

Case No: Site No:

Date of visit: Inspector(s):

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

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (FRESHWATER)

a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures

1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection? If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium		CoGP 2.4.31, 3.4.39	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT	Low		CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium		CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed of appropriate mesh size with regard the size of the escaped fish?	Low		CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High			
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High		CoGP 2.4.28, 3.4.36 SSI, 2,9	

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

General records			SSI 2,1	
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			Facilities	Moorings
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low			
b) Any special adaptations	Low			
c) The name of the supplier	Low			
d) The date of purchase	Low			
e) Each inspection including				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low			
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium			
iii) the place of each inspection	Low			
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High			
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High			
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:				
i) The mesh size	Medium		SSI, 2,2	
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low			
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:				
i) The date of construction	Low		SSI, 2,3	
ii) The material used in construction	Low			
iii) Its dimensions	Low			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4	
i) The date of installation	Low			
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low		SSI, 2,5	
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters[3]			SSI, 2,6	
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low			
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low			
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low			
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low			
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium		SSI, 2,11 (a)	
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High		SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that pens and moorings are designed, manufactured and installed suitable for purpose at the location of the site?	High		CoGP 3.4.11	
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High		CoGP 3.4.12	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.10 Can the site demonstrate evidence that all nets have been designed and manufactured under the control of a Quality Management System to ensure they provide containment for the whole of their working life?	High		CoGP 3.4.13	
2.11 Are all screens inspected daily and relevant action taken? Are records maintained of inspection frequency and the outcomes?	High		CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	
2.12 Are screens constructed from a suitably strong and robust material, and therefore fit for purpose?	High		CoGP 2.4.19	
2.13 Can the site demonstrate awareness of the minimum net strengths to be used at all times?	High		CoGP 3.4.14	
2.14 Does the site have a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements?	High		CoGP 3.4.15	
2.15 Does the site use nylon nets older than 5 years?	High		CoGP 3.4.16	
2.16 Can site managers demonstrate awareness of the minimum fish size supplied where new stock is introduced?	High		CoGP 3.4.18	
2.17 Have nets been treated with UV inhibitor?	Low		CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low		CoGP 3.4.20, 3.4.21	
2.19 Can the site demonstrate evidence of nets being inspected and strength tested after each cycle by a competent person?	High		CoGP 3.4.22	
2.20 Is in accordance with a detailed procedure based on manufacturer's advise and using a documented quality control system?	High		CoGP 3.4.22	
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23	
a) net base	High			
b) side wall	High			
c) above the waterline	High			
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High		CoGP 3.4.24	
2.23 Are additional inspections undertaken following adverse weather where required?	High		CoGP 3.4.25	
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High		CoGP 7.1.8	
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High		CoGP 7.4.7	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.3 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working in the site in relation to any helicopter operations?	High		CoGP 2.4.27, 3.4.33	
3.4 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations?	High		CoGP 3.4.35 SSI 2,6,a	
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High		SSI 2,7,a ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37	

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

4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High		CoGP 2.4.6, 3.4.8, 2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 2.4.23, 3.4.27 SSI 2,7, b SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High			
b) standard operating procedures	High			
c) contingency plan	High			
4.3 Is the integrity of all handling equipment checked, including pipelines, pumps, transport tanks, graders, counters and vaccination stations, before fish are handled?	High		CoGP 2.4.24, 3.4.28	
4.4 Do these checks include the suitability of the above equipment for use during adverse weather conditions where appropriate?	High		CoGP 2.4.25, 3.4.29	
4.5 Are mitigation measures such as safety nets, security devices, or bunding used at potential risk points, such as pipe connections?	High		CoGP 2.4.26, 3.4.30	
4.6 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low		SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low		SSI 2,6,c	
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?				
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?	Medium		2.4.7, 3.4.9	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.10 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including -The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed - The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Medium		SSI, 2,8,a	
4.11 Where predator nets are deployed is this done in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of access by predators? For example, see requirements of Annex 7.	Low		SSI, 2,8,b	
	Low		3.5.34-37 2.5.34-37	
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High			
5.2 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the site is not located within an area likely to be affected by flood, or suitable flood defences in place?	High		CoGP 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.4.11	
5.3 Does the site have effective measures in place to prevent fish from jumping out of holding facilities into surface waters or natural water courses?	High		CoGP 2.4.12	
5.4 Is the site inflow system designed to prevent any upstream escape of farm stock?	High		CoGP 2.4.14	
5.5 Are the screen sizes capable of containing the entire range of fish sizes within the unit in every instance?	High		CoGP 2.4.15	
5.6 In the case of a land-based aquaculture system, are there two screens incorporated into the outflow system of a suitable size to prevent the passage of fish in all potential water conditions?	High		CoGP 2.4.20	
5.7 Does the net mesh size contain the entire range of fish sizes in every instance of the species involved?	High		CoGP 3.4.17	
5.8 Are boat operations conducted in a manner which avoids damage to nets and pens?	High		CoGP 3.4.34	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High		CoGP 3.4.24	
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:- a) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High		CoGP 3.4.31	

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

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

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

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

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