FHI 059, Version 13	lssu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0058			Date of visit: 04/03/2024
Time spent on site:	1h	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS1360 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Applecross Smolt Ongrowing Bakkafrost Scotland	1
Case Types: 1 REP	2 REG 3 WEL	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C):	Thermometer No:		FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? UNI/REG only - if unable to carr	ed?	N/A If yes, see additional info N/A If yes, see additional info N/A If yes, see additional info N/A	rmation/clinical score sheet.

FHI 059, Version 13 Additional Case Information:

Site visit conducted accompanied by APHA Vet following reports of significant mortalities.

Initial mortality event report was wk 3 50,620 (3.56%), wk 4 30,488 (2.22%), wk 5 147,668 (11.01%).

During stocking of the site there was an issue with the pipework, a burr on a reducer resulted in some physical damage this was replaced and transfers continued without further issue. Mortalities continued to increase post transfer, some fungus was reported but following disease screening furunculosis was identified as the underlying cause of the elevated mortalities. In week 5, on veterinary advice, the fish were transferred to sea (Aird) to reduce the infection pressure within the system. The site was fallowed on the 6/2/2024, A full clean and disinfect was to be completed.

Due to the issues that have occurred onsite, the surveillance frequency could not be assessed appropriately as the frequency of movements on and off site were not representative of normal site operations, the site will remain medium risk.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issue	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0058		Site No:	FS1360]			
Date of Visit:		04/03/2024	I		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Author			ito roprocento	tivo2			V	1
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	•	checked by S	ne representa	uve :			Y Y	1
Site Details (include	e cleaner fisl	n for all secti	ions)					
Total No facilities		4	Facilities sto	cked	0	No facilitie	s inspected	4
Species								
Age group								
No Fish								
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Date (Si	,	currently fallo	W	Next Input Da		potentially		
Recent (last 4 wks) of	lisease proble	ems?		N/A	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
 Movement records Date of last inspect Are records completed and the second second	ction: lete and corre cords availabl lete and corre ates for introd	ectly entered? e for dead fis ectly entered? uctions (outw	h and waste? ith GB) availa nalf) of the bu	ble? siness (not usi			First Inspect	tion Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records a	wailabla far ir	apaction?						V
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fish -	Dundas Che	micals	
If other detail:	s disposed of	1					micals	
3. Mortality records of	omplete and	correctly ente	ared?					V
4. Recent mortality (I		-	Fallow					· ·
5. Evidence of recen	,							N/A
If yes, facility nos/no		•••		reason.				1477
	montality por		on por raointy,					
6. Any other peaks in	mortality du	ring period ch	ecked?					Y
· · ·		al information						
7. Have increased (u			en reported to	vet or FHI?				Y
If yes, detail action:		see additiona						
8. Have 'mortality eve				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?	N
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N/A
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records 1. Biosecurity records available for inspection? 2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
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?	
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?	
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 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?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
, ,	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0058	Site No:	FS1360
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	s in the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or e	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	e year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as can these be deployed in a reasonable period	well as access to suitable biological and/or me	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. sali</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	· ·	or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare pro	blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have the rapeutic treatments been admini suggested criteria for treatment or where C .		
11. Has any other action been taken (where a		
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action		
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried		
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, sea lice?	where fewer populations or part populations a	ire held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice i		t actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detai	I reasons.
Containment Inspection	as due to produtore in the surrent or provisue	
 Has the site experienced equipment damages Are measures in place to mitigate against the statement of the statement		
Site indoors.		
If other, detail below:		
 Have escape incidents or events been exp 	perienced 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	-	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they e	kist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action a	greed with local wild fish interests and was no	rmission diven by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild han interests and was per	
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini		d in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measured		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re-	egards to containment? If no, please detail rea	ason(s)

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2024-0058]		Date of visit:	04/03/2024]		
Site No:	FS1360	נ		Inspector:				
		-				_		
Results Summary	Freq.		I .		te of Notifica		I .	
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
		-	8					
Report Summary	Dete	laan	ondu					

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
REG,REP,WEL	05/04/2	024	
	_		
	_		
	_		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0169

 SITE NO
 FS1360

 CASE NO
 20240058

DATE OF VISIT04/03/2024SITE NAMEApplecross Smolt Ongrowing 1INSPECTORInspector

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected following reports of increased mortality by the farm operator. The inspection was conducted in conjunction with a veterinary officer from the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA). A separate report will be issued by the Animal and Plant Health Agency.

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.

On this occasion, the site was found to be fallow.

Records

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.

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 inadequately maintained.

The following point was raised with the site representative during the inspection:

• Tricaine Methanesulfonate (TMS) had been administered to stock to conduct check weights, its usage was not recorded in the medicine records.

The administration of TMS must be recorded appropriately in the medicine records. Records will be checked at the next inspection.

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 fallow and the measures in place for the containment of stock could not be assessed.

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

Signed:

Date: 05/04/2024

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)