FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0088			Date of visit: 16/04/2024
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS1322 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	n 2
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 3.35	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	y out intended visit deta	ail reason below:	

FHI 059, Version 13

Additional Case Information:

EU 3rd country imports - consignment due 05/04/2023 500,000 ova from Iceland (Benchmark Genetics)- into incubation 2 EU 3rd country imports - consignment due 25/01/2024 1,250,000 ova from Republic of Ireland (Mowi Ireland)- 2 million into incubation 3 but movdat details Incubation 2.

EU 3rd country imports - consignment due 13/03/2024 382,500 ova from Republic of Ireland (Mowi Ireland) - this movement went into Incubation 1 but certificate and movdat detail Incubation 2.

Iceland import over a year ago so not included in surveillance frequency. Informed they do not intend to import more ova from Iceland in foreseeable future.

Inspection and paperwork by observed by

Ova generally held on site for 10 weeks before transferring to first feeding unit. Current stock input 6/3/24 from Aquagen - Holywood.

No treatments on site. Incubation 2; IPN, and PMCV PCR NEGATIVE - 4/1/24

Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons. Site probes are checked between each batch of fish. These are checked against a calibrated thermometer which is done annually but records were not available for inspection.

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

FHI 059, Ve	rsion 13			Issued	by: FHI		[Date of issue:	12/05/2020
Case No:	2024- <mark>0</mark> 088		Site No:	FS1322]				
Date of		16/04/2024			Inspector(s):				
Visit:		10/04/2024							
-		ation Details						_	
	/site details made to de	summary che tails?	cked by site i	representativ	e?		Y Y	_	
Site Details	s (include c	leaner fish fo	r all section	s)				_	
Total No fac		1	Facilities sto	cked	1	No facilities	inspected	1	
Species	SAL								
Age group									
No Fish Mean Fish	1,397,956							_	-
Wt	0.1 g								
	Date (Site)	9 weeks time		Next Input D	ate (Site)	not known			
		ase problems			Any escapes		sit)?		N
lf yes, detail:									
Movement	Pacorda								
		vailable for ins	pection?					_	Y
	ast inspectio						06/02/202	3	-
	•	and correctly	entered?					-	Υ
	•	ds available fo		nd waste?					Υ
5. Are recor	rds complete	e and correctly	entered?						Υ
6. Are healt	h certificates	s for introducti	ons (outwith	GB) available	?				Y
Transport	Records								
-		-			ess (not using	a STB)?			Y
If yes, is the	ere a system	in place for n	naintenance o	of transportat	ion records?				Y
Mortality R									
-		ilable for inspection	ection?		Other (deteil)				Y
2. How are	mortalities d	site at central	Paraaldina a	noilor	Other (detail)				
detail:		sile al central	Darcaluine ei	IISIIEI					
•		plete and cor	•						Y
	nortality (last	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			2%, wk 13 0.61	%, wk 12 1.4	9%	_	
		creased/atypi							N
If yes, facilit	ty nos/no mo	ortality per faci	lity/no stock	per facility/rea	ason:				
6 Any othe	r neaks in m	ortality during	neriod check	(ed2				_	N
lf yes, detail:		ortanty during	period ericer						
	reased (une)	xplained) mor	talities been i	reported to ve	et or FHI?			N	7A
If yes, detai									
8. Have 'mo	ortality event	s' been report	ed to FHI? If	no, enter det	ails on mortali	ty events she	et.	N	/Α

Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N/A
If yes, detail:		
If other, det		
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, det		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, record		Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Sco	•••	
of any increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been inclu		Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the preser		
listed disease is detected been included and how and when t		Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked higher health status, certification if required)?	on the farm site been covered (equal or	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	d between each epidemiological unit to	
minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement o	f staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead	Y
fish etc.)?		
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place	e to maintain the physical containment of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?		
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	nted on site?	Ŷ
lf no,		
detail:		
Results of Surveillance		
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or o	on behalf of the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	on benañ ol, the busiless:	Y
3. Any significant results?		N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).		
in yes, detail (il not detailed under recent disease problems).		
Records checked between: 06/02/2023	9 - 16/04/2024	

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	n issue	12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0088		Site No:	FS1322		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		novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup		0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	3
	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	Farm is protect disinfection or	ed (secure water supply through borehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstrean	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	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent stat		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	inpasteurised feed	0				
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity	_	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites		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				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		13 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0088	Site No:	FS1322
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previou 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallo 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed a zamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	owed synchronously on a single and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreem Management Area (or equivalent)?	ent or statement relevant to the	e site and CoGP Farm
 5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Lega 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard species 		(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the sugges records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ted criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) number or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that recor		or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19)
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish Health Inspecto 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is considered		blems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is co		
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a single treatments, where conducted, carried out in coopera 14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer pasea lice?	tion between participating farm	ns?
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedur recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infe		t actions to deal with
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice	e count data? If no please deta	il reasons.
Containment Inspection		
 Has the site experienced equipment damage due to preda Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation e 		
indoors and pest traps If other, detail below:		
 Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers? Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries) 	they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5	5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes g	give detail	
 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of the second se	·	
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to conta		ason(s)

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2024-0088			Date of visit:	16/04/2024]		
Site No:	FS1322	I		Inspector:		I		
Results Summary	Freq.				te of Notificat			
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp
	+							
	1							
	1							
	1							

Report Summary			
Case Type		Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI,CNI	02/05/2024		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0125

 SITE NO
 FS1322

 CASE NO
 20240088

DATE OF VISIT16/04/2024SITE NAMEBarcaldine Hatchery Incubation 2INSPECTORInspector

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 low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third 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.

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: 02/05/2024

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)