FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020			
Case No: 2024-0089			Date of visit: 16/04/2024			
Time spent on site:	1.5 hours	Main Inspec	etor:			
Site No: FS1326	Site Name:	Barcaldine On-Growing Unit				
Business No: FB0125	Business Name:	Scottish Sea Farms Ltd				
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3	4 5	6			
Water Temp (°C): 12.66	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y			
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA			
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving	g fish present?	Y If yes, see additional info	ormation/clinical score sheet.			
Clinical signs of disease observed? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Gross pathology observed? Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.						
Diagnostic samples taken?		N				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Treatments; Aquacen /formalin- Cress /bronopol - (pyceese out of stock) - 500oc day withdrawal - on withdrawal - for fungus 9/4-11/4

Case paperwork and inspection by , observed by

Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons. Site thermometer checked between inputs against a calibrated thermometer (annual calibration). Records were not available for inspection.

Mort figures for site split into units 1 and 2. Units 1 wk15 0.42%, wk14 0.12%, wk 13 0.16%, wk 12 fallow - Unit 2 wk 15 0.12%, wk14 0.08%, wk13 0.04%, wk 13 0.02%

PCR tested negative for salmon gillpox, flavobacterium and ERM.

About 4 or 5 dead fish were observed in the mort collection tanks associated with about five tanks. These were observed with Saprolegnia.

FHI 059, Version	on 13		Issued by: FHI				Date of issue: 12/05/2020		
Case No:	2024-0089		Site No:	FS1326					
Date of Visit:		16/04/2024			Inspector(s):				
Registration/A	Authorisation	Details							
1. Business/sit			d by site repre	esentative?			Υ		
2. Changes ma	ade to details?	?					Υ		
Site Details (in	nclude clean	er fish for all	sections)						
Total No faciliti		16	Facilities sto	cked	16	No facilities	inspected	16	
Species	SAL			T			T		
Age group	Fry/parr								
No Fish	1,081,425								
	3.5 g								
Mean Fish Wt									
Next Fallow Da		5 weeks time	<u> </u>	Next Input D	ate (Site)	7 weeks time	<u></u>		
Recent (last 4	· /				Any escapes			N	
	fungus	probleme.			rany cocapec	(on ree race th	ж., .		
ii yee, actaii.	rangas								
Movement Re 1. Movement re 2. Date of last 3. Are records 4. Are movement 5. Are records	ecords availal inspection: complete and ent records av complete and	correctly ent railable for de correctly ent	ered? ad fish and w ered?				07/12/2021	Y Y Y Y	
6. Are health c Transport Rec 1. Are any mov If yes, is there	c ords vements carrie	ed out by (or o	on behalf) of t	he business (_	ГВ)?		N/A	
Mortality Reco 1. Mortality rec 2. How are mo	ords available ortalities dispos	sed of?			Other (detail)			Y	
If other detail:				ensiler					
•	3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?								
4. Recent mort	tality (last 4 wl	ks):	see additiona	al info					
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?									
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:									
6. Any other pe	eaks in mortal	ity during peri	od checked?					N	
If yes, detail:									
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?									
If yes, detail ac									
8. Have 'morta	lity events' be	en reported to	o FHI? If no, e	enter details d	n mortality ev	ents sheet.		N/A	

Treatments and Medicines Records	V					
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y					
If yes, detail: formalin and bronopol (Aquacen and Cress)						
If other, detail:	V					
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y					
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y					
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	T					
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? formalin and bronopol (Aquacen and Cress)						
If other, detail:	V					
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	ī					
Biosecurity Records						
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y					
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ÿ					
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?	Y					
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?	Y					
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	Y					
etc.)?						
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	Y					
aquaculture animals held on site?						
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y					
If no, detail:						
Results of Surveillance						
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?	Y					
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).						
Records checked between: 7/12/21- 16/4/24						

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	f issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0089		Site No:	FS1326		Insp:	
Date of Visit	16/04/2024 No of movements/supp./dest.						
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 sup	ocluding third country	0			14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Movements on	Number of dest		0		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 b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	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	•	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	4				
		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	1			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	Ī			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 st	taff 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	1			
					Total		20
					Rank		MEDIUM

Case No:	2024-0089	Site No: FS1326				
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only					
•		s in the previous 4 years?				
		equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?				
	•	cenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin,				
	amectin benzoate) as	well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and				
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or		gement agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm				
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)				
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required	I standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)				
7. Are sea lice (L. salm records are inspected?		elow the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that				
		Imonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 d that records are inspected?				
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.				
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which	n is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)				
· ·		istered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the elongatus is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where	applicable)?				
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the action	ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?				
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried	d out in cooperation between participating farms?				
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?						
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?						
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stock	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.				
Containment Inspect	ion					
•		age due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N			
		the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	V			
		the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	I			
indoors and pest trap If other, detail below						
ii otilei, detaii below						
2 Have occano incide	ente or avante baan av	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N			
If Yes proceed with qu		•	IN			
		• •				
4. Have these been re						
		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.4.17)				
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO ar	nd local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)				
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail				
O If all note were stant	aved was this satism	ground with local wild fish interacts and was namical an aircan by Castilla				
Ministers? (Legal, Co		greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish				
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could						
be considered unde	•					
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ			

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

		_				_				
Case No:	2024-0089			Date of visit:	16/04/2024					
6'' N	E04000									
Site No:	FS1326			Inspector:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification								
results cultillary	r req.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
								2 11135		
Danart Cumman										
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
ECI, CNI	30/04/2024	шэр	Z insp							
201, 0111	00/04/2024									

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 **DATE OF VISIT** 16/04/2024

SITE NO FS1326 SITE NAME Barcaldine On-Growing Unit

CASE NO 20240089 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.

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.

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.

R04



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)