

Case No:	<input type="text" value="2023-0529"/>	Date of visit:	<input type="text" value="29/11/2023"/>			
Time spent on site:	<input type="text" value="3.5hrs"/>	Main Inspector:	<input type="text" value=""/>			
Site No:	<input type="text" value="FS0839"/>	Site Name:	<input type="text" value="Geasgill"/>			
Business No:	<input type="text" value="FB0169"/>	Business Name:	<input type="text" value="Bakkafrøst Scotland"/>			
Case Types:	1 <input type="text" value="ECI"/>	2 <input type="text" value="CNI"/>	3 <input type="text" value="SLI"/>	4 <input type="text" value=""/>	5 <input type="text" value=""/>	6 <input type="text" value=""/>
Water Temp (°C):	<input type="text" value="10.4"/>	Thermometer No:	<input type="text" value="T309"/>	FHI 045 completed	<input type="text" value=""/>	
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	M-37
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="text" value="N"/>					

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

**Additional Case Information:**

Salmon came on from the Ormsary Smolt Unit (FS0575) and Applecross (1 cage of this stock remains on site) and were performing well until a period of elevated mortality during June and July. The elevated mortalities were attributed to PD, combined with FW treatments. Mortality has since reduced and has been below the reporting threshold since wk41.

Slice treatments were completed early on in the cycle (in Dec, Feb and Mar) and only FW treatments have been conducted since.

Site normally grows to harvest, however fish were split down and 2 cages were sent to Lamlash for ongrowing. Lamlash lies in a different CoGP area (M-48) and a different disease management area (20) to Geasgill (M-37 and 16a). Lamlash is the only site in its DMA and both sites hold the same yearclass of fish. Lamlash was also fallow prior to receiving fish from Geasgill. Wrasse that were on site at the time of transfer, were moved across to Lamlash with the salmon. A risk assessment was completed and was available for inspection.

Site conducts live haul harvests to Carindow.

Mortality above reporting threshold:

Wk37-50, 52 2021.

Wk1, 5, 18, 21-22 2022.

Wk28 2023: 20,535 (2.97%), wk29: 53,901 (8.02%), wk30: 85,914 (14.93%), wk31: 49,593 (11.01%), wk32: 35,268 (8.8%), wk33: 27,165 (7.43%), wk34: 12,633 (3.73%), wk35: 15,741 (4.83%), wk 36: 3,981 (1.28%), wk37: 5,478 (1.79%), wk38:6,485 (2.16%), wk39: 3,493 (1.19%), wk40: 3,773 (1.3%).

Mortalities above reporting threshold this cycle were attributed to PD, combined with poor gill health and treatment losses. All were reported with the exception of the event that occurred in wk44 2021. Information was collected during the inspection and a notification was submitted retrospectively. NFA.

Fish were vaccinated against furunculosis, IPN and 22Q3 stock were also vaccinated against PD. Fish displaying clinical signs of PD were observed during the inspection, but were unable to be caught using a handnet. Fish in the next cycle will be vaccinated with the Claynav PD injection following positive results during trials.

Wk36 2021: 1.03 average adult female leps. Reduced week after. Wk38: 2.5 (physical treatment), wk41: 1.89, wk42: 1.51, wk43: 4.38, wk44: 3.78 (physical), then dropped to 0.48.. Wk21 2023: 0.98 then 1.14, then 0.6, 1.58, 0.65.

Wildcaught wrasse sourced from the local area were input to site in June and have been performing well since input. Appeared in good health during inspection. Site has lost 12,101 wrasse since input.

The general population of salmon across the site appeared in good condition and were actively shoaling in the cages. Lethargic fish exhibiting physical damage were also observed in most of the cages. Physical damage had been attributed to previous SRS infection followed by secondary bacterial infection. The extent of the damage ranged from minor to moderate. Where these fish could be caught with a handnet, they were removed at the time and humanely dispatched.

Inspection and paperwork completed by ■■■■, observed by ■■■■.

Case No:  Site No:

Date of Visit:  Inspector(s):

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

**Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)**

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="14"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="10"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="14"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="SAL"/> <input type="text" value="WRA"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="22Q3"/> <input type="text" value="Wildcaught"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="274,852"/> <input type="text" value="19,354"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="3.7kg"/> <input type="text" value="100g"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="May 24"/>	Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="August 24"/>		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		<input type="text" value="Y"/>	Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
If yes, detail:	<input type="text" value="PD and poor gill health"/>				

**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?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail: <input type="text" value="Optomease"/>		
If other, detail: <input type="text"/>		
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"/>	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	<input type="text"/>	
If other, detail: <input type="text"/>		
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: <input type="text"/>		

**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"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). <input type="text" value="PD, AGD"/>		

Records checked between:	<input type="text" value="16/06/21 - 23/11/23"/>
--------------------------	--

Case Number:	2023-0529	Site No:	FS0839	Insp:		
Date of Visit	29/11/2023	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		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	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	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		
<b>Management practices</b>		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				3
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>18</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No:

### 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) followed 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, azamethipos and emamec) 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?
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 10/6/19) 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?
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 production cycle?
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?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

Sealpro nets, double sashed top nets, stitched.

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?
 

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)

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)

2023-0529

Site No: FS0839

	N
	Y
ectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can	Y
valent)?	Y
	Y
	Y
d? (CoGP Annex 6)	N
w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?	Y
	Y
	N
treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Y
	Y
	Y
	Y
the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	Y
	Y
	Y
	Y
	N
iP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	
	Y

Case No: 2023-0529

Site No: FS0839

Date of Visit: 29/11/2023

Inspector: [REDACTED]

**Point of Compliance**

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

If N, no further questions require completion.

**Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements**

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

**Arrangements for Fish Health Management**

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

**Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice**

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

**Live Fish Movements**

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?



**Harvesting**

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

**Fallowing**

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest 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 agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or 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, parties to the agreement?

**Management and operation**

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?



Case No: **2023-0529** Site No: **FS0839** Date of visit: **29/11/2023**

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected population:	Species:	Yearclass (SW SAL only):	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
01/11/21	07/11/2021	≥750g	2.6kg	SAL	S0	Weekly	3.26	Explained	Gill health related

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):	Yearclass Year
	20,969		Information collected during routine inspection. Mortality event is historic. NFA.	2020



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0169	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	29/11/2023
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0839	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Geasgill
<b>CASE No</b>	20230529	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	██████████

### 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.

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 not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Directorate 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, 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:



Date: 07/12/2023

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at [Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)