FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0042		Date of visit: 21/02/2024
Time spent on site: 2.5 h	lours	Main Inspector:
	ite Name: Mill Burn (Old Mil Jusiness Name: Kintail Hatchery	1)
Case Types: 1 ECI 2 C	NI 3 4	56
Water Temp (°C): 9.9 Ti	hermometer No: Site	FHI 045 completed Y
Observations: R	Region: HI Water type:	F CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	Y If yes, see a	dditional information/clinical score sheet. dditional information/clinical score sheet. dditional information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out	t intended visit detail reason below:	

FHI 059, Version 13

Additional Case Information:

2022 stock - 4.99% total loss from hatch to leaving site. No particular mortality peaks. 2023 stock - 3.55% total loss from hatch to leaving site. No particular mortality peaks. 2024 stock - 4.31% so far from hatch. Hatch losses approximately 200-1000/tank.

Only alevins on site at present. Low numbers of dead fish seen in the tanks. A few weaker fish, but most appeared in good condition and showed normal behaviour.

Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons. Site thermometers calibrated annually to ice point. Calibration records checked.

Paperwork and inspection carried out by shadowed by

FHI 059, Versie	on 13			Issued by: F	HI		Date of	f issue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0042]	Site No:	FS0831]			
Date of Visit:		21/02/2024]		Inspector(s):			
Registration//			d by oite repre	a antativa?			V	
 Business/sit Changes ma 		-	a by site repre	sentative?			Y Y	-
Site Details (i	nclude clean	er fish for all	sections)					
Total No facilit		26	Facilities sto	cked	22	No facilities	inspected	26
Species	SAL						1	
Age group	Alevins							
No Fish	2,000,000							
	0.2g							
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Da	· · ·	June 2024		Next Input D		Jan 2025		
Recent (last 4	wks) disease	problems?		IN	Any escapes	(since last vi	sit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Re	cords							
1. Movement r		ble for inspec	tion?					Y
2. Date of last							20/02/2022	
3. Are records	complete and	d correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Are moveme	ent records a	vailable for de	ad fish and w	aste?				N/A
5. Are records	•	•						N/A
6. Are health c	ertificates for	introductions	(outwith GB)	available?				Y
Transport Do	oordo							
Transport Re 1. Are any mov		ed out by (or (on behalf) of t	ha husinass	(not using a S			Y
If yes, is there		• •			• •	10):		Y
				noponation				
Mortality Rec	ords							
1. Mortality rec	ords available	e for inspectio	n?					Y
2. How are mo	rtalities dispo	sed of?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality red	•							Y
4. Recent mor	• •		Most tanks 1	50-300 ever	/ two days.			N
5. Evidence of If yes, facility n		••		acility/reason				
in yes, racinty in	IOS/HO HIOITAI	ty per lacinty/l		aciiity/reason				
6. Any other pe	eaks in morta	lity during per	iod checked?					N
If yes, detail:		,						
7. Have increa	sed (unexpla	ined) mortaliti	es been repor	ted to vet or	FHI?			N/A
If yes, detail ad								
8. Have 'morta	llity events' be	en reported to	o FHI? If no, e	enter details o	on mortality ev	ents 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	
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	
disease is detected been included and how and when 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	Y
higher health status, certification if required)?	
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	Y
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?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	
Records checked between: 20/02/2022-21/02/2024	

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

FRI 059, Version 15		Issued by. FHI			Date of Issue.		. 12/03/2020
Case Number:	2024-0042		Site No:	FS0831		Insp:	
Date of Visit	21/02/2024		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible		novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
species		novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country	0	9	18	26	9
	Number of sup		0		10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of des		0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water	-	Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or		0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	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	cessing	0]			0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent stat	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0]			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		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			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		28 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0042	Site No:	FS0831
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problem	s in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single ye	ar class basis?
-	cenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (incl well as access to suitable biological and/or mech d of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	gement agreement or statement relevant to the sit	e and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	I standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Le	gal 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 Co	GP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. sal</i> or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	<i>Imonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or al d that records are inspected?	bove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which	n is considered to cause significant welfare problem	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	istered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis le elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication	
11. Has any other action been taken (where	applicable)?	
	ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice leve	els recorded?
	d out in cooperation between participating farms?	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, lice?	, where fewer populations or part populations are I	heid without treatment for sea
15. Is there a site specific written lice manages scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	ement procedure with waypoints describing set ac infestation?	tions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail re	asons.
Containment Inspection	age due to predators in the current or previous pro	duction cyclos?
	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	-
Site inside		P
If other, detail below:		
3 Have escape incidents or events been ex	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	last FHI inspection? N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No ski	· ·	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mini		
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB f	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.	17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO an	nd local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover eso	capees? If yes give detail	
8. If all nots were deployed was this action of	greed with local wild fish interests and was permis	ssion given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild han interests and was permit	
	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in	code but could
be considered under satisfactory measured to actinfactory measured and actinfactory with a		p(p)
To. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with I	regards to containment? If no, please detail reaso	Υ Υ

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2024-0042]		Date of visit:	21/02/2024			
Site No:	FS0831]		Inspector:		l		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notificat	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI/CNI	22/02/2024		
	_		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0108

 SITE NO
 FS0831

 CASE NO
 20240042

DATE OF VISIT21/02/2024SITE NAMEMill Burn (Old Mill)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.

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 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: 22/02/2024

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)