

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2021-0356"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="05/10/2021"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text" value="6 hours 30 minutes"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text" value=""/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS1305"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Westerbister"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0125"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Scottish Sea Farms Ltd"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNI"/>	3 <input type="text" value="SLI"/>	4 <input type="text" value="VMD"/>	5 <input type="text" value="DIA"/>	6 <input type="text" value=""/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="12.9"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="T155"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value=""/>	
Observations:	Region:	OR	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	O-3
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>					

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

Additional Case Information:

Stock on site inputted in July 2020 from Barcaldine

Risk assessment in place to support the case of non-synchronous fallow of the area

Slice treatments in fish which went to Hunda for caligus and in summer for Leps

Average female leps - 1.39 week 37; 1.34 week 36; 1.80 week 35; 1.34 week 34

Site to stock wrasse (local wild caught from Orkney) to help combat rising sea lice levels. Stock due in 8 October 2021.

Reported loss of stock upon input - captured through supplier mortality records.

Paperwork inspection by virtual meeting - Thursday 30 September 2021 - [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

Site inspection by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Samples from fish 1, fish 2 and fish 3 - pools 1 and 2 taken by [REDACTED]. Samples from fish 4 and 5 - pool 3, and VMD samples from fish 6 and 7 taken by [REDACTED] under the supervision of [REDACTED]

Oxygen levels satisfactory on site and temperature beginning to drop. It is hoped that this will help to alleviate mortality issues.

Several moribund, lethargic and dead fish observed across the site.

Case No: **2021-0356** Site No: **FS1305**
 Date of Visit: **05/10/2021** 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	16	Facilities stocked	16	No facilities inspected	16
Species	SAL				
Age group	2020 Q2				
No Fish	447,878				
Mean Fish Wt	3.362kg				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	March 2022	Next Input Date (Site)	? July 2022		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		Any escapes (since last visit)?	Y		N
If yes, detail:	Complex gill disease				

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **28/05/2019**
- 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)? **Y**
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **Y**

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Other (detail)**
- If other detail: **Mortalities held in bins and ensiled on mainland - at Twatt**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **58,577 - 11.35% mortality for the site for the past 4 weeks. Complex gill**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
Up to 6,500 to 7,000 per cage for past 4 weeks. Mortality highest in pens 1, 2 and 6. But has increased across all of the site. Estimated loss of some 18% since stocking.
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**
- If yes, detail: **June / July increased mortality up to 700-1000 per week across site. Oxygen dropped and complex disease issues. Mortality in previous stock at 10.89% for cycle.**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **Y**
- If yes, detail action: **Reported increased mortalities to FHI and investigated by veterinary professionals.**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. **Y**

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)? Y

If yes, detail: Paramove Tricane cage 9

10 pen 1, 5 and 7 - 14 Septen Tricane - weekly treatments for lice counts
September - pen 2

If other, detail:

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)? Tricane for lice counts

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 from sample taken in June 2021

Records checked between: May 2019 - present date

Case no: Site No: Date of visit/
Sampling: BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No	F1	P1	F2	F3	P2	F4	F5	P3				
Fish nos	1	1	2	3	2-3	4	5	4-5	6	7		
Pool Group	1		2	2		3	3					
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL		
Average weight	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000	3.3000		
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW	SW		
Stock Details		Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine		
	Stock Origin		Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine	Barcaldine		
Facility No	1	1	2	2	2	16	16	16	9	9		

Case no: 2021-0356

Site No: FS1305

Method of killing: Percussive

Date of visit: 05/10/2021

Inspector(s):

Sheet Relevant: Y

S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence

Fish Number		1	2	3	4	5				
Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes)		>1 hou	>1 hou	>1 hou	>1 hou	>1 hour				
External Signs										
Behaviour	Moribund	S				S				
	Lethargic	S	W		W	S				
	Hanging vertical	S				S				
	Spiralling									
	Flashing									
	Loss of equilibrium	S		S		S				
Body	Dark									
	Distended abdomen									
	Anorexic		M	W	W					
	Scale Oedema									
Opercula	Shortened			M	M					
	Flared									
Haemorrhaging	Throat									
	Ventrum									
	Base of fins									
	Elsewhere									
Eyes	Exophthalmic									
	Enophthalmic (sunken)									
	Cataract									
	Haemorrhagic									
Gills	Pale	S				W				
	Zoned									
	Necrotic									
Lesions	Flank									
	Elsewhere									
Vent	Inflamed									
	Trailing faeces									
Lice Load	Estimate numbers									
Internal Signs										
Ascites	Clear									
	Bloody									
Oedema	In tissues									
Heart	Pale/anaemic									
	Granulomas									
	Deformed									
Liver	Petechial haem									
	Gross haem		S	W	W	W				
	Tissue breakdown									
	Enlarged									
	Colour number(s)		3	5	5	4	4			
	Granulomas									
	Lesions									
Pyloric caeca	Petechial haem	W								
	Tubules mauve									
	Lack of fat		M							
Spleen	Enlarged					W				
	Granulomas									
Gut	No food present									
	Yellow pseudo-faeces									
	External haem									
	Internal haem									
Body wall	Haemorrhaging									
Swim bladder	Haemorrhaging									
	Fluid filled									
Kidney	Swollen									
	Grey									
	Granular									
	Liquefied									
General	Parasites present									
	Anaemia									

Additional comments:

F1 and F5 - good sized fish observed gasping and hanging vertical moving up and down through the water column. F1 gills damaged pale and clumped, F5 clumped gills. F1 food in gut, excess fat around edges of the spleen, liver mustard in colour. F2 haemorrhaging over the gill tips, yellow brown mucus within hind gut. F3 suspected very recently dead - may impact on histology findings - brown mucus in gut. F4 and F5 food in gut.

Case Number:	2021-0356	Site No:	FS1305	Insp:		
Date of Visit	05/10/2021	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	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
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		4
	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				0
	Common processes with other farms	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 Rank					19	MEDIUM

Case No: **2021-0356**

Site No: **FS1305**

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?
- 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)
- seal pro nets 50 mm bird 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?
- 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)

Case No: 2021-0356

Site No: FS1305

Date of Visit: 05/10/2021

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

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

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?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

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?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

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?

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?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

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?

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?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

Live Fish Movements

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

Harvesting

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

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?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

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?

Management and operation

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Site No: FS1305

Case No: 2021-0356

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0125	DATE OF VISIT	05/10/2021
SITE No	FS1305	SITE NAME	Westerbister
CASE No	20210356	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

Section 1: Summary

During a routine inspection moribund and lethargic fish were observed on site and removed for diagnostic sampling. Increased mortality, reported to be associated with complex gill disease was being experienced on site at the time of the inspection.

Histopathological examination revealed mild proliferative gill pathology, mild hepatic necrosis and splenic necrosis. Positive results for Salmon Gill Poxvirus, *Neoparamoeba perurans* and *Paranucleospora theridion* were obtained. These results support the suggestion of complex gill disease, which is likely to be a factor contributing to the mortality being experienced on site at the time of the visit.

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

Section 2: Case Detail

Observations

During a routine inspection several moribund and lethargic fish were observed on site and five were removed for closer observation and diagnostic sampling. At the time of the inspection the site was stocked with 447,878 2020 Q2s at an average weight of 3.362 kg. Increased mortality was being experienced, up to the level of 11.35% for the four weeks prior to the inspection and was believed to be a consequence of complex gill disease.

Behavioural, clinical and pathological signs of disease were observed across the 5 fish and included: hanging vertical in the water column (fish 1 and 5); loss of equilibrium (fish 1, 3 and 5); anorexia (fish 2, 3, and 4); pale clumped gills were observed (fish 1 and 5); haemorrhaging over the gills tips (fish 2); gross haemorrhaging across the liver (fish 2, 3, 4, and 5); petechial haemorrhaging over the pyloric caeca (fish 1); reduced fat levels across the pyloric caeca (fish 2); enlarged spleen (fish 5). In addition, fish 3 and 4 had reduced opercula.

Samples

Samples were collected from five fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Pool number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
1	1	1	Atlantic salmon	3.3 kg / 2020	Barcaldine
2 & 3	2	2	Atlantic salmon	3.3 kg / 2020	Barcaldine
4 & 5	3	16	Atlantic salmon	3.3 kg / 2020	Barcaldine

Results

The results for this case are as follows:

Bacteriology:

Kidney and gill material from all five fish was inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

- *Vibrio* sp. : F1-F5 (gill) was isolated from the samples taken.

The level and purity would not suggest this bacterium would be implicated in fish morbidity.

Virology:

Pooled tissue samples, in accordance with the table above, were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (qPCR).

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV) and viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV) for pools 1 and 2. No result was obtained from pool 3 due to endogenous control failure from two separate extractions suggesting that the sample for RNA was not at an acceptable quality or quantity to determine either the absence or presence of specific pathogens.

In addition, individual fish tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of Salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV) using real-time PCR (qPCR).

Salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV)

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	18.37	-	-	-	Negative
F2	19.14	30.04	30.09	30.02	Positive
F3	18.40	27.04	26.77	26.86	Positive
F4	19.43	27.13	27.01	27.50	Positive
F5	18.37	29.46	29.57	29.45	Positive

R09

Parasitology:

Tissue samples from individual fish were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the parasites *Neoparamoeba perurans* (the causative agent of Amoebic Gill Disease) and *Paranucleospora theridion* using real-time PCR (qPCR). Positive results for tests for both parasites, from all samples taken, were obtained according to the tables below.

Neoparamoeba perurans (AGD)

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	18.37	32.77	35.08	34.44	Positive
F2	19.14	26.43	26.52	26.68	Positive
F3	18.40	26.21	26.09	26.22	Positive
F4	19.43	29.46	29.31	29.45	Positive
F5	18.37	27.52	27.65	27.70	Positive

Paranucleospora theridion

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	18.37	28.93	29.08	28.91	Positive
F2	19.14	27.38	27.48	27.52	Positive
F3	18.40	27.75	28.00	27.98	Positive
F4	19.43	30.31	29.95	30.21	Positive
F5	18.37	29.93	30.31	30.33	Positive

Histology: Tissue samples of gill, skin and skeletal muscle, heart, pyloric caeca, pancreas, hind gut, liver, spleen, and kidney were taken from all five fish. The tissue samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin. The tissues were processed and examined by light microscopy.

Histopathological examination revealed the following:

Gill: Mild multifocal hyperplasia (F1, F4), several individual lamellae displayed epithelial thickness and some prominent goblet cells (F1). F4 also exhibited some lamellar vascular disturbance, however the tissue present is very limited, only taken one gill filament. F5 displayed lamellar adhesions, irregular epithelium, spongiosis and lamellar vascular disturbance. Fish 3 displayed autolysis artefacts which hindered the reading.

Skin & Muscle: Within the normal range.

Heart: Mild pericarditis (F1 & F5) and a small thrombus in the compact layer.

Gut and pyloric caeca: Area of haemorrhage observed on the adipose tissue (F5). Marked cell sloughing (likely associated with post-mortem artefacts) (F1, F3).

Pancreas: Within normal range.

Liver: Mild multifocal hepatic necrosis (F1 & F2), mild diffuse hepatocellular vacuolation (macrovisicules) (F1 & F5).

Kidney: Within normal range.

Spleen: Absence of haematopoietic tissue (F1) and F4 displayed focal reduction of white pulp.

Signed:



Fish Health Inspector

Date: 10 December 2021

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/>

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0125	DATE OF VISIT	05/10/2021
SITE No	FS1305	SITE NAME	Westerbister
CASE No	20210356	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. Samples were taken for diagnostic purposes. A separate report will be issued detailing the results of these tests.

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.

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.

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 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.

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 to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), 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 parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

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: 8 December 2021

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/>