

## Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee

### Environmental impacts of salmon farming

#### Written submission from Ian Armstrong, Nevis Marine Ltd

I first worked on a Scottish salmon farm as a schoolboy in 1977 before graduating with a B.Sc. in Wildlife & Fisheries Management from the University of Edinburgh's Department of Ecological Sciences. I have worked in the salmon farming industry ever since, and I am extremely proud of our achievements. With that pride also comes full acceptance that improvements are required to overcome the understandable concerns of internal and external stakeholders.

As we are only custodians of our environment it is beneficial for *any* industry to be scrutinised with scientific vigour, and so much good should come out of this ECCLR review from an environmental perspective.

However, after reading Issue 01 of the SAMS report, I write to add a respectful note of caution to help you ensure that this timely review does not develop into a missed opportunity.

As a very small SME I do not possess the time to write a comprehensive reply so I will use the following example to illustrate my concern:

During the period 2009-2016 I was one of the team leaders who introduced modern Hydrogen Peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) treatments throughout the international salmon farming industry. From a Scottish support base I worked directly with our customer's fish health veterinarians to undertake H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> treatments in Norway, Faroes, the Atlantic & Pacific coasts of Canada, and the US.

As part of my commercial responsibilities I participated in all the major international scientific conferences which focused on sea-lice, and I learned a significant amount about *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* from various scientists. With the benefit of this knowledge I do not believe that Section 2.1 of the SAMS report offers the critique that this important challenge deserves.

With all due respect to the high calibre scientists of SAMS I believe they should have sub-contracted this critical part of their report to internationally renowned scientist(s) who are specialists in this particular aspect of biology. This would have avoided their mistake of using an out of date diagram to illustrate the lifecycle of this ingenious parasite (Fig 2.1, page 11), and eliminated the need for Professor Tett to provide a written apology on 1<sup>st</sup> February to the Committee for providing erroneous information during his oral evidence.