FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0007			Date of visit: 22/01/2020
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0323 Business No: FB0235	Site Name: Business Name:	Cairndow Hatchery Cooke Aquaculture (Freshwat	er) Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Fish on site will be 2020 S0 -Put to sea in October. They will be held onsite until about 10-15g then transferred to Loch Garasdale and Furnace,

Current stock imported as ova from Stofnfiskur.

Mortalities are ensiled on site and collected by Hasco about once a year. Transported by tanker to Energen biogas plant, Deerdykes

wk 13/1/20 Issue with spate and matting caused mortality increase due to suffocation in C section; 16,000 morts on Sat 18/1/20 and 65,591 on Friday 17/1/20. Morts now back to normal.

Last cycle some fish held until S1. Not planning to do that this year due to water shortage in the summer.

High morts in spring 2019, poor water quality resulting in morts attributed to fungus and lesion only in C section. - 27/5/19 approx. 70.000 lost at 0.25g in C section. 10/6/19 peak; about 153356 morts for C section in week. Wt 0.4g

Site thermometers used for biosecurity reasons.

FHI 059, Version 12	!		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0007]	Site No:	FS0323	3			
Date of Visit:		22/01/2020	0		Inspector(s):]
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site det			site representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•	Í	·				N	1
Site Details			_			_		
Total No facilities		76	Facilities sto	cked	50	No facilities	s inspected	50
Species	sal							
Age group	fry							
No Fish	2,309,035							
Mean Fish Wt	0.32g							
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	Oct 2020		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Dec 2020		
Decemb (least 4 value)	diagona probl	omo?		N	Any assence	(ainea laat v	riait\2	N
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease probi	ems?		I I	Any escapes	(Since last v	risit) !	IN
Movement Record								
1. Movement record		r inspection?					00/04/0040	Y
2. Date of last inspe		11 1 11	^				23/01/2019	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement re								1
5. Are records comp		•		able?				\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \
6. Are health certific		iuctions (out)	Willi GD) avalla	able :				<u>'</u>
Transport Records								
1. Are any moveme					_			N
If yes, is there a sys	item in place f	or maintenar	nce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti	es disposed o	f?			Ensiled - on s	site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	tered?					Y
				2800 fish mort	•	•		
				this cycle. Bo	th batches hat	ched in Dec	- figures incl	luded non
4. Recent mortality	•		hatch					
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?								
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality per	facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:				
see additional info								
6. Any other peaks								Y
If yes, detail:		-see addition		a vet on ELUA				NI/A
7. Have increased (unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	vonto' boon "	ported to EU	12 If no odd M	IDT ages and	ontor on morts	lity ovente al	hoot	l N
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents been re	ported to FIII	r: ir no, add iv	iixii case and e	enter on morta	iity events si	neet.	IN

FHI 059, Version 12	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Recent treatments (la If yes, detail:	ast 4 wks)?		N
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records av	ailable for inspection?		Y
3. Are records complete	and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdraw	al period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment	t(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored	appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records			
1. Biosecurity records av	vailable for inspection?		Y
•	•	ding and safe disposal been considered	? Y
	•	ottish Ministers or veterinary professiona	al of any
increased (unexplained,	nortality at the site been included?		Y
	·	ence or suspicion of the presence of a list	ited disease Y
	ed and how and when that will be not		
		d on the farm site been covered (equal o	or higher
health status, certification	on ir requirea)?		
6. Have the husbandry a	and hipsecurity measures implements	ed between each epidemiological unit to	minimise Y
•	•	sitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
		e to maintain the physical containment	
aquaculture animals hel			
•	procedures been adequately impleme	ented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveillance	e		
1. Has any animal health	h surveillance been carried out by, or	on behalf of, the business?	Y

23/1/19- 22/1/20

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

3. Any significant results?

FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 08/10/2018		
Case Number:	2020-0007		Site No:	FS0323		Insp:			
Date of Visit	22/01/2020		No of m	No of movements/supp./dest.					
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10			
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	$\overline{}$		
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	9		
Special Control of the Control of th	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0			14	5		
Movements off			0			10	10		
Movements on	Frequency of n Number of des		0			10	3		
Exposure via water	Transcr or doo	Site contacts	0						
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ted (secure water supply through							
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				igwdow		
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2		
,		or in a coastal zone with category III					-		
		n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		ш		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8				
	namio apotroan	TO WARM T add execution	<u> </u>						
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure				
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		1		
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0		
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				$\overline{}$		
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			-		
	Processing fish equivalent state	n from zone or compartment of us	4						
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8	1			$\overline{}$		
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm	10						
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	1			0		
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1			-		
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5						
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	Ī			0		
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				-		
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4				
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0		
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2				
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				ш		
CoGP/Regulator				•					
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0		
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				М		
	IVee			1					
Platform access to cages	Yes No		0				0		
	140			J					
					Total		30		
					Rank		HIGH		

Case No:	2020-0007	;	Site No:	FS0323						
Sea Lice Inspection (
•	nced sea lice problems in the pre	•								
	lanagement Area (or equivalent)	•								
azamethiphos and ema can these be deployed 4. Is there a signed doo	access to a range of licenced in-famectin benzoate) as well as ac in a reasonable period of time? cumented farm management agr	cess to suitable biological a	nd/or mecl	hanical control measur	res, and					
Management Area (or										
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)										
6. Do records adequate	By reflect the required standard	specified in the SSI and the	CoGP? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex	(6)					
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the sur (CoGP Annex 6)	ggested criteria for treatme	nt in the Co	oGP during the period	that					
_	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) nu 0/6/19) during the period that rec	•	el of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6	6/19) or					
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish Health Insp	pectorate? If no, FHI see co	mment.							
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is conside	ered to cause significant we	lfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)					
	reatments been administered or or creatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>									
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable))?								
12. Have therapeutic tr	eatments or the actions taken ha	ad a significant impact upon	the lice le	vels recorded?						
13. Are treatments, who	ere conducted, carried out in coo	pperation between participat	ting farms?	?						
sea lice?	g strategy for the site, where few									
	ific written lice management proc scalation of a sea lice infestation		ribing set a	actions to deal with rec	ognised					
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect se	a lice count data? If no plea	ise detail re	easons.						
Containment Inspecti	on									
1. Has the site experier	nced equipment damage due to	predators in the current or p	revious pro	oduction cycles?	N					
2. Are measures in pla	ce to mitigate against the predati	ion experienced on site? (D	etail below	')	Υ					
indoors										
If other, detail below:										
					N					
	nts or events been experienced		te since the	e last FHI inspection?	N					
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to questi ported to Scottish Ministers?	on 10			_					
4. Have these been rep	orted to Scottish Millisters:									
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB forthwith (w	here they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	1.17)						
6. Have these been rep	ported to the SSPO and local fish	neries trusts forthwith (where	e they exist	t)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)					
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover escapees? If	yes give detail								
8. If gill nets were deplo	oyed was this action agreed with	local wild fish interests and	was perm	ission given by Scottis	h					
Ministers? (Legal, CoG			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							
9. What action was tak	en to prevent and minimise the r	isk of further escapes? (No	t covered in	n code but could						
be considered under	r satisfactory measures of the	Act)								
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Υ					

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No: 2020-0007 Site No: FS0323 Date of visit: 22/01/2020

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass:	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
13/01/20	19/02/2020	1st feed to 5g	0.3g	SAL		Weekly	4.24	Explained	O2 problems
10/06/19	16/06/2019	1st feed to 5g	0.4g	SAL		Weekly	5.20	Explained	Water quality and fungus
17/06/19	23/06/2019	1st feed to 5g	0.4g	SAL		Weekly	5.30	Explained	Water quality and fungus
24/06/19	30/06/2019	1st feed to 5g	0.4g	SAL		Weekly	3.90	Explained	Water quality and fungus

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):
	99369	Suffocation on the screen due to spate conditions on Thursday night 16th Jan. Mortality on the 17th and 18th January. 2345868 fish on site at time. Mortality for the site was 1.06% the week before and 0.4% the week after.	Collected during a site inspection. No increased mortality at time of inspection.
		High morts in spring 2019, poor water quality resulting in morts attributed to fungus and lesion only in C section.	Collected during a site inspection. No increased mortality at time of inspection.
		High morts in spring 2019, poor water quality resulting in morts attributed to fungus and lesion only in C section.	Collected during a site inspection. No increased mortality at time of inspection.
		High morts in spring 2019, poor water quality resulting in morts attributed to fungus and lesion only in C section.	Collected during a site inspection. No increased mortality at time of inspection.

Case No:	2020-0007			Date of visit:	22/01/2020				
0430 110.	2020 0001			Date of Visit.	22/01/2020				
Site No:	FS0323			Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
·	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
					ļ				
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI	12/02/2020								





Cooke Aquaculture (Freshwater) Ltd c/o Cooke Aquaculture Scotland Ltd Crowness Road, Hatston Kirkwall Orkney KW15 1RG

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0235 SITE NO FS0323 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 22/01/2020
SITE NAME Cairndow Hatchery
CASE NO 20200007

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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 high. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted annually. 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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

R04

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

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

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Date: 12/02/2020