FHI 059, Version 13	lse	sued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0009			Date of visit: 07/02/2024
Time spent on site:	2 hrs	Main Inspec	ctor:
Site No: FS0770 Business No: FB0398	Site Name: Business Name:	Duartmore Loch Duart Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 4.4	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additional inf	ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet. ormation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	y out intended visit detail re	eason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Due to the manger being unavailable, paperwork was not observed during the physical inspection and was later inspected via a Teams meeting on 16/02/24. Paperwork inspected by and observed by the second conducted on 07/02/2024 by the second by the second by the second conducted conducted by the second conducted by the second conducted by the second conducted by the second conducted conducted conducted conducted by the second conducted co

Fish observed through a small window in the side each tank as snow settled on top of the bird net and obscured a view of the fish from above. Water visibility was poor.

Loch Duart refer to Duartmore (FS0770) as Duartmore South and Duartmore Hatchery (FS0067) as Duartmore North. Some evidence of dorsal fin erosion (possibly due to fin rot or fin nipping) observed on fish sampled for VMD

Calibrated site thermometer used to take temperature. Due to sub-zero temperature, temperature was not displayed on inspectors field thermometer. FHI 045 Thermometer fail sheet completed.

Currently thinning fish (reducing the stocking density in tanks by transferring fish to empty tanks within the site) on the date of the inspection.

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: F	н	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0009	Site No: F	S0770	
Date of Visit:	07/02/2024	1	Inspector(s):	
Registration/Autho	orisation Details ails summary checked by s	site representative?		V
2. Changes made to				Y
•	le cleaner fish for all sect			
Total No facilities	23	Facilities stocked	23 No fac	cilities inspected 23
Species Age group	SAL S1 2023			
No Fish	385,216			
Mean Fish Wt	90g			
Next Fallow Date (Si		Next In	put Date (Site) Jul 202	25
Recent (last 4 wks)			N Any escapes (since I	
If yes, detail:				
Movement Records	-			
	s available for inspection?			Y
2. Date of last inspec				28/02/2023
-	blete and correctly entered			Y
	cords available for dead fis			
	olete and correctly entered ates for introductions (out			N/A
0. Are nearried				
Transport Records				
•	nts carried out by (or on be	half) of the business (not using a STB)?	N/A
-	tem in place for maintenan			
Mortality Records				
•	available for inspection?			Y
2. How are mortalitie			Other (detail)	
If other detail:	recorded		then taken to mort skip at Ba	adcall shorebase. This is
•	complete and correctly ent			Y
4. Recent mortality (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·), wk 6: 0 fish, wk 5: 0 fish, w	
	nt increased/atypical morta			N
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per facility/no sto	ock per facility/reason:		
6. Any other peaks it	n mortality during period cl	becked?		Y
0. Any other peaks in			due to salt contamination iss	sue with feed supplier
				(0.21%). The company then
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	following month to backgrou	
If yes, detail:				
	unexplained) mortalities be	en reported to vet or I	HI?	N/A
If yes, detail action:				
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been reported to FH	If no, enter details o	n mortality events sheet.	N/A

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?			Ý
Biosecurity Records			
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?			Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, record	ding and safe	disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Sco	-	•	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?			Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the prese		on of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been included and how and when that will be not			Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked			Y
health status, certification if required)?			
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemente transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, vis			Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in plac			Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	e to maintaint	The physical containment of	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately impleme	ented on site?		Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveillance			
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or	on behalf of, t	the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?			Y
3. Any significant results?			Y
		Patogen reported renal pathology asso	ociated with
		salt contamination of feed which result	lted in
		increased mortality in 2023. Report als	
		mortality level had returned to normal	following the
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		change of feed supplier.	
Records checked between:	28/02/2023 - 1	16/02/2023	

FHI 059, Version 13					Issued b	y: FHI		
Case no:	2024-000	9 Site N	lo: F	-S0770			07/02/2024	07/(
Priority samples:	VI	E	BA	PA	Samp MG	bling:		
Time sampling starts/ends:	10:00	:00 10	0:05:00	Insp	pector:	VMI	D No.	1
Environmental conditions:	1	ndoors	2	3	4	5		
Summary samples	HIST	E	BA	MG	VI	PA	Total Sam	ples
Add Fish/Pools - click								
Pool/Fish No								
Fish nos	1-2							
Pool Group								
Species	SAL	_					_	
Average weight	85g	_		_	_	_		
Sex Water Type	FW	_			_		_	
water Type		_		_		_		
Stock Origin Stock Origin Graility No	5 Duartmore Hatchery							

)2/2024	Additio	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:											
		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
0		Total T	ests ass	igned	0										

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

Fri 039, version 13		Issued by. I Hi					. 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0009		Site No:	FS0770		Insp:	
Date of Visit	07/02/2024		No of m	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of n	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	•	0	3	6	10	10
wovements on	Number of des		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or	ted (secure water supply through borehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		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 n or 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 state	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∨ 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 poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised 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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
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 Rank		18 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0009	Site No:	FS0770
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or each sea and s	in the previous 4 years? quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single y	year class basis?
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or med I of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
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? (I	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
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
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
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 probl	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> <i>longatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication	
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le out in cooperation between participating farms where fewer populations or part populations are	?
	ement procedure with waypoints describing set a nfestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail r	reasons.
	ge due to predators in the current or previous p he predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
Bird nets, 3 screens in place at tank and o If other, detail below:	discharge channel, contract held with pest o	control company, site fenced with a
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	sters?	
	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4 d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	
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 pern	nission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini be considered under satisfactory measur	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered i res of the Act)	in code but could
-	egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s)

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2024-0009		Date of visit: 07/02/2024						
Site No:	FS0770	l	Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.			Dat	te of Notificat	tion			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI, CNI, VMD	21/02/2024		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0398

 SITE NO
 FS0770

 CASE NO
 20240009

DATE OF VISIT07/02/2024SITE NAMEDuartmoreINSPECTORImage: Constraint of the second se

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.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

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.

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 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: 21/02/2024

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at <u>Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot</u> (www.gov.scot)