FHI 059, Version 13	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0445			Date of visit: 18/10/2022
Time spent on site:	45mins	Main Inspecto	ir:
Site No: FS0562 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Geocrab Hatchery The Scottish Salmon Company	y
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	45	6
Water Temp (°C): 7.5	Thermometer No:	T308	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: WI	Water type: F	
Dead/weak/abnormally behavin Clinical signs of disease observ Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? UNI/REG only - if unable to car	ved?	N If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.

#### FHI 059, Version 13

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Last mortality event and report was on the 08/08/2022 where fish were 23.6g (Q1). Mortality reported a 2.03%, 38955, transfer stock to lochs. Elevated water temperatures and issues with the oxygenation system, fish were transferred out to fw sites, fish will be moved back when systems are repaired. Only 2023 Q1 transferred, 2022 Q3 were not affected. Transfer stock to lochs (FS0737 & FS0149) temporarily

The last fish moved off site, Wk37, 17/18 09 2022, Gravir.

Ensiled on site and transporter takes waste tanks away.

Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons.

During the site inspection, hatching eggs were observed and minimal amount of unviable/failed eggs were seen.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ied by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2022-0445	]	Site No:	FS0562				
Date of Visit:		18/10/2022	]		Inspector(s):			I
Registration/Autho								_
1. Business/site deta		/ checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	o details?						Y	J
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	sh for all sect	ions)					
		1 hatchery						1 hatchery
Total No facilities		and 8 tanks	Facilities sto	ocked	1 hatchery	No facilitie	s inspected	and 8 tanks
Species	OVA							
Age group	Q3 2023							
No Fish	1 million							
Mean Fish Wt	Ova							
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	never fallow		Next Input Da	_ ` '	Ova: week		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease prob	olems?		N	Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Record	_							
1. Movement record		or inspection?						
2. Date of last inspe		of inspection?					03/12/2019	·
3. Are records comp		rectly entered?	,				03/12/2019	I Y
4. Are movement re		•		>				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific				able?				Y
o. / tro fricatar octano								· · ·
Transport Records	5							
1. Are any movement	nts carried ou	ut by (or on bel	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place	for maintenan	ce of transpo	rtation records	?			
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Ensiled - on	site		
If other detail:					•			
3. Mortality records	complete and	d correctly ente	ered?					Y
			2022: Wk40	, 1199, 0.12%;	Wk39, 1041,	0.10%; Wk	38, 0,0%; Wk	37, 189,
4. Recent mortality (	(last 4 wks):		0.07%					
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/	atypical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality pe	r facility/no sto	ck per facility	/reason:				
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality d	uring period ch	ecked?					Y
If yes, detail:	2021: Wk29	9, 14307, 2.2%	o (parr, fungus	s). Wk30, 3.74	%, 24,930 (pa	rr, fungus)		
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents' been re	eported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events sl	neet.		Y

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, recordin	ng and safe disposal been considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scott	ish 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	ce or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified	ed to Scottish Ministers? Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked of	on the farm site been covered (equal or higher Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visite	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place aquaculture animals held on site?	to maintain the physical containment of Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	ted on site?
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or or	h behalf of, the business?
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: 03	3/12/2019-18/10/2022

FHI 059, Version 13

					Date		. 12/03/2020
Case Number:	2022-0445		Site No:	FS0562		Insp:	
Date of Visit	18/10/2022		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out		novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or neuronal neuron neuronal neuron	0	9	18	26	g
	Number of sup		0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	3
movements on	Number of des		0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		·
Water contacts with other		ted (secure water supply through					
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or	borehole) or in a coastal zone with category I	0				0
diseases)	farms upstrear	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstrear	or in a coastal zone with category III n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V nor within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent stat	n from zone or compartment of	4				
		n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	[			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0				0
···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Feeding unpas	•	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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator	1		-	r			
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		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2022-0445	Site No:	FS0562
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
<ol> <li>Has the site experienced sea lice problems</li> <li>Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e</li> </ol>	s in the previous 4 years? quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single :	year class basis?
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (ir well as access to suitable biological and/or me d of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manag Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (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 ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. sali</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	<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
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)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> elongatus is considered to have welfare implica	
<ul><li>11. Has any other action been taken (where a</li><li>12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action</li></ul>	applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le	evels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating farms	\$?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, sea lice?	where fewer populations or part populations ar	e held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice it	ement procedure with waypoints describing set nfestation?	actions to deal with recognised
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	ge due to predators in the current or previous p	vroduction cycles? N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against t	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	w) Y
predator net		
If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	ne last FHI inspection? N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	-	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis		
-	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	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)	greed with local wild fish interests and was perr	nission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measured		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re-	egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s) Y

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2022-0445			Date of visit:	18/10/2022	]		
Site No:	FS0562	]		Inspector:		I		
Results Summary	Freq.		Date of Notification					
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
Case Type ECI, CNI	27/10/2022							
,								

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI, CNI	27/10/2022		





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

# SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0169 SITE NO FS0562 CASE NO 20220445 **DATE OF VISIT** 18/10/2022 SITE NAME INSPECTOR

Geocrab Hatchery

# 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 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.

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.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

## 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.



Fish Health Inspector

Signed:

Date: 27/10/2022

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>