FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0056			Date of visit: 04/03/2024
Time spent on site:	1	Main II	nspector:
Site No: FS1336 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross Hatchery Bakkafrost Scotland	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.2 and 13	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet.		
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

2023 Fry elevated mortalities: Wk 45 25438 (1.35%) first feeding morts

Fry mortalities for the last 4 weeks wk 10 212 (0.01%), wk 9 2734 (0.17%), wk 8 24822 (1.50%) gut fungus, wk 7 14187 (0.85%)

2023 parr increased mortalities: wk 30 34626 (2.51%) caused by burrowing following a power failure and loss of light.

2023 July parr wk 9 309 (0.02%) wk 8 185 (0.01%)wk 7 140 (0.01%) wk 6 1127 (0.07%)

Gut fungus had caused an increase in fry morts salinity was increased to treat. Salt back ground level increased to 1.3ppt, normally sits at 0.6-0.8 ppt.

Paperwork inspected on the 4th and 5th March 2024, site inspection conducted 5th March 2024

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity protocols. Thermometers are regularly calibrated against a mercury thermometer.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0056		Site No:	FS1336				
Date of Visit:		04/03/2024]		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Author	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta			ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	•						Y	
Site Details (include	e cleaner fis				15	7.		10
Total No facilities		16	Facilities sto	cked	15	No facilitie	s inspected	16
Species	SAL	SAL						
	Fry Nov	Parr 2023						
No Fish	1,630,246	1,585,168						
Mean Fish Wt	0.7	16.2						
Next Fallow Date (Si		Mid may 202	24	Next Input Da		27th May 2		
Recent (last 4 wks) of	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered?								Y
4. Are movement red	cords availabl	e for dead fis	h and waste?					Y
5. Are records comp	lete and corre	ectly entered?	•					Y
6. Are health certification	ates for introd	luctions (outw	vith GB) availa	able?				Y
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen	ts carried ou	by (or on be	half) of the bu	ısiness (not usi	ng a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a syst					-			Y
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	vailable for i	spection?						Y
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish - I	Dundas Che	emicals	
If other detail:					TTTOIC TION	Danaao On	511110410	
3. Mortality records of	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
•	•	corrosily only		al information				
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): see additional information5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?							N	
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
ir yes, raeling hes/he mortality per raeling/he stock per raeling/reason.								
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	rina period ch	necked?					Y
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? If yes, detail: see additional information								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?							N/A	
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality eve	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		Y

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							
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 Scotti	sh 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							
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)?							
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented l		Y					
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visito							
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to	o maintain the physical containment of	Y					
aquaculture animals held on site?							
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented	ed 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: 29	0/5/2023 to 4/3/2024						

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0056		Site No:	FS1336		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/03/2024		No of me	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	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	9	18	26	
	Number of supp	cluding third country	0		10	14	
DA							10
Movements off	Frequency of m Number of dest		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Trambor or door	Site contacts			6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)		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 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	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0	1			
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	,]			0
Too or anpaotounous roods	Feeding unpast	•	5				0
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	J 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
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		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2024-0056		Site No:	FS1336	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
•	enced sea lice problems in the p	revious 4 vears?			
·	Management Area (or equivaler	•	on a single ve	ear class basis?	
	access to a range of licenced in				
azamethiphos and em	amectin benzoate) as well as a lin a reasonable period of time	access to suitable biological			ures, and
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or	cumented farm management a equivalent)?	greement or statement relev	ant to the sit	e and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required standar	d specified in the SSI and th	e CoGP? (Le	egal SSI, CoGP Anne	ex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the second (CoGP Annex 6)	suggested criteria for treatm	ent in the Co	GP during the period	l that
_	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) r 0/6/19) during the period that r		evel of 3 or a	bove (prior to w/b 10	/6/19) or
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish Health In	spectorate? If no, FHI see c	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is consi	dered to cause significant w	elfare proble	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	5.3.50)
	reatments been administered or reatment or where <i>C. elongatu</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicab	e)?			
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the actions taken	had a significant impact upo	on the lice lev	els recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	nere conducted, carried out in c	ooperation between particip	ating farms?		
14. Is there a harvestir sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where for	ewer populations or part pop	oulations are	held without treatme	nt for
	cific written lice management pr scalation of a sea lice infestation		cribing set a	ctions to deal with re	cognised
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks reflect	sea lice count data? If no ple	ease detail re	asons.	
Containment Inspect	ion				
	nced equipment damage due t	o predators in the current or	nrevious nro	duction cycles?	N
·	ace to mitigate against the pred	·	•		Y
site indoors	too to magato agamet the prod	ation expendition on the t	Dotali Dolow)		
If other, detail below	:				
,					
3. Have escape incide	ents or events been experience	d on or in the vicinity of the	site since the	last FHI inspection?	N
If Yes proceed with qu	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to que	stion 10			
4. Have these been re	ported to Scottish Ministers?				
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB forthwith	(where they exist)? (CoGP -	4.4.37, 5.4.	17)	
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and local fi	sheries trusts forthwith (whe	ere they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escapees?	If yes give detail			
9. If all note were dead	loved was this setion care ad wi	th local wild fish interests are	d was name:	opion givon by Coatti	oh
Ministers? (Legal, CoC	,		·		511
	cen to prevent and minimise the		ot covered in	code but could	
	er satisfactory measures of the				
10. Is the site inspecte	ed as satisfactory with regards t	o containment? If no, please	e detail reaso	n(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2024-0056			Date of visit:	04/03/2024	-		
Site No:	FS1336]		Inspector:		ı		
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
, i	i i	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
							-	
							-	
	1						-	
	 						-	
							-	
	<u> </u>							
	_							
Donort Cureran				1				
Report Summary	Date	Inon	ond I					
Case Type ECI,CNI	15/03/2024	Insp	2 nd Insp					
201,0141	10/00/2024							
	1							

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 04/03/2024

SITE NO FS1336 SITE NAME Applecross Hatchery

Case No 20240056 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 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.

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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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: 15/03/2024
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)