

Case No: Site No:

Date of visit: Inspector(s):

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

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records

1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium		CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2, Annex 6 SSI 1,2, SSI 1,2(g)	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ? (Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed and correct stages recorded ⁴)	Low & Medium			
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated?	Low			
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail.	Low			
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?			Detail if necessary:	

b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:			CoGP Annex 6 CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50 CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	
a) <i>L. salmonis</i> record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment?	High			
b) <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High			
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	Medium			
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of :			VMD ¹² 19 SSI 1,3 VMD 18	
the name / identity of the product	High			
the date of administration	High			
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered	High			
the method of administration of the product	High			
the identification of the fish / facilities treated	High			
name of the person administering the treatment	Low			
the withdrawal period	Medium			
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:				
the name of the veterinary surgeon	High			
name of the product	High			
batch number	High			

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
the date of administration	High			
amount administered	High			
identification of fish treated	High			
withdrawal period	Medium			
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	High			
Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site average <i>L.salmonis</i> numbers (all stages)				
2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their impact is there a record of:	Low		SSI, 1,4	
the nature and date of the method employed; the identification number of all facilities subjected to the method; the name of the person employing the method				
2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:			VMD 19	
proof of purchase of the medicine concerned	Medium			
name of the product	High			
batch number	High			
the date of purchase	Medium			
the quantity purchased	High			
the name and address of the supplier	Medium			
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19	
the date of disposal	Medium			
the quantity of product involved	Medium			
how and where it was disposed of	Medium			
2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83	
Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments conducted on site				
2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	
2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use, available to those responsible for treatment administration?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?			Detail if necessary:	
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and farm management agreements or statements				
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?	Low		SSI 1,5,b CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the provisions of the NTS ⁶ ?	Low		CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider: -agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -coordinated monitoring and treatment -co-operation between participating farms This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine	Medium		CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?	Low		SSI 1, 5, c	
3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy? For example, the principles of ISLM include: Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD. The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice) Appropriate discharge consent in place Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary Monitoring lice numbers Using an array of treatments where possible Treating all stocks on site at the same time Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and certainly not on the same cohort of lice Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities.	Medium		4.3.82, 5.3.51	
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High		CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?	High		CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	Low		CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High		CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?			AFSA ¹³ 4A Detail if necessary:	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium		AFSA 4B	
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined , is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?	High ¹⁰		CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) followed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High		CoGP 4.3.100	
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?	High		CoGP 4.3.101	
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures				
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site?	High		CoGP 7.1.8	
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1	
parasite identification	High		CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High		5.3.53-55	
recording counts	High			
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low			
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low			
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High		CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this Where records exist regarding SOPs and site procedures these should be inspected to confirm suitability				
e. Inspection of site and site stock				
5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?	Medium		VMD schedule 5	
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High			
Refer to section e) of guidance notes				
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating to sea lice infestation?	High			
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low		CoGP Annex 6, 4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording? (Cross reference to training records – Section d)	High			
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High		CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54	
6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)? N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice	Medium		Annex 6	
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct? Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are: for Caligus elongatus all identifiable stages and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings) ¹¹	High		Annex 6	
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?	Medium			
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner? Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations, appropriate product used	High			
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation?	High		CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	
7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium		CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment?	High		CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
h. FHI sea lice counts If necessary conduct a sea lice count in accordance with the protocol of the CoGP. Indicate where this procedure has been done and make a record of results within the comments box	Power granted under the Act – section 3 (2) (a)	
i. 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 3 (3) (a)	
j. 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] Scottish Statutory Instrument – The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008

[2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture

[3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be

[4] Recording requirements:- for *C. elongatus* – all identifiable stages and for *L. salmonis* - mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)

[5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately

[6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS

[7] FMA = Farm Management Area

[8] FMS = Farm Management Statement

[9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement

[10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18

[11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate – for *Caligus elongatus*: mobiles; and for *Lepeophtheirus salmonis*: non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.

[12] VMD - The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)

[13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)