FHI 059, Version 13	Is	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0554			Date of visit: 02/12/2021
Time spent on site:	2.5 hours	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: FS0323 Business No: FB0235	Site Name: Business Name:	Cairndow Hatchery Cooke Aquaculture (Fresh	water) Ltd
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 IMP	4 MIX 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	~	N If yes, see additional in	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	y out intended visit detail r	eason below:	

### **Additional Case Information:**

Eggs going into 18 tanks today. Eggs arrived from Iceland last night and being laid down today.

Morts ensiled - waste removed by Hazco to either Energen Biogas or Scottish Water Deerdykes anaerobic digestion plants. Import of eggs from Iceland - certificate checked - ICE GJ 36/21 - dated 26/11/2021 - arrived 01/12/2021.

Also checked ICE GJ 09/21, ICE GJ 02/21 (departed 12/01/21 signed on 07/01), ICE GJ 34/20, ICE GJ 14/20.

All original certificates available on site.

Increased mortality in one tank in March 2021 due to water issues - 4.89% of the batch (roughly half a tank) but site percentage for week below reporting threshold (2.45%). A couple of other slight peaks in mortality due to failed hatch. Aquacen and Cress used - no withdrawal recorded- both should be 500 degree days. Issue raised but no further action required as template updated during visit. All other required information recorded in treatment record. Site thermometer used due to biosecurity measures on site.

FHI 059, Version 13	<b>;</b>		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0554		Site No:	FS0323				
Date of Visit:		02/12/2021	]		Inspector(s)			
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site det			ite representa	ative?			Υ	7
2. Changes made to	o details?						Υ	]
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities	0.000	76	Facilities sto	ocked	4	No facilitie	es inspected	76
Species	SAL			T			T	
Age group	2021 Ova							
No Fish	1,800,000							
Mean Fish Wt	0.2g							
Next Fallow Date (S		2023 - possi	ble	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Jan 2022	•	
Recent (last 4 wks)	•			_ ·	Any escapes		visit)?	N
If yes, detail:				•	,	,	,	
Movement Record  1. Movement record  2. Date of last inspect  3. Are records completed. Are movement records	ds available fo ection: olete and corre	ectly entered?		Ŷ			22/01/2020	Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				Y
Transport Records	5							
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys					_			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti		•			Ensiled - on	site		•
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•		Site fallow					
5. Evidence of rece		typical mortal						N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				
6 Any other peaks	in martality du	ring pariod ak	a alca dO					
6. Any other peaks If yes, detail:	See addition	<u> </u>	ieckeu?					
7. Have increased (			en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	μ.σ.σ.σ.) ·		- F					
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events s	heet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records					
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N			
If yes, detail:					
If other, detail:					
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		Y			
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		N			
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N			
5. If yes, what treatment(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, record	ling and safe disposal been considered?	Y			
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Sco	ottish 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 prese	nce or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease				
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?					
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 implemente	, o	Y			
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, vis	sitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place	e to maintain the physical containment of	Y			
aquaculture animals held on site?					
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately impleme	ented 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:	22/01/2020 - 02/12/2021				

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0554		Site No:	FS0323		Insp:	
Date of Visit	02/12/2021		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	18	26	0
	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		10	26 14	5
DA							- 6
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10 10	3
Exposure via water	Trambol of door	Site contacts			6-10		,
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III 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		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	equivalent statu		4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V 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				
	Collection poin	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	, ]			0
oos or ampaoroamooa roodo	Feeding unpas	•	5				ű
Biosecurity	<u> </u>	Number of sites	1	J 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		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				_			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	]			0
	No		2				
					Total		24
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2021-0554		Site No:	FS0323	]
Sea Lice Inspection (	Seawater Sites Only)				
•	enced sea lice problems in the p	revious 4 vears?			
·	Management Area (or equivalen	·	n a single ve	ear class basis?	
	access to a range of licenced in				
azamethiphos and em	amectin benzoate) as well as a d in a reasonable period of time	ccess to suitable biological			
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or	cumented farm management a equivalent)?	greement or statement relev	ant to the si	te and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)			
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required standard	I specified in the SSI and the	e CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Ann	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the s ? (CoGP Annex 6)	uggested criteria for treatme	ent in the Co	GP during the perio	d that
_	female sea lice ( $L.\ salmonis$ ) r 0/6/19) during the period that re	•	evel of 3 or a	bove (prior to w/b 10	0/6/19) or
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Health In	spectorate? If no, FHI see co	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is consi	dered to cause significant we	elfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)
	reatments been administered o reatment or where <i>C. elongatu</i> :				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicabl	e)?			
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the actions taken	nad a significant impact upor	n the lice lev	els recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	nere conducted, carried out in co	operation between participa	ating farms?		
14. Is there a harvestir sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where for	wer populations or part pop	ulations are	held without treatme	ent for
	cific written lice management pr scalation of a sea lice infestation		cribing set a	ctions to deal with re	ecognised
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks reflect s	ea lice count data? If no ple	ase detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion				
	nced equipment damage due to	nredators in the current or	nrevious pro	nduction cycles?	N
·	ace to mitigate against the preda		-	•	Y
Site Inside	noo to mangato agamet ale proud	(-		<u>'</u>	
If other, detail below	:				
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been experience	d on or in the vicinity of the s	site since the	e last FHI inspection	? N
If Yes proceed with qu	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ques	tion 10			
4. Have these been re	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forthwith (	where they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and local fi	sheries trusts forthwith (whe	re they exist	)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escapees?	f yes give detail			
8 If all note were deal	loyed was this action agreed wi	h local wild fish interests on	d was parmi	esion divon by Sast	tich
Ministers? (Legal, Coo	SP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)				.1511
	ken to prevent and minimise the		ot covered in	code but could	
	er satisfactory measures of the				
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with regards to	containment? If no, please	detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2021-0554	1		Date of vic	sit: 02/12/20	021			
Case No.	2021-0554	_		Date of VIS	oit. 02/12/20	021			
Site No:	FS0323			Inspecto	or:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
	_								
			_						
	+								
	1								
		L							
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
MIX	03/12/2021								
ECI, CNI	07/12/2021								
IMP	07/12/2021								





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0235 Date of Visit 02/12/2021

SITE NO FS0323 SITE NAME Cairndow Hatchery

**Case No** 20210554 **Inspector** ■

## 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.

An import inspection and an inspection of the requirements for mixing medicated feedstuffs were also carried out. Separate reports will be issued in relation to these.

### 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. 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 Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be inadequately maintained.

The following point was raised with the site representative during the inspection:

Treatments administered did not have the appropriate withdrawal period recorded in the medicine record. The record template was updated during the visit to include a field for recording this. Withdrawal period must be recorded where relevant in future. No further action is required at present but this will be checked at future inspections.

### 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: Date: 07/12/2021
Fish Health Inspector

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





## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0235 Date of Visit 02/12/2021

SITE NO FS0323 SITE NAME Cairndow Hatchery

CASE NO 20210554 INSPECTOR

## Inspection of a consignment imported into Scotland

An inspection was conducted on a consignment of 1.8 million Atlantic salmon ova imported into Scotland from Iceland.

The accompanying health certificate met the requirements of the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 and the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012.

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

Signed: Date: 07/12/2021

Fish Health Inspector

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