FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2023-0047			Date of visit: 01/03/2023
Time spent on site:	.5hrs	Main Ir	nspector:
Site No: FS0065 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Laxford Loch Duart Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.7	Thermometer No:	T152	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-3
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	fish present?	Y If yes, see addition	al information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed	d?		al information/clinical score sheet.
Gross pathology observed?			al information/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?		N	
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

#### Additional Case Information:

Salmon came on from Duartmore and have generally performed well throughout most of the cycle. Mortalities increased during the autum of 22 and was attributed to AGD excerbated by environmental insult.

Only medicinal treatments were a SLICE in Feb 22 and Salmosan in April 22. All other treatments have been FW (July, October and November 22). Site reported good clearance of lice following each treatment.

Site received 5,832 farmed wrassed in July 21 (58% mortality since input) and 8,676 wildcaught wrasse in August/September 21 (50% mortality since input).

Mortalities above the reporting threshold:

Wk38 2022: 2,520 (1.1%) WK37: 3,421 (1.47%) Wk36:5,868 (2.46%) Wk35: 12,684 (5.05%) Wk34: 26,062 (9.4%) Wk33: 13,108 (4.51%) Wk32: 32,474 (10.05%)

Wk31: 13,574 (4.03%) Wk30: 17,473 (4.94%)

Attributed to poor gill heath on site and positive AGD diagnosis exacerbated by lice treatments.

General population of fish on site appeared in good physical health on inspection. Some runts were observed across the site, but were not moribund. One wrasse mortality was observed during the inspection.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared in good health externally and internally. Fish are due to begin being harvested in the coming weeks.

No movements on or off site have occurred since the last inspection.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2023-0047	]	Site No:	FS0065	]			
Date of Visit:		01/03/2023	]		Inspector(s):			i
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	ails summary	checked by s	ite representa	itive?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•	·	·				Υ	]
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	sh for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		24	Facilities sto	cked	20	No facilitie	s inspected	24
Species	SAL	WRA	WRA					
Age group	S0 21	Wildcaught	Farmed					
No Fish	209,493	4,320	2,438					
Mean Fish Wt	4.5kg	Mixed	50-60g					
Next Fallow Date (Si		June 23	50 00g	Next Input Da	ite (Site)	Nov 23		
Recent (last 4 wks)	•				Any escapes		visit\?	N
If yes, detail:	alocase prob				7 trly Cocapes	(Sirioc last	viole):	14
ii yes, detaii.								
Movement Records	2							
1. Movement records		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspec		i ilispection:					28/10/2022	
3. Are records comp		actly antarad?	•				20/10/2022	V
4. Are movement red		•						V
								1
5. Are records comp		•		1.1.0				NI/A
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	ductions (outw	ith GB) availa	ible?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemer	nts carried ou	it by (or on bel	half) of the bu	siness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst					-			Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a		•			-			Y
2. How are mortalitie					Other (detail)			
If athen alata!!.	•		s to Badcall sl	norebase, skip	ped and uplift	ed by DK W	aste Services	s. Taken to
If other detail:		oosting, Banff.						
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente						Y
			Wk6: 591 (0.	.28%), WK5: 5	97 (0.28%), V	VK4: 1,004	(0.47%), WK3	3: 645 (0.3%)
4. Recent mortality (								
5. Evidence of recen	nt increased/a	atypical mortal	ities?					N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	facility/no sto	ck per facility/	reason:				
6. Any other peaks in		<u> </u>						Y
If yes, detail:		nal information						
7. Have increased (u	inexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter of	details on mort	ality events sl	neet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: T.M.S.	
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?	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? T.M.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 dise	ease
is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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	r
health status, certification if required)?	·
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimis	Y 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	V
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?  If no, detail:	ı
ii iio, detaii.	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	T
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	T
3. Any significant results?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).  AGD, August 22	
D   .	
Records checked between: 28/10/2020 - 15/02/23	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2023-0047		Site No:	FS0065		Insp:	
Date of Visit	01/03/2023		No of m	ovements/s	upp./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	20	0
Species	compartment in Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	0
							0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6 6	10	0
Exposure via water	Number of desi	Site contacts		_	<u>ီ</u> 6-10	10	U
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	, <u> </u>	1-5	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I	4	0	4		4
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	1	2	4		1
		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				
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				•
		from zone or compartment of	_				
	equivalent statu	us .	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				
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	inpasteurised feed	0	i I			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		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of	No		1				0
footbaths etc			<u>'</u>				
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry			0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		<u> </u>				0
	No		2				
					Total		9
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued b	y: FHI	Date of iss	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2023-00	147	Site No:	FS0065	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Managements. 3. Does the site have access to a	ice problems in the previous 4 years? Int Area (or equivalent) fallowed synch It range of licenced in-feed and bath se enzoate) as well as access to suitable	ea lice medications (inc	cluding deltamethrin,	N Y Y
4. Is there a signed documented Management Area (or equivalent	farm management agreement or state	ement relevant to the si	te and CoGP Farm	Υ
5. Are sea lice count records ava	ilable for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoG the required standard specified in the	·	egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y Y
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) records are inspected? (CoGP A	ord levels below the suggested criteria	for treatment in the Co	oGP during the period that	N
	a lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish bring the period that records are inspec		above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	Y
	to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, a level which is considered to cause sign		ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	Y N
suggested criteria for treatment of 11. Has any other action been ta	been administered or other actions taker where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to ken (where applicable)? or the actions taken had a significant i	have welfare implicati	ons? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Y Y Y
	cted, carried out in cooperation between for the site, where fewer populations of the site, where fewer populations of the site.	• • •		Y Y
<ol><li>15. Is there a site specific written scenarios during the escalation of</li></ol>	lice management procedure with way f a sea lice infestation?	points describing set a	ctions to deal with recognised	Υ
16. Do the sea lice levels observe	ed on stocks reflect sea lice count data	a? If no please detail re	easons.	Υ
	oment damage due to predators in the ate against the predation experienced	·	•	N Y
O. Hava assama insidenta an ava		nite of the nite nines the	a last El II inancation?	INI
If Yes proceed with questions 4 - 4. Have these been reported to S 5. Have these been reported to lo		? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	.17)	N
7. Were methods (if any) used to	recover escapees? If yes give detail			
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38 9. What action was taken to prev	ent and minimise the risk of further es	·		
be considered under satisfact 10. Is the site inspected as satisf	actory with regards to containment? If	no, please detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2023-0047	Site No: FS0065	
Date of Visit: 01/03/2023	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located w	rithin a farm management area?	Υ
If N, no further questions require comple	tion.	
2. Has a current farm management agre 3. Is the current FMAg/S available for ins 4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant 5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 6. To Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of 6. Arrangements for Fish Health Manage 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum farm?  9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccinate 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species 11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maxim individual farm?	farm management area? In site(s) to which it applies? Commencement of the agreement or state review?  Ement In health standards for the stocks to be intition requirements for stocks held in the are so of fish which may be stocked into the are um stocking density of any pen on any far ements for the storage and disposal of any	roduced to the area or  ea or farm? ea or farm? m in the area or the
Arrangements for The Management o		nbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availab of statement? 15. Does the FMAg/S identify any require lice on farms in the area or individual fare	oility and the use of medicines on farms co ements for the sensitivity testing of availab ms?	overed by the agreement  Y  sle treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	stances under which biological controls ar	nd cleaner fish are to be
	ements for synchronous treatments on far	rms within the area?
area or farm?	stances when live fish may be introduced ements for the movement of live fish on ar	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable h	narvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restocke		
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	e or more year classes may be stocked onto s	sites covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether brocovered by the agreement or statement?	odstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	t on any site
Point of Compliance for Farm Managen 24. Does the farm management agreemen parties to the agreement?	nent Agreements Only nt include arrangements for persons to becon	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and op 26. What is the version no/date of issue of	perated in accordance with the agreement or some state of the FMAg/S?  Mar-22	statement?

•	mi 059, version 15							133	ueu by. i	111			
	Case no:	2023-00	)47	Site No:		FS0065			Date of Samplin		01/	03/2023	01/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Jampiin	g. HI		1	
	Time sampling starts/ends:		00:00		0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. <b> </b>	17
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
Н	Fish nos	F1	F2	F3									
		ГІ	Г	го									
H	Pool Group Species	SAL	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	4.5kg		4.5kg									
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW									
Stock Details		Duartmore (FS0770)	Duartmore (FS0770)	ω Duartmore (FS0770)									
U.	, asimy 140	U	1	U									

03/2023	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
	Fish dis	spatched	d by perd	cussive	blow.						
0	1	Total To	ests ass	signed	0	1					

Site No: FS0065

Case No: 2023-0047

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

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

Casa Na	2022 0047			Data d	04/02/2	202			
Case No:	2023-0047	J		Date of Vi	sit: 01/03/20	023			
Site No:	FS0065	]		tor:					
Results Summary	Freq.	Freq. Date of Notification							
·		Database	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> In	
	1								
	1								
	1								
	-								
Report Summary				1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	06/03/2023								
	-								
	1								





# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0398
 Date of Visit
 01/03/2023

 Site No
 FS0065
 Site Name
 Loch Laxford

 Case No
 20230047
 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.

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.

# 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 further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: 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>

Date: 06/03/2023