FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 08/10/2018
Case No: 2020-0107				Date of visit: 03/03/2020
Time spent on site: 3	.5 hours		Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS0614 Business No: FB0572	Site Name: Business Name:	Holywood Breed AquaGen Scotla	-	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.8	Thermometer No:	T213		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type:	F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see a	additional inforr	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:		

Site had a high rate of egg fertilisation, however there was then trouble with white spots appearing on eggs and early hatching. I waste collected by Billie Bowie and transported to Dundas Chemicals.

Received a shipment of eggs from Norway on the 17/01/2019. (intra.no.2019.0000131 (no-0028399).

FHI 059, Version 12			lssu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0107		Site No:	FS0614	4			
Date of Visit:		03/03/202	20		Inspector(s)]
Registration/Author 1. Business/site det 2. Changes made to	ails summar		site representa	ative?			Y N	}
Site Details								_
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	ocked	6	No facilitie	s inspected	16
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL					
Age group	17s0	19S1	2020					
No Fish	414	30,225	12.5 million	I				
Mean Fish Wt	10 Kg	592 g	OVA					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	No plans		Next Input D	ate (Site)	April 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) If yes, detail:	disease pro	blems?		1	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
•								
Movement Record			~					
1. Movement record		for inspection	?				14/11/2018	Ŷ
 Date of last inspe Are records comp 		rrectly entered	42				14/11/2010	
4. Are movement re		•		,				Ý
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		-		able?				Y
Transport Records		,	,					
1. Are any movement		ut by (or on b	ehalf) of the h	isiness (not us	sing a STB)2			
If yes, is there a sys			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:					•			
3. Mortality records	complete an	nd correctly er	ntered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	(last 4 wks):		WK 9 0.22%	6 (68) WK 8 0.	22% (68) WK	7 0.1% (31)	WK6 0.2% (6	60)
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased	/atypical mort	alities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality pe	er facility/no s	tock per facility	/reason:				
								-
Any other peaks i If yes, detail:	n mortality o	luring period	checked?					N
7. Have increased () mortalities h	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. N/A								

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	N				
If yes, detail:					
If other, detail:					
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	ř				
 Are records complete and correctly entered? Are fish in a withdrawal period? 	1				
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				
	V				
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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	1				
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher					
health status, certification if required)?					
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y				
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?					
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y				
aquaculture animals held on site?					
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?	N				
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).					

Records checked between:

14/11/2018 - 03/03/2020

FHI 059, Version 12

FRI 059, Version 12		ISSUED by. FILL			Date	UI ISSUE	. 00/10/2010
Case Number:	2020-0107		Site No:	FS0614		Insp:	
Date of Visit	03/03/2020		No of movements/supp./dest.				Score
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	5
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0	5	10		5
Movements off	Frequency of n	•	0	3	6		
Novements on	Number of des		0	3	6		6
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species	disinfection or		0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
		or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n 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 pro	cessing	0				
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent stat	n from zone or compartment of	4				
		n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0				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 between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		
					Total Rank		26 HIGH

Case No:	2020-0107		Site	No:	FS0614			
Sea Lice Inspection (1. Has the site experie	Seawater Sites Only) nced 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	• •							
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)								
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required s	standard specified in th	e SSI and the CoG	9P? (L	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		ow the suggested criter	ia for treatment in t	the Co	oGP during the period that			
	female sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> 0/6/19) during the perio			f 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or			
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish H	ealth Inspectorate? If r	io, FHI see comme	ent.				
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which i	s considered to cause	significant welfare	proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)			
					levels have exceeded the ions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where a	pplicable)?						
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions	s taken had a significar	t impact upon the l	lice le	vels recorded?			
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	out in cooperation betv	veen participating f	arms?	?			
14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, v	where fewer population	s or part populatior	ns are	held without treatment for			
	cific written lice manager scalation of a sea lice in		aypoints describing	g set a	actions to deal with recognised	1		
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count d	ata? If no please de	etail re	easons.			
Containment Inspect	ion							
•	nced equipment damag	e due to predators in t	ne current or previo	ous pr	oduction cycles?	Ν		
	ice to mitigate against th			-	-	Y		
Tank lids	Site Inside	Pest control		_				
If other, detail below:								
				_				
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been expe	erienced on or in the vi	cinity of the site sin	nce the	e last FHI inspection?	Ν		
If Yes proceed with que	estions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10						
4. Have these been rep	ported to Scottish Minist	ters?						
5. Have these been rep	ported to local DSFB for	rthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.3	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 an	ny) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give deta	il					
8. If gill note wore deal	oved was this potion or	reed with local wild fick	interests and was	norm	ission given by Scottish			
Ministers? (Legal, Co		reed with local wild list	interests and was	penn	ission given by scottish			
	9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could							
	r satisfactory measure							
	d as satisfactory with re	· ·	If no, please detail	l reas	on(s)	Y		

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 12

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0107	Date of visit: 03/03/2020						
Site No:	FS0614	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	-							
Dan and Communication	-	-						
Report Summary	Date	Insp	ond In an					
Case Type ECI, CNI	23/04/2020	insp	2 nd Insp					
	<u> </u>							
	Ī							

marine scotland science



AquaGen Scotland Ltd BETA Centre Unit 16A Stirling University Innovation Park Stirling FK9 4NF

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0572 SITE NO FS0614 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 03/03/2020SITE NAMEHolywood Breeding CentreCASE No20200107

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.

Records in relation to aquaculture animals transported by the business were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

R04

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 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 further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed:			

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 23/04/2020

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