FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2024-0057			Date of visit: 04/03/2024			
Time spent on site:	Om .	Main In	spector:			
Site No: FS1333 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross Incubation U Bakkafrost Scotland	Init			
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 5.1	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?	•	N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

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

Mortalities for the last three weeks: wk 9 4153 (0.27%), wk 8 32279 (2.07%), wk 7 11274 0.72%) (site only stocked three weeks ago).

Site recently stocked with Stofenfiskur and Aquagen ova, inputs earlier in the year from Ormsary (Hebridean stock type).

Stock only moved to Applecross Hatchery for on-growing.

Site thermometer used due to biosecurity protocols.

Paperwork completed on the 4/3/2024 and site inspected on the 5/3/2024.

FHI 059, Version 13	i e	Issued by: FHI				Date of issue: 12/05/202		
Case No:	2024-0057		Site No:	FS1333	В			
Date of Visit:		04/03/2024	]		Inspector(s)			•
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site det			ite representa	ative?			Υ	7
2. Changes made to	o details?	·					Υ	1
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities	0.000	Hatchery	Facilities sto	cked	7	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	Ova	,		I		110 100	Г	
Age group	Feb-24							
No Fish	1,524,112							
Mean Fish Wt	N/a							
Next Fallow Date (S		Mid May 202	24	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	27/5/2024		•
Recent (last 4 wks)	•				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:					, , , , , , , ,	(1 11 111	- '/	
1. Movement record 2. Date of last inspect 3. Are records completed for the following states of the fo	ection: plete and corrected available end corrected available end corrected set of introduced end corrected available end end end end end end end end end en	ectly entered? le for dead fis ectly entered? luctions (outwood) t by (or on belor maintenance	h and waste? vith GB) availah	able? usiness (not us	-		05/10/2022	Y Y Y
Mortality records     How are martaliti		•			Whole fish -	Dundon Ch	omicolo	'
<ol><li>How are mortaliti If other detail:</li></ol>	es disposed o	l f			WHOLE HISTI -	Dunuas Cn	emicais	
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	arod?					
4. Recent mortality		correctly erite		al comments				
<ol> <li>Kecent mortality</li> <li>Evidence of receive</li> </ol>	•	typical mortal	1	ai comments				I N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		/reason:				- 1
ir yes, racinty 1105/110	Thortaity per	Tacility/110 3to	ok per racility	/16a3011.				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:	upayalainad)	martalitica ba	on reported to	a viot or EUIO				N/A
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	nortailles be	en reported to	Vel OI FII!				IN/A
If yes, detail action: 8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been re	norted to FHI	2 If no enter	details on mort	tality events s	heet		N/A
o. Have mortality e	volito pecilite	ported to 1 TII	. II IIO, EIILEI	dotalis off filoff	tainly everits s	nicet.		IN//\

Treatments and Medicines Records		NI				
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				
<ol> <li>Biosecutity records available for inspection:</li> <li>Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and saf</li> </ol>	e disposal heen considered?	Y				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Minister	·					
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been included?	ers or veterinary professional or any	Y				
	icion of the presence of a listed disease					
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)?						
Tioditi status, sorumoutori ir roquirou,						
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between	each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y				
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equip						
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintai	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	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	t, 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: 5/10/2022 to	0 4/3/2024					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0057		Site No:	FS1333		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/03/2024		No of me	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	
with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or			0	4.0	26	0
Species	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0	_	6	10	3
Exposure via water	Indiliber of des	Site contacts			6-10	10	3
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 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	cessing	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 state	ı from Category III farm	8				
		from Category V farm	10				
Diamanal of the board the board			10	] 1			
Disposal of fish and fish by- products			0				0
		esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5	l			
Use of unpasteurised feeds		•	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	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				
					Tetal		0.7
					<b>Total</b> Rank		HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2024-0	)57 Site	No: FS1333
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater	Sites Only)	
-	ice problems in the previous 4 years?	
· ·	nt Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a s	ingle vear class basis?
•	a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medication	
	enzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/o	
4. Is there a signed documented Management Area (or equivalen	farm management agreement or statement relevant to	the site and CoGP Farm
	ilable for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) the required standard specified in the SSI and the Co	GP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) recretords are inspected? (CoGP)	ord levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in	the CoGP during the period that
~	a lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level oring the period that records are inspected?	f 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
•	to the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see common level which is considered to cause significant welfare	
	been administered or other actions taken when <i>L. sali</i> or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare in	
11. Has any other action been ta	ken (where applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments	or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the	lice levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where condu	cted, carried out in cooperation between participating	farms?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy sea lice?	for the site, where fewer populations or part population	ons are held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific writter scenarios during the escalation of	lice management procedure with waypoints describin of a sea lice infestation?	g set actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observ	ed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please of	detail reasons.
Containment Inspection		
	oment damage due to predators in the current or previ	ous production cycles?
	ate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail	
site indoors	J. C.	,
If other, detail below:		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nts been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site si	nce the last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4	·	
4. Have these been reported to \$		07.5.4.47)
	ocal DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.	
6. Have these been reported to t	he SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where the	ey exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to	recover escapees? If yes give detail	
8 If all nets were deployed was	this action agreed with local wild fish interests and wa	s permission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.3)		g pointed on a given by because.
	ent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not cov	vered in code but could
be considered under satisfac		
10. Is the site inspected as satis	actory with regards to containment? If no, please deta	il reason(s)

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2024-0057			Date of visit:	04/03/2024				
Site No:	FS1333	1		Inspector:		1			
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
results Summary	1 104.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp	
						J		2 11100	
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp						
ECI,CNI	15/03/2024								

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 04/03/2024

SITE NO FS1333 SITE NAME Applecross Incubation Unit

Case No 20240057 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 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 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 (www.gov.scot)</u>