FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2021-0574			Date of visit: 07/11/2021
Time spent on site:	Hrs	Main Ins	spector:
Site No: FS1326 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine On-Growing L Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	Jnit
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.5	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	I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet. I information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	uil reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Site thermometer used due to operators biosecurity practices.

Although registered as 1 site, it is operated as two separate units (2 units of 8 tanks), each has a separate access points, separate PPE, separate equipment and separate RAS.

Mortalities

On-growing Unit 1

WK 45 - 1,490 (0.11%),

WK 46 - 2,451 (0.18%),

WK 47 - 1,899 (0.14%),

WK 48 - 1,960 (0.14%)

On-growing Unit 2

WK 45 - 1,201 (0.1%),

WK 46 - 1,411 (0.1%),

WK 47 - 1,346 (0.1%),

WK 48 - 822 (0.06%)

Very good biosecurity practices in place incl controlled access. Feeding is controlled from central stores and pumped to hoppers at each tanks

No dead or moribund observed, fish appeared in very good condition. Water was very peaty, although good visibility from observation deck.

FHI 059, Version 13	3		Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2021-0574		Site No:	FS1326				
Date of Visit:		07/11/2021]		Inspector(s)	:		
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site det			site representa	ative?			Υ	7
2. Changes made to	o details?						N]
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	16	No faciliti	es inspected	16
Species	SAL							
Age group	Parr							
No Fish	2,719,662							
Mean Fish Wt	26.8g							
Next Fallow Date (S		Dec 21		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Jan 22		
Recent (last 4 wks)				· •	Any escape		t visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						,	,	
Movement Record		r inanaatian?						
Movement record Data of last incord		r inspection?					4.0/00/2040	T
2. Date of last inspe		a othy optorod	2				16/09/2019	·
 Are records comp Are movement re 	•	•		•				
5. Are records com								
Are health certific	•	•		ahle?				N/A
o. Ale ficaliti certific		actions (out	vitii OD) avalit	1010 :				1471
Transport Records	S							
1. Are any moveme	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N/A
If yes, is there a sys	stem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records		nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti					Ensiled - on	site		•
If other detail:	alopeced c				21101104 011	0.10		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•	correctly crit		al comments f	or breakdown	<u> </u>		
5. Evidence of rece		typical mortal			or breakdown			I N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				
	,	,	,					
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:	(as a stable and						NI/A
7. Have increased (• •	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:		ported to EU	2 If no onter	details on mor	tality ovente o	hoot		N/A
8. Have 'mortality e	vents been re	ponea lo FHI	: Il fio, enter	uetalis on mon	tailly events s	neet.		IN/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?	Y
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, 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	Y
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: 16/09/19 to 06/12/21	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2021-0574		Site No:	FS1326		Insp:	
Date of Visit	07/11/2021		No of movements/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	40	200	0
species	compartment in Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
					ļ		0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Number of desi	Site contacts			<u> </u> 6-10	10	3
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	ı	I-3	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				0
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	2	4		
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	1	2	4		
		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	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters					
processors			0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				•
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
		from zone or compartment of					
	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 wast	te only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	, 1			0
osc of anpasteurised reeds	Feeding unpas		5	1			0
Biosecurity	r county unput	Number of sites] 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0		2		2
		taff and equipment	0		2		2
				' 1			
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Todo of practico				ı			
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					_ , _		
					Total		13
					Rank		LOW

Case No:	2021-0574	Site No:	FS1326	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)			
• •	enced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?			
•	Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously of	n a single v	/ear class hasis?	
	access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice med			
azamethiphos and ema	amectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological d in a reasonable period of time?			d
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or	cumented farm management agreement or statement relevent	vant to the s	site and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6	5)		
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the	e CoGP? (L	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatm? (CoGP Annex 6)	ent in the C	oGP during the period that	
_	female sea lice ($L.\ salmonis$) numbers per fish been at a le 0/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	evel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	r
If yes, have these beer	n reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see of	comment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which is considered to cause significant w	elfare probl	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
	reatments been administered or other actions taken when a treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welf			
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicable)?			
12. Have therapeutic tr	reatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upo	on the lice le	evels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	nere conducted, carried out in cooperation between particip	ating farms	?	
14. Is there a harvesting sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part pop	oulations are	e held without treatment for	
	cific written lice management procedure with waypoints des scalation of a sea lice infestation?	cribing set a	actions to deal with recognised	b
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ease detail r	reasons.	
Containment Inspecti				
•	enced equipment damage due to predators in the current or		•	N
	ace to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	v)	Υ
Site Indoors, Pest				
Control				
If other, detail below:				
2 Have escape incide	ents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the	cita cinca th	o last EUI inspection?	N
·	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	one since (I)	io idat i i ii iliapection!	14
	ported to Scottish Ministers?			
•		1127 57	1 17)	
	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – ported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (whe			
o. have these been rep	ported to the SSFO and local lisheries trusts forthwith (whe	ere urey exis	st)? (COGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	
7. Were methods (if an	ny) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail			
0.14 '11 '				
8. If gill nets were deplemental Ministers? (Legal, CoG	loyed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests ar GP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	nd was perm	nission given by Scottish	
9. What action was tak	ken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (N	ot covered i	in code but could	
be considered unde	er satisfactory measures of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please	e detail reas	son(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13

-									
Case No:	2021-0574	J		Date of vis	sit: 07/11/20)21			
Site No:	FS1326]		Inspect	or:				
Results Summary	Freq.	1	Date of Notification						
Results Summary	r req.	Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd	
	_						op		
	_								
					_				
	_								
Report Summary				1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1					
ECI, CNI	13/12/2021		Z IIIOP						
,									
	-								





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0125 Date of Visit 07/12/2021

SITE NO FS1326 SITE NAME Barcaldine On-Growing Unit

Case No 20210574 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.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third 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.

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 adequately maintained.

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: 13/12/21

Fish Health Inspector

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/