FHI 059, Version 13	ls	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0146			Date of visit: 11/05/2022
Time spent on site: 6h)	Main Inspe	ector:
Site No: FS0240 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Linnhe Mowi Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5 DIA	6
Water Temp (°C): 9.8	Thermometer No:	T305	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-33
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	fish present? 1? out intended visit detail r	Y If yes, see additional ir Y If yes, see additional ir Y If yes, see additional ir Y P	nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet. nformation/clinical score sheet.

Additional Case Information:

Remote paperwork completed 04/05/22.

WRS some wild caught from N. Ireland, some farmed.

Fallow possibly Sep 22 (if current stock moved to Muck or Rum) or July 2023.

Treatment imported from Chile: Veterian (Florfenicol)

Lethargic and moribund fish observed in pen 8-10. Site staff actively remove lethargic and moribund fish on a daily basis from these pens. Fish removed for diagnostic from pen 8 and 9. Lethargic fish also observed in some of the other pens, particularly pen5 and 7. Approximately 10-15 lethargic fish observed in pen 5 and 7 each. Two fish removed for diagnostic removed from pen 5. Overall majority of fish in pens 1-7 appeared to be shoaling normally. Fish a little deeper in the water and at times with the light conditions difficult to observe. At the time of inspection strong tidal currants were observed on site.

FHI 059, Version 13			lss	sued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020				
Case No:	2022-0146		Site No:	FS02	240							
Date of Visit:		11/05/202	22		Inspector(s):		l				
Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? 2. Changes made to details?												
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fi	sh for all se	ctions)									
Total No facilities		10	Facilities st	tocked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	10				
Species	SAL	WRS	LUM									
Age group	2021 Q4	mixed	2021									
No Fish	915,000	31,844	2,240									
Mean Fish Wt	1.8kg	80-150g	50g									
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	Sep 22 or .	July 23	Next Input	Date (Site)	Oct 22 or	Oct 23					
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prol	olems?			Y Any escap	es (since last	visit)?	N				
n yes, detail.	other pens (Oxytetracy now). Healt	affected as v /cline) treatm th visit sched	vell. 3 pens wi ent to be start uled for tomor	ith smaller fisl ted towards th rrow.	h treated with he end of the v	Florfenicol, wi veek (3 pens	th no effect. N with smaller fis	lew Aquatet sh only for				
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? Mortality Records 1. Mortality records available for inspection? 2. How are mortalities disposed of? If other detail: 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?												
 SAL: wk 14, 2022: 1.49% / 14,423; wk 15, 2022: 1.14% / 10,882; wk 1.16% / 10,996; wk 17, 2022: 1.13% / 10,493. WRS: wk 14, 2022: 15; wk 15, 2022: 77/ 0.24%; wk 16, 2022: 144/ 0.45%; wk 17, 2022: 13 LUM: wk 14, 2022: 270/ 1.12%; wk 15, 2022: 195/ 0.82%; wk 16, 20 1.38%: wk 17. 2022: 448/1.93%. 												
J. Evidence of recer	mortality or	atypical mon	allues (tu/roocon:				1				
SAL Moiority of rea	rto from nor				mifiacatly law	or figures						
6 Any other peaks	ns from pen	s 8, 9 and 10 luring period	, remaining po	ens on site sig	gnilicantly lowe	er ligures.		V				
If yes detail								1				
7 Hove increased (r	SAL: WK 13	, 2022: 1.14	/o	to vot or EU!	2			V				
7. Have increased (unexplained	nortalities b	been reported	to vet or FHI	ſ			Ť				
If yes, detail action:		SAL: Healt visits in Ap	n visit 24/3/22 ril. Next visit p	2, Flortenicol t planned 5/5/2	reatment start 2.	ed for pen 8,9	9,10 on 5/4/22	. Further				
8. Have mortality ev	ients' been r	eported to FI	n, ente	r details on m	iortality events	s sneet.		Ŷ				

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
Veterin 80%	
(Florfenicol),	
If yes, detail: TMS	
If other, detail:	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Ý
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? Veterin 80% (Florfenicol), TMS	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
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 ves, are results available for inspection?	Y
3 Any significant results?	Y
If ves, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Visit 13/4/22: Samples collected from affected pens (8 & 9) Pathology observed consistent with Tenacibaculum m	aritimum
and also Moritella viscosa. PatoGen report on samples collected (13/4/22) dated 21/4/22; PCR positives for M. visc	osa: T.
maritimum. Visit 28/4/22: Samples collected from 8 &9. Samples positive for Tenacibaculum spp., and Yersinia ruc	skeri
however negative results for T, maritimum and M, viscosa.	Non,
Records checked between: 11/03/2022 - 04/05/2022	



Add Fish/Pools - click

	Deel/Eich No			F 0			D4	DO				
	POOI/FISH NO	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	Pí	PZ				
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	1-2	4-5	6	7	8	
	Pool Group	P1	P1		P2	P2						
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL			SAL	SAL	SAL	
	Average weight	2kg	2kg	700g	700g	700g			1.8kg	1.8kg	1.8kg	
	Sex	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	
tock Details	Stock Origin	n Glenfinnan	n Glenfinnan	o Glenfinnan	o Glenfinnan	o Glenfinnan			Glenfinnan	o Glenfinnan	o Glenfinnan	
S	Facility NO	5	5	8	9	9			1	3	6	

J5/2022	2022 Additional Sample Information:												
7		Total Te	ests ass	igned	13	l							

FHI 059, Version 13			lss	ued by:	FHI		Date of issue: 12/05/20			
Case no:	2022-0146		Site N	0:	FS024	0	Method of killing: Percussive			
Date of visit:	11/05/20	22	Inspec	ctor(s):				Sheet R	elevant:	
S for strong preser	nce: M for medium presence: W f	for weak pres	sence							
Fish Number		F1	F2	F3	F4	F5				
Time sampled after	er death (if > 45 minutes)	60	80	0 80	80) 90				
External Signs										
Behaviour	Moribund	IM	M	M	M	M				
	Lethargic	S	S	S	S	S		_		
	Hanging vertical	_	-		_			_		
	Spiralling							_		
	Flashing				-					
Body	Dark									
Body	Distended abdomen									
	Anorexic			М	M	S		_		
	Scale Oedema									
Opercula	Shortened	М	M							
	Flared									
Haemorrhaging	Throat									
	Ventrum									
	Base of fins									
F	Elsewhere									
Eyes	Exophthalmic									
	Enophthalmic (sunken)		_		_			_		
	Haemorrhagic	-	-		-					
Gills	Pale									
onio	Zoned				W	w				
	Necrotic									
Lesions	Flank				M	M				
	Elsewhere									
Vent	Inflamed									
	Trailing faeces									
Lice Load	Estimate numbers									
			_					_		
Internal Signs		_	_		_			_		
Ascites	Clear		-		-			_		
Oodomo				-			_	_		
Heart	Pale/anaemic		-					_		
licalt	Granulomas	_						_		
	Deformed			W						
Liver	Petechial haem	W	W	W						
	Gross haem									
	Tissue breakdown									
	Enlarged									
	Colour number(s)	4	3	4	2	2				
	Granulomas									
Dularic con	Lesions									
ryioric caeca										
	Lack of fat			м	s	S				
Spleen	Enlarged	М	M	M	Ŵ	Ŵ				
	Granulomas									
Gut	No food present			W	S	S				
	Yellow pseudo-faeces	S	S	М	W	W				
	External haem									
	Internal haem									
Body wall	Haemorrhaging									
Swim bladder	Haemorrhaging		м							
	Fluid filled									
Kidney	Swollen	NA .	M	M	W/	W				
	Grey	M	IM	M	~~	**				
			IVI	141	W	M				
General	Parasites present									
	Anaemia									
	Aldellia		1		1					

,			,				
Case no:	2022-0146						
Date of visit:	11/05/2022						
S for strong presen	ce: M for medium presence: W for w						
Fish Number							
Time sampled afte	er death (if > 45 minutes)						
External Signs							
Behaviour	Moribund						
	Lethargic						
	Hanging vertical						
	Spiralling					 	
	Flashing						
	Loss of equilibrium				 	 	
Body	Dark Distantia di shahaman						
	Distended abdomen						
	Anorexic Socia Ocdoma						
Opercula	Shortened						
Opercula	Flared						
Haemorrhaging	Throat						
naomonnagnig	Ventrum						
	Base of fins						
	Elsewhere						
Eyes	Exophthalmic						
-	Enophthalmic (sunken)						
	Cataract						
	Haemorrhagic						
Gills	Pale						
	Zoned						
	Necrotic						
Lesions	Flank						
	Elsewhere						
Vent	Inflamed						
	Trailing faeces						
	Estimate numbers						
Internal Signs							
	Clear						
A301103	Bloody						
Oedema	In tissues						
Heart	Pale/anaemic						
	Granulomas						
	Deformed						
Liver	Petechial haem						
	Gross haem						
	Tissue breakdown						
	Enlarged			 	 	 	
	Colour number(s)						
	Granulomas				 		
Dedaute and a	Lesions						
Pyloric caeca	Petechiai haem						
	Look of fot						
Spleen	Enlarged						
opieen	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						

2022-0146

Case Number:	2022-0146	Site No:	FS0240		Insp:	
Date of Visit	11/05/2022	No of mo	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements		0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or		0	10	26	
species	compartment including third country	0	9	10	20 14	5
				10		
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
Evnequia via water	Number of destinations		3	6 10	10	
Exposure via water	Earm is protected (secure water supply through		1-5 	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or borehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
,	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		1
On farm processing within	No on farm processing					
the rules of the directive	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-	Site's own waste only processed.		1			
products	Common processes with other farms					
	Collection point for waste from other forms	3				
		5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	Number of sites	s <u> </u>	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		C
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		C
Disinfection of equipment	Yes	0]			
between sites, use of footbaths etc.	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator	1		J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		1			
with regulator or industry	No	0				
code of practice		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				
	No	2				
				Total		26
				Rank		HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0146	Site No:	FS0240
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or er 3. Does the site have access to a range of lice azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as and can these be deployed in a reasonable pro-	in the previous 4 years? quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (ir well as access to suitable biological and/or med eriod of time?	year class basis? Including deltamethrin, Chanical control measures,
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm Y
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp6. Do records adequately reflect the required	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Y Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Y
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that Y
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salr</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the perio	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or od that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N/A
10. Have therapeutic treatments been adminissuggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C</i> . et al. Has any other action been taken (where a 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, sea lice?	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> <i>clongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implicant applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le out in cooperation between participating farms where fewer populations or part populations ar	evels recorded? * <i>levels</i> have exceeded the tions? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) N/A N/A N/A Y e held without treatment for Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage recognised scenarios during the escalation of	ment procedure with waypoints describing set a sea lice infestation?	actions to deal with Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons. Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against t	ge due to predators in the current or previous p he predation experienced on site? (Detail below	roduction cycles? N v) Y
If other, detail below:		
tensioned nets, top nets, seal blinds 3. Have escape incidents or events been exp If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the to question 10	ne last FHI inspection?
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	sters?	
 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and 	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)	4.17) st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ag Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and mini be considered under satisfactory measur 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re- 	greed with local wild fish interests and was perr mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered res of the Act) egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	nission given by Scottish in code but could son(s)

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0146 S	Site No: FS0240	
Date of Visit: 11/05/2022	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance	thin a farm management area?	
If N, no further questions require completi	on.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm M	anagement Agreements and Statements	
2. Has a current farm management agree	ment or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared	Y Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant f	farm management area?	Ý
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of α	site(s) to which it applies?	Pt 2
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of re	view?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manager	nent	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum farm?	health standards for the stocks to be introdu	uced to the area or Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	on requirements for stocks held in the area o	or farm? Y
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximu	im stocking density of any pen on any farm in	n the area or the Y
individual farm?	monte for the storage and dispessal of any de	and fish from any fish
farm in the area or the individual farm?	ments for the storage and disposal of any de	
Arrangements for The Management of	Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	its for the sharing of data on sea lice numbe	ers and treatments? Y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availabi of statement?	lity and the use of medicines on farms cover	red by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any required lice on farms in the area or individual farm	ments for the sensitivity testing of available ti າຣ?	reatments for sea Y
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circums used on farms in the area or individual far	tances under which biological controls and c	cleaner fish are to be Y
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrange	ments for synchronous treatments on farms	within the area? Y
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circums area or farm?	tances when live fish may be introduced or r	removed from the Y
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrange	ments for the movement of live fish on and o	off sites in the area Y

Hanna the se	
narvesting 20. Does the EMAd/S identify acceptable baryest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?	Y
Fallowing	
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest	Υ
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	Y
agreement or statement?	N/
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site	Ŷ
covered by the agreement of 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,	N/A
parties to the agreement?	
Management and operation	N/
25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	Ŷ
20. What is the version ho/date of issue of the FMAg/3?	
MOWI only business in the CoGP area	

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Site No: FS0240

Case No: 2022-0146

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Case No:	2022-014	6		Date of visit:	11/05/2022			
Site No:	FS0240			Inspector:		I		
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
MG-AGD	0/5	16/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-SAL POX	3/5	16/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG- PARA THER	5/5	16/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-VHS	0/5	16/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-IHN	0/5	16/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-ISA	0/5	16/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-PMCV	0/5	17/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-SAV	0/5	17/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
MG-IPN	0/5	17/05/2022		18/05/2022		16/06/2022		
TENC	3/5	02/06/2022		02/06/2022		16/06/2022		
SULC	2/5	02/06/2022		02/06/2022		16/06/2022		
HPAT	4/5	02/06/2022		02/06/2022		16/06/2022		
PMCH	1/5	02/06/2022		02/06/2022		16/06/2022		
ADHE	5/5	02/06/2022		02/06/2022		16/06/2022		
SPAT	5/5	02/06/2022		02/06/2022		16/06/2022		
YRUK	3/5	14/06/2022				16/06/2022		
Rhodococcus sp.	1/5	14/06/2022				16/06/2022		
VSPE	2/5	14/06/2022				16/06/2022		
VVIS	1/5	14/06/2022				16/06/2022		
NSIG	2/5	14/06/2022				16/06/2022		

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	18/05/2022		
DIA	16/06/2022		





FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0119

 SITE NO
 FS0240

 CASE NO
 20220146

DATE OF VISIT11/05/2022SITE NAMELinnheINSPECTORInspector

Section 1: Summary

During a routine inspection moribund and lethargic fish were removed for diagnostic sampling. The site had reported increased mortality due to bacterial infection for several weeks prior to the visit.

Histopathology examination revealed bacterial infection (likely associated with *Tenacibaculum* sp.) in F3; F4 and F5 displayed bacterial ulcerative dermatitis. F2 displayed myocarditis and all fish had evidences of splenitis and nephritis, potentially associated with bacterial infection. Some peritonitis was observed in all fish, potentially associated with vaccine administration.

Yersinia ruckeri was identified on plates taken from kidney material of fish F1, F2 and F5. *Moritella viscosa* was identified on plates taken from F5 lesion. *Vibrio* sp. was identified on plates taken from fish 4 and 5. Both Yersinia ruckeri and Moritella viscosa are primary fish pathogens, Vibrio sp. is more commonly a secondary pathogen. The purity of growth would not suggest that any one of these bacteria could be implicated as the primary cause of morbidity however the level of growth overall was significant.

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

Section 2: Case Detail

Observations

During a routine inspection moribund and lethargic fish were observed on site and removed for diagnostic sampling. At the time of the visit the site was stocked with 915,00 2021Q4 Atlantic salmon at an average weight of 1.8kg, as well as wrasse and lumpfish. The site had been reporting mortality events above the reporting threshold to the Fish Health Inspectorate in the weeks leading up to the inspection. Mortalities were attributed to bacterial infection with *Tenacibaculum*. Mortality records showed that mortality was increased predominantly in pens 8, 9 and 10. During the site inspection approximately 10-15 moribund and lethargic fish were also in pens 5 and 7.

All fish removed for the diagnostic were moribund and lethargic. Externally, F1-F2 had shortened opercula and F3-F5 were anorexic. F4-F5 had slightly zoned gills, as well as lesions on the flanks. Internally, F1-F3 showed some petechial haemorrhaging on the liver with the heart of F3 showing slight deformity. F3-F5 had a lack of fat around the pyloric caeca and had no food present in the gut. All fish showed signed of an enlarged spleen, as well as a slightly grey appearance of the kidney, with the kidney also appearing slightly granular in F1-F3. The kidney appeared liquefied in F4-F5. The swim bladder displayed some haemorrhaging in F2.

R09

Samples

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

Fish number	Pool number	Facility number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1 – F2	P1	5	Atlantic salmon	2kg, 2021 Q4	Glenfinnan
F3	N/A	8	Atlantic salmon	700g, 2021 Q4	Glenfinnan
F4 – F5	P2	9	Atlantic salmon	700g, 2021 Q4	Glenfinnan

Results

Bacteriology: Kidney, gill, spleen and lesion material from five fish was inoculated onto appropriate media for the isolation of bacteria.

The following bacteria were isolated:

- Yersinia ruckeri: F1-F2& F5 (Kidney);
- Moritella viscosa: F5 (Lesion);
- Vibrio sp.: F4 (Lesion, Gill); F5 (Kidney, Lesion, Gill);
- Rhodococcus sp.: F3 (Kidney);

Rhodococcus sp. was identified using PCR and sequencing of 16s rRNA. *Rhodococcus* sp. is not known as a fish pathogen.

From the tests conducted on *Yersinia ruckeri* isolates, we do not have evidence of resistance to oxytetracycline, sulphamethoxazole/trimethoprim or florfenicol. We have evidence which may indicate some resistance to amoxycillin.

From the tests conducted on *Moritella viscosa* isolates, we do not have evidence of resistance to oxytetracycline, amoxycillin or florfenicol. We have evidence which may indicate some resistance to sulphamethoxazole/trimethoprim.

Virology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (qPCR).

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	18.79	-	-	-	Negative
F2	19.1	-	-	-	Negative
F3	19.43	32.23	32.26	32.87	POSITIVE
F4	19.59	27.76	28.29	28.82	POSITIVE
F5	20.18	27.77	27.68	27.43	POSITIVE

Salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV)

R09

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV), viral haemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV) and piscine myocarditis virus (PMCV).

Parasitology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the parasites specified below using real-time PCR (qPCR).

Fish Number	Endogenous control Cp value	Cp Values			Reported Result (PCR)
F1	18.79	32.94	32.54	32.16	POSITIVE
F2	19.1	33.41	32.85	33.93	POSITIVE
F3	19.43	25.93	25.83	25.94	POSITIVE
F4	19.59	27.02	26.45	27.41	POSITIVE
F5	20.18	26.24	25.95	26.36	POSITIVE

Paranucleospora	theridion
-----------------	-----------

The samples tested negative for Neoparamoeba perurans (AGD).

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

Histopathological examination revealed the following:

<u>Gill:</u> Several clusters of filamentous bacteria and no inflammation reaction associated (F3). Mild, multifocal, interlamellar epithelial hyperplasia (F1, F2). Some scattered aneurysmal dilation/telangiectasia, lamellar congestion and freed blood among gill filaments (F1-F5). F4 displayed post-mortem artefacts.

<u>Skin & Muscle: lesions:</u> partial absence of epidermal (F4 & F5). Some dermal oedema and presence of high number of mixed bacteria that stained Gram-negative and Giemsa positive (F4 & F5). Foci of unknown round-shaped structures (potentially yeast) noted in all the lesions. Musculature displayed mild inflammation and some haemorrhage.

<u>Heart:</u> Several clusters of filamentous bacteria and no inflammation reaction associated (F3). Mild influx of mononuclear cells (F2). Some pericarditis (F4, F5).

<u>Gut and pyloric caeca:</u> Mild to moderate peritonitis (potentially associated with vaccine administration) (F1-F5). Some cell sloughing (potentially linked to post-mortem artefacts).

Pancreas: Within the normal range.

<u>Liver:</u> Some cuffing (F1-F5). Mild, multifocal hepatocellular cell degeneration and necrosis and some haemorrhage (F5). F2 displayed some congested vessels.

<u>Kidney:</u> Some foci of sparse haematopoietic tissue and some inflammatory cells circulating within the sinusoidal spaces (F2). Renal tubes displayed hyaline droplets on the lining epithelium (F2-F5). F2 and F3 exhibited very few numbers of rod-shaped and filamentous Gram-negative bacteria, respectively.

<u>Spleen:</u> Several clusters of filamentous bacteria surrounded by melanin pigment (F3) and F1 also exhibited very few numbers of rod-shaped Gram-negative bacteria. Mild diffuse vaculation in the white pulp (F1-F5). Slightly congested (F2-F5).

Signed: Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/06/2022

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

marine scotland science



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS
 No
 FB0119

 SITE No
 FS0240

 CASE No
 20220146

DATE OF VISIT11/05/2022SITE NAMELinnheINSPECTORInspector

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 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 found to be inadequately 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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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.

R25

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

• FS numbers must be recorded in the source/destination section of the movement record book, to allow for better traceability of stocks. It was discussed with the site manager that this would be recorded in future. No further action is required.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met.

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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 18/05/2022

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

Signed:

2022-0146

F1 (Pen 5)







F2 (Pen5)







F3 (Pen8)













F5 (Pen 9)





