FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2024-0060			Date of visit: 05/03/2024			
Time spent on site:	1	Main	Inspector:			
Site No: FS0301 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Couldoran Hatchery Bakkafrost Scotland				
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 11.9	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y			
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	n If yes, see addition	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 detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Issues with stock in April following a change in feed, poor growth and increased mortalities were reported, disease screening was conducted no significant pathogens identified. This continued through May with elevated mortalities reported. The fish were transferred to a new diet by the end of May with mortalities reducing.

ERM was identified during June 2023, a second dip vaccination was administered and issue resolved without further treatment though July.

Recirc unit is at 11.5 degrees, remaining tanks at 11.9 degrees. site thermometer used for biosecurity, thermometers are calibrated by biology department, also hand held probe used to calibrate as well.

Peaks in mortality 2023 wk 9 2643 (1.24%) Fungus, wk 17 13641 (0.97%), wk 18 66599 (4.77%), wk 19 72492 (5.45%), wk 20 96736 (7.96%), wk 21 (95941 (8.26%), wk 22 51208 (4.81%),

Mort last four weeks wk 10 828 (0.03%), wk 9 3599 (0.14%), wk 8 8762 (0.33%), wk 7 5978 (0.23%) mainly first feeding poor doers.

FHI 059, Version 13		_	Issu	ed by: FHI		D	ate of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0060		Site No:	FS0301				
Date of Visit:		05/03/2024	1		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site deta			te representa	ative?		Y		
2. Changes made to	details?	·	·			Y	,	
Site Details (include	o cloanor fie	h for all socti	onel					
Total No facilities		58	Facilities sto	cked	32	No facilities in	nspected	58
Species	SAL	SAL	r domines sto	okea		TVO TACILITIES II	nopeoted	
Age group	fry	August						
No Fish	1,683,827	908,411						
Mean Fish Wt	0.7g	5.2g						
Next Fallow Date (Si		on-going cyc	e	Next Input Dat	te (Site)	20th April		
Recent (last 4 wks)	•				, ,	(since last vis	it)?	N
` '		e recirc unit A	ugust 2023 s		, ,		,	
 Are records comp Are movement rec Are records comp Are health certification Transport Records Are any movement yes, is there a syst 	cords availablete and corrected attestion for introduction attention of the corrected out the correcte	e for dead fishectly entered? luctions (outwood)	ith GB) availa	able? siness (not usir	-			Y Y N/A Y
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a	available for in	nspection?		_				Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	f?			Whole fish - I	Dundas Chem	icals	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): see additional information								
5. Evidence of recen		* *						N
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:								
6. Any other peaks in	•	<u> </u>	ecked?					Y
If yes, detail: see additional information								
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?						Y		
If yes, detail action: Screening conducted no specific disease issue identified considered to be feed reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.								
8. Have mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	r if no, enter o	details on morta	ality events sh	eet.		Y

Treatments and Me	dicines Records					
1. Recent treatments	(see comment)?	Y				
If yes, detail:	Aquacen					
If other, detail:						
	available for inspection?	Y				
•	ete and correctly entered?	Y				
4. Are fish in a withdr	awal period?	Y				
5. If yes, what treatm	ent(s)? Aquacen					
If other, detail:						
6. Are medicines stor	ed appropriately?	Y				
Biosecurity Record						
	s available for inspection?	Y				
	nd frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y				
	nd period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any					
, ,	ned) mortality at the site been included?	Y				
	t 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)?						
		V				
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.)?						
	available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	- 1				
aquaculture animals	-	V				
If no, detail:	ity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	ı				
ii iio, detaii.						
Results of Surveilla	neo					
	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	V				
•	available for inspection?	·				
3. Any significant res	·	Y				
	etailed under recent disease problems). ERM identified no treatments required	_				
ii yoo, dotaii (ii not de	Transit direction recent disease production.					
R	ecords checked between: 12/5/2022 to 5/3/2024					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0060	Site No: FS0301				Insp:	
Date of Visit	05/03/2024		ovements/s	ments/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	0	10	26	
	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	
h				-	!		10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	3
Exposure via water	Trainibor 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				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	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		0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	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	te only processed.	0				
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
	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		1
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Το	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				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		19 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2024-0060	Site No:	FS0301
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)	
Has the site experienced sea lice problem		
	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	vear class basis?
-	cenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (ir	
	s well as access to suitable biological and/or med	
4. Is there a signed documented farm management Area (or equivalent)?	gement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for in	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	d standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (I	Legal 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 C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ($\it L$. sa 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the per	Ilmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or riod that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which	h is considered to cause significant welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	nistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> elongatus is considered to have welfare implica	
11. Has any other action been taken (where	applicable)?	
	ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice le	
	d out in cooperation between participating farms	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site sea lice?	, where fewer populations or part populations are	e held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice managescenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	gement procedure with waypoints describing set infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
0.41		
Containment Inspection	age due to predators in the current or previous p	roduction cycles?
	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
	s are fully enclosed with tarp lids securely tie	
If other, detail below:	s are rully enclosed with tarp has securely the	eu
Have escape incidents or events been expending the second of the se	sperienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	ne last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No sk	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Min		
The state of the s	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.	4.17)
	nd local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail	
8. If all nots were deployed was this action of	agreed with local wild fish interests and was pern	nission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	agreed with local wild non interests and was pen	mission given by Scottism
	nimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measured in the satisfactory measured in		
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s) Y

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2024-0060			Date of visit:	05/03/2024			
Site No:	FS0301]		Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
r too and o anninary		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
							-	
							_	
							_	
Report Summary	Dete	Luca	and .					
Case Type	Date 15/03/2024	Insp	2 nd Insp					
ECI,CNI	15/03/2024							

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0169 Date of Visit 05/03/2024

SITE NO FS0301 SITE NAME Couldoran Hatchery
CASE NO 20240060 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)