FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2024-0031			Date of visit: 19/02/2024				
Time spent on site:	nr	Main Inspe	ctor:				
Site No: FS1323 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	tion 3				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 7.99	Thermometer No:	T308	FHI 045 completed				
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional inf					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

## **Additional Case Information:**

Stock origin: Comp hatch 1, elite Aquagen; Comp hatch 2,3,4,5, fanad

When ova are received at the hatchery, eggs are disinfected with buffodine before input into the comphatches.

General health check is conducted, with ~200 ova inspected. Prior to moving to first feeding unit, fish are also tested (pre transfer checks that include, IPN, PMCV and histology).

No treatments have been conducted on site.

Alevins observed with majority in healthy condition but a few mortalities observed.

FHI 059, Version 13		Issu	Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2	024-0031	Site No:	FS1323				
Date of Visit:	19/02/20	)24		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Authoris 1. Business/site details 2. Changes made to d	s summary checked b	y site representa	ative?			Y N	
Age group 2 No Fish 1	1 hatcher 6AL 023 ,338,800 1g/alevins 9) w/b 25/03	Facilities sto	Next Input Da	1 hatchery te (Site) Any escapes	No facilities w/b 29/04/2	2024	1 hatchery
If yes, detail:	ocaco probleme:		_	, my cocapec	(0.1.00)		
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?							Y Y Y Y
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?							Y
Mortality Records  1. Mortality records ava  2. How are mortalities	•			Ensiled - on :	site		Y
If other detail:							V
<ul><li>3. Mortality records col</li><li>4. Recent mortality (last</li><li>5. Evidence of recent in the second of the second of</li></ul>	st 4 wks): increased/atypical mo	2024: Wk8, 0.44%,6013 rtalities?		Vk7, 0.25%,3	433; Wk6,0.	14%, 1960; V	Vk5,
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?  2024, wk4, 3.66%, 57198 (Aquagen stock, sac fry,); 2023, wk33, 2.70%, 18748 (sac fry); wk29, 3.06%, 22444 (sac fry); Wk28, 3.71%, 28351 (sac fry); Wk27,4.03%, 32040 (sac fry); Wk26, 2.65%, 27716(Ova and hatch fail); Wk25,3.19%, 34549 (Ova); wk24, 2.32%, 25670 (Ova and hatch fail)						27716(Ova	
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.							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?	Y				
Biosecurity Records	V				
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y				
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?					
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?					
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?					
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?					
nealth status, certification in required:					
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	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	Y				
aquaculture animals held on site?					
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y				
If no, detail:					
Results of Surveillance					
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N				
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?					
3. Any significant results?					
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).					
Records checked between: 31/07/2023-19/02/2024					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0031 Site No: FS1323					Insp:	
Date of Visit	19/02/2024		No of m	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	5
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or			0	4.0	26	
Species	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
							- 40
Movements off	Frequency of m		0	_	6	10	10
Exposure via water	Number of desi	Site contacts			6-10	10	3
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	,		0.10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III 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	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
		from zone or compartment of	1				
	equivalent statu	from Category III farm	8				
		from Category V farm	10				
Diamagal of fight and fight had			1	] 1			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products			0				0
		esses with other farms	3				0
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5	J			0
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites		from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator	•		<u> </u>	ı			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0	]			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
and the second to day of	No		2				0
				J			
					<b>Total</b> Rank		27 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2024-0031	Site No:	FS1323
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only	Λ	
Has the site experienced sea lice problem		
	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of I	icenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in s well as access to suitable biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm mana Management Area (or equivalent)?	agement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
<ul><li>5. Are sea lice count records available for in</li><li>6. Do records adequately reflect the require</li></ul>	nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) d standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels b records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	pelow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. sa</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the pe	almonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or riod that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
•	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. this considered to cause significant welfare probabilities.	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	nistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> . <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implica	
11. Has any other action been taken (where	e applicable)?	
	ons taken had a significant impact upon the lice l	
	ed out in cooperation between participating farms	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site sea lice?	e, where fewer populations or part populations ar	e held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice managed scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	gement procedure with waypoints describing set e infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stock	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
	age due to predators in the current or previous p	
	t the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	W) Y
indoors, rentokill If other, detail below:		
•	xperienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	ne last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No st		
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mir	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)
·	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	•
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover es	scapees? If yes give detail	
	agreed with local wild fish interests and was perr	mission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)  9. What action was taken to prevent and mi	nimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory meas		iii oode but could
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	son(s) Y

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2024-0031			Date of visit:	19/02/2024				
Site No:	FS1323	Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
resource Summary		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
							-		
							_		
							_		
D 10									
Report Summary	Dete	Lean	and .						
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
ECI, CNI	29/02/2024								

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

**BUSINESS No** FB0125 **DATE OF VISIT** 19/02/2024

SITE No FS1323 SITE NAME Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation 3

CASE No 20240031 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 high. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted annually. 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.

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

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

R04



Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 29/02/2024

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)