

Case No:	2022-0169	Date of visit:	25/05/2022			
Time spent on site:	1 hour	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0146	Site Name:	Kinlochmoidart Hatchery			
Business No:	FB0169	Business Name:	The Scottish Salmon Company			
Case Types:	1 <input type="checkbox"/> ECI	2 <input type="checkbox"/> CNI	3 <input type="checkbox"/> MIX	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	Thermometer No:	<input type="checkbox"/> Site	FHI 045 completed	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Observations:	Region:	HI	Water type:	F	CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/> N					

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

Additional Case Information:

Site only received fish last week so no mortality has been recorded

Site uses a flow through system for parr and two recirculation systems for the smolts.

Last import of ova came onto site in January 2020. Site has retained the health certificate as required, but no longer intend to receive ova from outwith the UK.

Fungus, mainly saprolegnia has been observed on site, but is only present in low numbers and is being managed successfully with no significant mortalities.

Water was very dark during the inspection so was difficult to observe the fish. Those that could be observed, appeared in good condition with only a few individuals displaying signs of fungal infection. Some fin damage was noted in most of the tanks, but manager advised that this damage had come in on the fish but was being mitigated through the use of four feeders in each tank to reduce aggression/fin nipping. He reported that this had worked well and the damage to fins as a result of nipping had reduced since the fish arrived on site.

Site thermometer used for temperature due to biosecurity risk.

Paperwork completed by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (MIX). Site inspection carried out by [REDACTED], supervised by [REDACTED].

Case No: 2022-0169

Site No: FS0146

Date of Visit: 25/05/2022

Inspector(s):

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	1 hatchery and 31 tanks	Facilities stocked	6 tanks	No facilities inspected	1 hatchery and 31 tanks
Species	SAL				
Age group	22 Q3	22 Q4			
No Fish	131,000	96,000			
Mean Fish Wt	9	5.9			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	continuous cycle		Next Input Date (Site)	20/05/2022	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: 17/11/2020
- 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? Y

Transport Records

- 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? N
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? Y
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? Whole fish - Dundas Chemicals
- If other detail:
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Fish only received last week. Single figure mortalities observed since input.
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? Y
- If yes, detail: Wk 6 2021 9,312 fish (2.52%), Wk 7 2021 6807 fish (1.89%) and Wk 8 2021 6324 fish (1.79%). Wk 23 14,677 fish (1.87%) and wk 24 4,066 fish (1.66%) 2021 - attributed to fungal infection.
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? N/A
- If yes, detail action:
- 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| If yes, detail: | Formalin | |
| If other, detail: | Cress | |
| 2. Medicines records available for inspection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 4. Are fish in a withdrawal period? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 5. If yes, what treatment(s)? | | |
| If other, detail: | Cress | |
| 6. Are medicines stored appropriately? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |

Biosecurity Records

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| If no, detail: | | |

Results of Surveillance

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 2. If yes, are results available for inspection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | Y |
| 3. Any significant results? | <input type="checkbox"/> | N |
| If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). | | |

Records checked between:	17/11/2020 - 20/05/2022
--------------------------	-------------------------

Case Number:	2022-0169	Site No:	FS0146	Insp:		
Date of Visit	25/05/2022	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	3
	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		1
	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		0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		0
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					7	LOW

Case No: **2022-0169**

Site No: **FS0146**

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? N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y

Site indoors Jump nets Rent-o-Kill Filter screens

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? N
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) Y

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	25/05/2022
SITE No	FS0146	SITE NAME	Kinlochmoidart Hatchery
CASE No	20220169	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. 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.

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.

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: 07/06/2022

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/>