FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0053			Date of visit: 16/04/2024
Time spent on site:	.5 hour	Main Inspecto	pr:
Site No: FS1321 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	n 1
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 2.79	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y
Observations:	Region: ST	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 infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	/ out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

#### FHI 059, Version 13

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Input 1/3/24 from Aquagen Scotland Current fish on site 14/3/24 Fanad Mowi Kindrum Ireland. Input. - cert says incubation 2 but went into incubation 1 Ova tend to be on site for 10 weeks before moving off to first feeding unit. No treatments in incubation units

waste note; last movement 21/12/23 to Barkip

Incubation 1, IPN and PMCV PCR NEGATIVE 4/1/24

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity reasons. Site thermometer is checked between each fish batch against a thermometer which is calibrated annually. Records were not available for inspection.

Paperwork observed by

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: F	FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0053	Site No:	FS1321	]	
Date of Visit: 16/04/2024	4		Inspector(s):	
Registration/Authorisation Details				
<ol> <li>Business/site details summary checked</li> <li>Changes made to details?</li> </ol>	a by site repre	esentative?		Y Y
Site Details (include cleaner fish for a	I sections)			
Total No facilities 1	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilities inspected 1
Species sal				
Age group alvins				
No Fish 1,342,892				
0.1g				
Mean Fish Wt				
Next Fallow Date (Site) 9 weeks tim	ie; June	Next Input I		week 37 - Aquagen
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			Any escapes	s (since last visit)? N
If yes, detail:				
Movement Records				
1. Movement records available for inspec	ction?			Y
2. Date of last inspection:				06/02/2023
3. Are records complete and correctly en	tered?			Y
4. Are movement records available for de		aste?		Y
5. Are records complete and correctly en	tered?			Y
6. Are health certificates for introductions		available?		Y
Transport Records				
1. Are any movements carried out by (or	on behalf) of t	he business	(not using a S	TB)? Y
If yes, is there a system in place for main				Y
Mortality Records				
1. Mortality records available for inspection	on?			Y
2. How are mortalities disposed of?			Other (detail	)
If other detail: ensiled off site at Barcald		siler		
3. Mortality records complete and correc				Ý
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):		6, w <mark>k13 1.2%</mark>	, wk14 0.01%	, wk15 0.06%
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical				IN
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility	no stock per t	acility/reason	:	
6. Any other peaks in mortality during pe	riod checked?			N
If yes, detail: 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalit	ies been repo	rted to vet or	FHI?	N/A
If yes, detail action:				
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported	to FHI? If no, e	enter details (	on mortality ev	vents 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: 6 Feb 2023 - 16 April 2024	

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, VEISION 15		Issued by. FHI			Date t	JI ISSUE	. 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024- <mark>0</mark> 053		Site No:	FS1321		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/04/2024		No of mo	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	10
species		novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup		0	5	10	14	10
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	6
	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				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	e 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	ocessing	0				0
the fules of the directive	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				
	-	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				
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	unpasteurised 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		2
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		2
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		36 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0053	Site No:	FS1321
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 ed	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single yea	ar class basis?
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (inclu well as access to suitable biological and/or mecha l of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site	and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Le	gal 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 CoC	GP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salr</i> , or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	nonis ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or ab that records are inspected?	pove (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problem	ns? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis le</i> <i>longatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication	
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice leve	els recorded?
	out in cooperation between participating farms?	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, v lice?	where fewer populations or part populations are h	eld without treatment for sea
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice in	ment procedure with waypoints describing set act nfestation?	tions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail rea	asons.
Containment Increation		
Containment Inspection	ge due to predators in the current or previous proc	duction cycles?
	he predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
indoors secure, Pests Solutions traps		
If other, detail below:		
<ol> <li>Have escape incidents or events been exp</li> </ol>	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	-	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	ters?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB fo	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.1	7)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ac	preed with local wild fish interests and was permis	sion given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in	code but could
be considered under satisfactory measur		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reasor	Y Y

FHI 059, Version 13

2024-0053	]		Date of visit:	16/04/2024	9		
FS1321	]		Inspector		I		
Freq.				te of Notifica			
	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
<b></b>						_	
						-	
1							
1							
	FS1321	FS1321 Freq.	FS1321 Freq.	FS1321 Inspector: Freq. Da	FS1321 Inspector: Date of Notification	FS1321 Inspector: Date of Notification	FS1321 Inspector: Date of Notification

Report Summary			1
Case Type		Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI, CNI	01/05/2024		

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

# SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0125

 SITE NO
 FS1321

 CASE NO
 20240053

DATE OF VISIT16/04/2024SITE NAMEBarcaldine Hatchery Incubation 1INSPECTORInspector

## 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.

During the inspect of the ova import certificates it was noted that the destination incubation unit number for two imports was different from the destinations detailed in the movement records. It was established that the destinations in the movement records were correct. For all future imports please ensure that the destination incubation unit number detailed on the certificate is where the ova are placed. If for any reason this should change and the destination detailed on the certificate is not where the import is being placed please inform the Marine Directorate Fish Health Inspectorate.

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.

R04

# 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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report

Signed:



Date: 01/05/2024

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)