

Case No:  Date of visit:

Time spent on site:  Main Inspector:

Site No:  Site Name:   
 Business No:  Business Name:

Case Types: 1  2  3  4  5  6

Water Temp (°C):  Thermometer No:  FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: HI Water type: F CoGP MA

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Clinical signs of disease observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Gross pathology observed?  If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.  
 Diagnostic samples taken?

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

**Additional Case Information:****TREATMENTS**

Tanks in affected unit were treated with Aquacen and Pyceze Tanks 1,2,5,6,9,10,13,14,15 were treated first. Tanks 3,4,2,8,11,12 treated the following day. These tanks were seeing higher mortalities due to the delay.

Last treated 22/05/2024 - started treating 17/05/2024 - bath treatments of Aquacen (500dd) and Pyceze (0dd) in withdrawal Reason for treatments day apart was to reduce impact on the bio filters.

**MORTALITIES**

Q2 2024 wk 20 0.01% (62) wk 19 0.01% (151), wk18 0.01% (262), wk17 0.02% (500) - IP vaccinated wk 13/14 0.09% (since been transferred out to sw sites prior inspection).

Fry @ 2.5g - wk20 0.2% (7130- runt die off) wk19 0.07% (2329),wk18 0.14% (4803), wk 17 0.3%(10554) - (wk16 transfer to tanks die off of deformities and runts 1.36% (48701))

Fry @ 0.34g - wk20 7.63% (288799), wk19 3.95% (155608) (week transferred from hatchery to fry units), wk18 0.32% (12804), wk17 0.47% (18557) - impacted by Fungus/ Saprolegnia.

Alevin @ 0.1g - came in week 15 - wk20 3.64% (164155), wk19 3.28% (152864), wk18 0.11% (5115), wk17 0.38% (17625) - eggs poor performers 10 to 15% classed as non viable - lots of nose/ spinal deformities

The majority of the fish population appeared to be feeding and swimming well. There was some fish hanging around the sides of the tanks that appeared lethargic with signs of fungus but were responding to feed and external stimuli. Site are expected to conduct further treatments the following week. Mortalities have significantly reduced since treatments. Wk 21 mortalities were reducing by approximately up to 50% per day. Samples were not taken.

Visual inspection and case paperwork conducted by [REDACTED] whilst supervised by [REDACTED].

Case No: **2024-0136** Site No: **FS0226**  
 Date of Visit: **23/05/2024** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

- 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **N/A**
- 2. Changes made to details? **N/A**

**Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)**

Total No facilities	42 + hatch	Facilities stocked	30 + hatch	No facilities inspected	30 + hatch
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL		
Age group	Fry	Fry	Alevin		
No Fish	3,497,390	3,459,352	4,344,124		
Mean Fish Wt	2.5g	0.39g	0.1g		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	never fallow		Next Input Date (Site)	July 2024	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N/A
If yes, detail:	Fungus - Saprolegnia, confined to fry at 0.39g that are kept in separate unit. See additional information for further details.				

**Movement Records**

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **25/03/2024**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **Y**
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **Y**

**Transport Records**

- 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? **[REDACTED]**
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **[REDACTED]**

**Mortality Records**

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Incinerated - on site**
- If other detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **see additional information**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **see additional information**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **Y**
- If yes, detail: **transfer and vaccinations**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
- If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. **Y**

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?  Y  
 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?  Y  
 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?  Y  
 2. If yes, are results available for inspection?  Y  
 3. Any significant results?  N  
 If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

Case Number:	2024-0136	Site No:	FS0226	Insp:	
Date of Visit	23/05/2024	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
<b>Live fish movements</b>		0	1-5	6-10	>10
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14
	Frequency of movements on from equivalent zone or compartment including third country	0	9	18	26
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	0	1-5	6-10	
Water contacts with other farms (holding species susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is protected (secure water supply through disinfection or borehole)	0			
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category III farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6	
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category V farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8	
<b>Management practices</b>		None	Secure	Unsecure	
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0			
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1			
	Processing fish from MS of equivalent status	2			
	Processing fish from zone or compartment of equivalent status	4			
	Processing fish from Category III farm	8			
	Processing fish from Category V farm	10			
Disposal of fish and fish by-products	Site's own waste only processed.	0			
	Common processes with other farms	3			
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5			
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of unpasteurised feed	0			
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5			
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0			
	No	1			
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0			
	No	3			
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			
	No	2			
<b>Total Rank</b>					0 <b>LOW</b>

Case No: 2024-0136

Site No: FS0226

**Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)**

1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (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 (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
8. Have average adult female sea lice (*L. salmonis*) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?  
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 is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried 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 levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

**Containment Inspection**

1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
  2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)
- If other, detail below:**
- 
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N/A  
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
  4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
  5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
  6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
  7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
- 
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
  9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
  10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2024-0136

Date of visit: 23/05/2024

Site No: FS0226

Inspector: [REDACTED]

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
REP	07/06/2024		



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	23/05/2024
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0226	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Inchmore
<b>CASE No</b>	20240136	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[REDACTED]

The above site was inspected following reports of elevated mortalities occurring on site. All stocked 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

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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

Treatment and medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland were available for inspection.

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

Signed: [REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 07/06/2024

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at [Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science)