FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020		
Case No: 2024-0032			Date of visit: 19/02/2024		
Time spent on site:	hr	Main Insp	pector:		
Site No: FS1324 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incub Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	pation 4		
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6		
Water Temp (°C): 7.88	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	information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:					

Additional Case Information:

Stock origin: all comp hatches 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	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0032]	Site No:	FS1324				
Date of Visit:		19/02/2024]		Inspector(s):			ı
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta			ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to		•	·				N	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities			Facilities sto	cked	1 hatchery	No facilitie	s inspected	1 hatchery
Species	SAL	,			,			
Age group	2023							
No Fish	1,347,329							
Mean Fish Wt	<1g/alevins							
Next Fallow Date (S		w/b 25/03/20)24	Next Input Da	te (Site)	w/b 29/04/	2024	
Recent (last 4 wks)	•				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:						`	,	
Movement Records								
1. Movement record		r inspection?					00/00/0000	Y
2. Date of last inspe							06/02/2023	
3. Are records comp		-						Y
4. Are movement re								Y
5. Are records comp		-		0				Y
6. Are health certific	ates for introd	luctions (outw	ith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records	;							
1. Are any movemer	nts carried ou	t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not usi	ng a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys	tem in place f	or maintenan	ce of transpo	rtation records?	?			Y
Martality Doords								
Mortality Records	ovojloblo for j	oonootion?						
Mortality records a					Enailed on	oito		
How are mortalitiesother detail:	es disposed o	1 ?			Ensiled - on	site		
Mortality records (complete and	correctly ent	arad?					
3. Mortality records (complete and	correctly ente		0.000/_0740.1/	MI-7 0 000/ 0	705. \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	0.440/ 4540	\\\\\\
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		2024: VVK8, 0.21%, 2854	0.28%, 3740; V I	VK7, U.2U%, 2	2725, VVKO, (J.11%, 154Z;	VVKO,
5. Evidence of recer		tvpical mortal						l N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	3 13 37 1	.,	.					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					Y
	2023, wk48,	5.85%, 1184	4 (unviable ov	/a); Wk47, 1.31	1%, 2690 (un\	viable ova); \	Nk34, 1.13%	, 4130(sac
	fry); Wk33, 2	2.36%, 8840(sac fry); Wk32	2, 2.95%, 1140	0(sac fry); Wł	k31, 2.84%,	11306(sac fr	y)); Wk30,
	4.25%, 1764	9(sac fry)); W	/k29, 4.72%,	20608(sac fry);	; Wk28, 4.48%	%, 20899(sa	c fry); Wk27,	
16 1.6.2	1.56%,13762	2 (hatch fail);	Wk26, 3.68%	5, 33612(hatch	fail); Wk25, 1	.67%, 15513	3(hatch fail)	
If yes, detail:		(11/1 .		. =				N1/*
7. Have increased (unexplained) i	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:			0.16	1.7.9	- 126			NI/A
Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sl	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records						
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N				
If yes, detail:						
If other, detail:						
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						
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y				
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	•	Y				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scot	ttish 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 presen						
is detected been included and how and when 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)?						
		V				
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.)?						
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of						
aquaculture animals held on site?		V				
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	ited on site?	Y				
If no, detail:						
Decition (Or maillemen						
Results of Surveillance	to be belief the husiness?	NI NI				
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or o	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).						
December the cloud heature are	20/20/2020 42/20/2024					
Records checked between: 0	06/02/2023-19/02/2024					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0032		Site No:	FS1324		Insp:	
Date of Visit	19/02/2024	supp./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		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	10	26	
оросно	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
					ļ		10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6 6	10	10
Exposure via water	Indiliber of des	Site contacts			6-10	10	J
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	<u> </u>				
farms (holding species	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstream	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		0]			0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of	4				
		r from Category III farm	8	-			
		from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	i			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	1			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		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				•			
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		27 HIGH
					Naiik		поп

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2024-0032	Site No:	FS1324
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only	Λ	
Has the site experienced sea lice probler		
	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	vear 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,
	agement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for in	ocnoction? (Logal SSL CoGP Annoy 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 be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L . sa 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
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	ch is considered to cause significant welfare prob	olems? (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	re 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	production cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate agains	t the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	w) Y
indoors, rentokill		
If other, detail below:		
Have escape incidents or events been e	xperienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	he last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No sl		·
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mir	nisters?	
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 a	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover es	scapees? If yes give detail	
If gill nets were deployed was this action	agreed with local wild fish interests and was perr	mission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
	nimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory meas 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	ures of the Act) regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	son(s)
		•

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2024-0032			Date of visit:	19/02/2024				
Site No:	FS1324	1		Inspector:					
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary				1					
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI	27/02/2024								

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

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

SITE NO FS1324 SITE NAME Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation 4

CASE No 20240032 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 inadequately 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.

R04

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.



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)