussions ahead of 2006/88 being implemented certainly did not accord with their view.

If we are to take their view that all marine species are likely to be VHS susceptible, then countries that have VHS freedom should be able to demand evidence that all marine fish stocks imported are free of the virus. Given that the Commission specifically restricted the list of susceptible species to those in trade, they are hardly going to wish to change to a guilty until proven innocent position. The very reason occurrence in a new species was considered an emerging disease was so that MS could act to control the disease when the disease was found in an unlisted species, as it was recognised that the VHs list was otherwise inadequate.

Also an d key to the whole thing is that the Commission would have more formal work to do if we made an Article 41 declaration than if they have us resolve the matter through bi-lateral actions until they list the species as susceptibles.

Hope your other meeting went well.

Regards - <REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (Cefas)

Sent: 19 April 2016 18:14

To: <REDACTED> (Cefas) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)>@cefas.co.uk>

Cc: <REDACTED> (Defra) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk)>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED>

(Cefas) <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)>@cefas.co.uk>; <REDACTED> (DEFRA)

<[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk)>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (FFG)

<[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@defra.gsi.gov.uk)>@defra.gsi.gov.uk>; <REDACTED> (Cefas)

<[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@cefas.co.uk)>@cefas.co.uk>

Subject: Re: VHSEU Co-ordination working group meeting LUMPFISH

Dear everyone,

I spoke with <REDACTED> today after the OIE EU co-ordination meeting re lump suckers and VHS. Unfortunately there were no representatives from Norway, Iceland or Ireland (who I believe are also involved) present - so we didn't have the opportunity for discussion as <REDACTED> had hoped.

However, I can update you as follows:

- 1) <REDACTED> is already in contact with <REDACTED> of the EURL and has requested a review of VHS in 'cleaner fish' in order to make a case for listing them as VHS susceptible. If the case is successful this would incorporate both lumpsuckers and wrasse. I stated our position, that we consider (given the outbreaks) there is sound basis for making such a case and feel very strongly this should be done.
- 2) In spite of the definition of emerging disease in the Directive (I did refer to the glossary!), both <REDACTED> and <REDACTED> do not consider this route of control applies to the lumpsucker case. The reason given - that it is commonly accepted and well known that both VHS genotype III and genotype IV occur in wild marine populations and the expectation is that an increasing number of species will continue to be reported as infected. The principle behind the 'emerging disease' application is for disease emergence that really is a new/ not widely known or accepted scenario. This reasoning made sense to me but, see comment 3 below...
- 3) This led me to query why we don't have more declarations of VHS positive marine areas - <REDACTED> explained this is because the basis of the Directive is applied to Aquaculture rather than wild...
- 4) <REDACTED> agreed with the steps implemented by the UK to obtain VHS declarations for lumpsucker imports via bi-lateral agreement with Iceland and Norway, he considers this to be the most appropriate short term option.
- 5) Long term - <REDACTED> is looking to form a working group to investigate the legal framework for using the 'quarantine' route to certify captive bred stock (F1 progeny and on) originating from wild Marine parents. Given the opinion on the VHS situation in Wild marine populations stated at point 2 and the associated potential for unknown infected areas, <REDACTED> believes this route to be more secure in terms of disease risk.
- 6) <REDACTED> is waiting on further feedback from <REDACTED> of the EURL, once he has this he will circulate a policy note to initiate discussions between UK, Ireland, Norway Iceland on a long term solution within the legal framework.

Sorry it's just a brief summary, but as said the opportunity for discussion was limited. More to follow from <REDACTED>,

Best regards

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)

Sent: 11 July 2017 15:35

To: <REDACTED> <REDACTED>@aquagen.no) <REDACTED>@aquagen.no>

Subject: Ova from Tingvoll

Hi <REDACTED>

Please could you send me a list of ova imports from AquaGen for 2017. Could you include in the list the source site of the broodstock and any other sites they were held at (e.g. the freshwater site prior to stripping) and the site(s) that the ova were held at.

Do you have any AquaGen literature detailing the location of the sites and the route the fish/ova follow from site to site e.g. broodstock held in cages at Tingvoll, transferred to FW tanks at ?, ova stripped at ? and ova incubated at Hemne just so we understand the linkages between the sites.

Cheers

<REDACTED>

<REDACTED>

Senior Fish Health Inspector

Marine Scotland Science

Scottish Government | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen AB11 9DB

Tel: <REDACTED>

S/B: <REDACTED>

Mob<REDACTED>

Fax: <REDACTED>

e: <REDACTED>@gov.scot

w: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine>

From: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Sent: 12 July 2017 13:49
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>; <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Cc: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: FW: Information update

Hi

This is the information from <REDACTED> on the ISA detection at Aquagen.

In summary, Aquagen have detected ISA at the seawater broodstock site Merraberget and the freshwater site at Rimstad, Tingvoll which received broodstock from Merraberget in May. This is to be confirmed by Mattilsynet. Samples taken in April, May and June by a private laboratory for ISA were negative, but the July samples were positive.

Scottish sites received ova in 2016/2017 from both Hemne (unconnected location) and Tingvoll hatcheries but the broodstock stripped for the 2016/2017 season were held previously at a sea site known as Hegebergetroa, not the currently affected site. I don't know the relation of the two sea sites to one another, but the reports state that Merraberget is more than 10km from any other site.

Andy has provided a list of the source hatcheries for all of the 2016/2017 consignments delivered to Scotland. Do we need to conduct any follow up surveillance at this point or do we need to contact Mattilsynet for further information?

Thanks

<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED> <[REDACTED](mailto:<REDACTED>@aquagen.no)>@aquagen.no
Sent: 12 July 2017 10:16
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB)
Subject: Information update

Hi <REDACTED> :

Further to our conversation and your email yesterday here is some more information for you.

You will understand that the discussions with Mattilsynet are on-going and I expect that you will have points of contact with them. To avoid any confusion or misunderstandings on what is an important matter for all of us, and most importantly our customers in the Scottish industry, I should make sure that communication goes through correct channels whilst as always being as helpful as possible. I can however give you a general summary just now and some background information which I hope will suffice for your immediate requirements.

The site in question where we have a detection and suspicion of ISA is called Merraberget, which is located in the ISA compartment associated with our Tingvoll broodstock holding and egg production site. The freshwater holding site on-shore at Tingvoll is called Rimstad.

At AquaGen we carry out a comprehensive internal disease screening programme on our brood-stock populations. Some of this is additional to the most important public health programme conducted under the auspices of Mattilsynet. Samples are taken for ISA screening throughout the time that a broodfish population is in production. This starts when smolts are transferred to sea, and is intensified when fish are finally selected for use to produce eggs. There have been sites in the Tingvoll area for 45 years and ISA has never before been detected.

Since the fish at Merraberget were graded and selected for broodstock earlier in the year, screening has been carried out for ISA and results from April, May and June were all negative. This recent detection (5th July) was reported following a visit and sampling carried out by our external fish health services provider – called “Akerbla”. At the end of May part of the population was transferred on-shore to Rimstad. Samples have also been taken from this location, and here also the virus has been detected.

The detection is still in the process of being confirmed and my colleagues, <REDACTED> and <REDACTED> are in close communication with Mattilsynet. There are 14,500 fish in the population, and our expectation is that these will likely be culled later in the week.

Regarding season 16-17, the eggs that were produced from our Tingvoll location last year came from an entirely different seawater site, called Hegebergetroa. This population was under the same surveillance and screening protocol, and all results were negative for ISA. In addition all eggs are taken from clinically healthy individuals, based on internal examination of all broodstock at the time of stripping by a fish-health qualified person. It was stripped at Rimstad, but the residence of this population at Rimstad terminated at the end December 2016 / early Jan.

For your information I have attached a copy of our fish health protocol and some results for 2016 production, and as requested, a summary of last “egg-season” shipments, with reference to the health certificates.

<REDACTED>

Best regards

<REDACTED>

This email has been received from an external party and

has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

From: <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>
Sent: 30 September 2016 14:04
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: SV: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Dear <REDACTED>,
We have informed all inspectors that they should provide health certificates for consignments of lumpfish certifying freedom of VHS. I will contact the certifying officer immediately. Thank you for informing me of this. I can confirm that the source site is free from VHS.

Best regards
<REDACTED>

From: <REDACTED>@mattilsynet.no>
Sent: 30 September 2016 14:09
To: <REDACTED> (MARLAB) <REDACTED>@gov.scot>
Subject: SV: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Dear <REDACTED>,

I forgot to inform you that our inspectors have been told to issue a health certificate stating that the cleaner fish come from an area free of VHS, IHN and GS if the Competent Authority of the receiving country request it.

Best regards
<REDACTED>

Fra: <REDACTED>@gov.scot
Sendt: 30. september 2016 14:27
Til: <REDACTED>
Emne: RE: Certification requirements for the placing on the market of lumpfish between Ireland, the United Kingdom and Norway

Dear <REDACTED>

I'm just following up on the agreement to supply health certificates for trade in cleaner fish.

We have received an import of lumpfish this week from Ryfylke Renesfisk (copy attached). There was a notification in Traces along with a health certificate, but the health attestations had all been scored out and the statement that the consignment had been inspected was incorrectly completed (Part

II.1.1). As lumpfish aren't officially listed as susceptible to VHS yet I haven't requested a replacement certificate.

I just wanted to confirm if the agreement to provide health certificates had been put into place yet in Norway. If so, I would appreciate it if you could update the certifying officer, <REDACTED>, on the requirements. I assume that there the source site is free from VHS as Norway is a VHS free approved country.

Thanks

<REDACTED>