Case No:	2023-0426	Date of visit:	13/09/2023
Time spent on site:	3 Hours	Main Inspector:	[redacted]
Site No:	FS1024	Site Name:	Toyness
Business No:	FB0125	Business Name:	Scottish Sea Farms Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 SLA 4 VMD 5 6

Water Temp (°C): 10.78 Thermometer No: T306 FHI 045 completed N/A

Observations: Region: OR Water type: S CoGP MA: O-3

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

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

Additional Case Information:

[redacted]- ECI/SLA Paper work completed 09/09/2023. Site inspection carried/VMD sampling carried out on 24/10/2023 by [redacted], observed by [redacted]
Toyness is a nursery site for Bring Head
2020: 16/09/2021 - wrasse. Wild caught Orkney wrasse.

Site stocked from Stofnfiskur and Aquagen eggs, from Knock and Barcaldine.

29/07/2023 to 07/08/2023 - florfenicol treatment
Mechanical treatment - Hydrolicer 10/08/2023 27/08/23
Thermolicer - 16-18 june wk 24 all pens
Salmosan treatment 08/06, too warm so only pens 1 and 3 done
Slice 09-15 may 23, wk 19, all

Fish input to site 1/09/2022 wk 36.

All harvests are live haul.

Furunc (type 1) had been identified back in June 2023 and picked up during routine gill samples. Antibiotic sensitivity testing conducted and anitibiotic administered prior to hydolicer treatmemt. Hydrolicer was very effective for the lice control.

Optoscale camera system is used on site to estimate biomass. System can also detect skin damage and takes 50,000 photos per day.

Mortalities for the last four weeks mainly attributed to environmental gill insults and some physical damage. Oxygen levels have been reported to be low in scappa flow

Site will begin harvesting next week, in order to maintain stocking density.

Inspection conducted by [redacted](observed by [redacted]). Follow-up inspection carried out on 24/10/2023 as site inspection/sea lice count could not be carried during previous inspection. Inspection took place directly after stormy weather. Due to the exposed nature of the site, four pens were inspected to witness sea lice counts. Directly before this inspection an escapes notification was recieved from the site, as a seal was found in a pen. An escapes investigation was conducted and an enhanced containment audit is scheduled wb 04/12/2023.

SLA report checked by [redacted] 22/05/2025.

Case No: 2023-0426 Site No: FS1024

Date of Visit: 13/09/2023 Inspector(s): [redacted]

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	10	Facilities stocked	10	No facilities inspected	6		
Species	SAL						
Age group	2022 S0						
No Fish	344,543						
Mean Fish Wt	3.5 Kg						
Next Fallow Date (Site)	June 2024	Next Input Date (Site)	September 2024				
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N				
If yes, detail:	Wild AGD						

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection?	Y
2. Date of last inspection:	26/10/2021
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?	Y
5. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?	N/A

Transport Records

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

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection?	Y
2. How are mortalities disposed of?	Other (detail)
If other detail:	Transferred to SSF on mainland for ensile using own carrier.
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	2023: WK 32, 0.58%, 2081; Wk31, 0.28%, 1009; Wk30, 0.34%,1232; Wk29, 0.32%, 1169
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?	N
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:	
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?	Y
If yes, detail:	Wk 37 2022: 1.79%, 11744 (input mortality, failed smolts, within 6 weeks post stocking). Wk 50 2022: 1.03%, 10956 (Peroxide treatment, fish size below mort threshold of 1.5%)
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?	N/A
If yes, detail action:	
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records

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

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any *increased* (*unexplained)* mortality at the site been included?	Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is detected been included and *how* and *when* that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	AGD - recent gill swabs, 02/08/2023, 7/12 positive; Furunclosis, samples taken on 28/06/2023, results recieved by 28/06/2023, 2/4. gill pox 1/3, HCMI, 1/4. Gill health low level for all (branchiomonas and gill pox). 19/07/2023 - microbiological assays for furunculosis are conducted alongside antibiotic sensitvity testing.
Records checked between:	26/10/2021- 13/09/2023

Case no:	2023-0426	Site No:	FS1024	Date of visit/ Sampling:	13/09/2023	24/1							
Priority samples:	VI		BA		PA		MG		HI				
Time sampling starts/ends:	13:00:00	13:30:00	Inspector:		VMD No.	15							
Environmental conditions:	1	Cloudy	2	Windy	3		4		5				
Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Samples		

Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1	F2										
	Pool Group												
Stock Details	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	3.5 Kg	3.5 Kg										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
	Stock Origin	Knock (FS0254)	Knock (FS0254)										
	Facility No	2	4										

10/2023 Additional Sample Information:

0 Total Tests assigned 0

Case Number:	2023-0426		Site No:	FS1024	Insp:	
Date of Visit	13/09/2023					

		No of movements/supp./dest.				Score
Live fish movements		**0**	**1-5**	**6-10**	**>10**	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water	**Site contacts**	**0**	**1-5**	**6-10**		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices		None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0				0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4				
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0				
	Common processes with other farms	3				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	**Number of sites**	**1**	**2 or 3**	**≥ 4**		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
				Total		**20**
				Rank		**MEDIUM**

Case No: 2023-0426 Site No: FS1024

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?	
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	
8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis levels* have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?	
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	

Containment Inspection

1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y

double bird nets, tensioned nets seal prevention nets

If other, detail below:

3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Y

Case No: 2023-0426 Site No: FS1024

Date of Visit: 13/09/2023 Inspector: [redacted]

Point of Compliance

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?	Y

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?	Y
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?	Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?	y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?	y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?	y
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?	y

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?	y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?	y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?	y
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?	y
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?	y

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?	y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?	y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?	y
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?	y
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?	y

Live Fish Movements

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?	y
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?	y

Harvesting

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?	y

Fallowing

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?	y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?	y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?	y

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?	y

Management and operation

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	y
26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?	Apr-23

Site No: FS1024

Case No: 2023-0426

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No: 2023-0426 Site No: FS1024

Date of visit: 13/09/2023 Inspector(s): [redacted]

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	Y	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2, Annex 6 SSI 1,2,	
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	Y		
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated?	Low	Y	SSI 1,2(g)	
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail.	Low	Y		
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?		N	Detail if necessary:	
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice				
2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:				
a) L. salmonis record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	Y	CoGP Annex 6	
b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	Salmosan was used but temperature was too high so treatment was abandoned. Thermolicer was used afterwards. Treatment was successful
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of :			VMD[12] 19 SSI 1,3	
the name / identity of the product	High	y		
the date of administration	High	y		
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered	High	y		
the method of administration of the product	High	y		
the identification of the fish / facilities treated	High	y		
name of the person administering the treatment	Low	y		
the withdrawal period	Medium	y		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:			VMD 18	
the name of the veterinary surgeon	High	N/A		
name of the product	High	N/A		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
batch number	High	N/A		
the date of administration	High	N/A		
amount administered	High	N/A		
identification of fish treated	High	N/A		
withdrawal period	Medium	N/A		
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded? Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site average *L.salmonis* numbers (all stages)	High	Y		
2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their impact is there a record of: 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	Low	Y	SSI, 1,4	
2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:			VMD 19	
proof of purchase of the medicine concerned	Medium	y	VMD 17	
name of the product	High	y		
batch number	High	y		
the date of purchase	Medium	y		
the quantity purchased	High	y		
the name and address of the supplier	Medium	y		
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19	
the date of disposal	Medium	N/A		
the quantity of product involved	Medium	N/A		
how and where it was disposed of	Medium	N/A		
2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice?	Medium	Y	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	N	CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	Data is analysed by Fish health and Welfare Manager, findings are discussed with senior management and veternary team once w week and treatments are allocated accordingly.
2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	Sallmosan treatmnent had to be abandoned due to temperature, swithched to thermolicer with positive results
2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances?	Medium	Y	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	Y	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?		Y	Detail if necessary:	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken 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	Y	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	Y	CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium	Y	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	Y	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	Y	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	Y	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	Y	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	Y	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High	Y	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)?		Y	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	Y	CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	FMAg
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium	Y	AFSA 4B	
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium	Y	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]	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High	N	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	Y	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	Y	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	Y	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High	Y	5.3.53-55	
recording counts	High	Y		
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Y		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Y		
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	All medicinal treatments are administered by dedicated personel on treatment boats, no site staff administer treatments.
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	Y	VMD schedule 5	
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High	Y		
Refer to section e) of guidance notes				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating to sea lice infestation?	High	Y		
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Y	CoGP Annex 6,	
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording?	High	Y	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
(Cross reference to training records – Section d)				
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High	Y	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)?	Medium	Y	Annex 6	
N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice				
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct?	High	Y	Annex 6	
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]				
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?	Medium	Y		
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	N/A		
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation?	High	N/A	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?		N/A		
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium	N/A	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	N/A	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)	Sea lice count observed during follow-up inspection on 24/10/2023. Count followed proceedure. Lice numbers were low, averaging at ~0.3 per fish.

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

Case No: 2023-0426 Date of visit: 13/09/2023

Site No: FS1024 Inspector: [redacted]

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2nd Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2nd Insp
ECI, CNI, VMD	23/05/2025		
SLA	13/10/2025		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO	FB0125	**DATE OF VISIT**	13/09/2023
SITE NO	FS1024	**SITE NAME**	Toyness
CASE NO	20230426	**INSPECTOR**	[redacted]

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

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

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Directorate were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

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

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

UKAS Accredited Inspection Body – Type C No. 0269
Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

An enhanced sea lice inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

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

Signed: Date: 23/05/2025

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)

UKAS Accredited Inspection Body – Type C No. 0269
Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/