FHI 059, Version 13	Issue	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0374			Date of visit: 17/09/2024
Time spent on site: 3	h	Mair	n Inspector:
Site No:FS0375Business No:FB0224	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Damph Torridon Smolts Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 MIX 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 13.5	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?		N If yes, see additi	onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet. onal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	son below:	

Additional Case Information:

Morts last for weeks, Wk 38 1621 (0.2%) wk 37 4202 (0.5) wk 36 10098 1.3%, wk 35 4006 (0.5%), Wk 34 10432 (1.3%), all Furunculosis

Additional peaks in mortality wk 30 11749 (1.4%) wk 31 10389 (1.3%). Furunculosis

Initial peak in furunculosis in week 30, antibiotic administered 23/7/2024 (Florocol), second treatment administered 22/8/2024 and a third treatment administered 3/9/2024 numbers have reduced after treatment.

Some treatments for whitespot/costia with Aquacen.

No clinical signs of disease noted during the inspection.

FHI 059, Version 13			lssu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0374]	Site No:	FS0375	5			
Date of Visit:		17/09/2024]		Inspector(s):			l
Registration/Autho								
 Business/site deta Changes made to 	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	uetails :						I	
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis					_		
Total No facilities		20	Facilities sto	cked	19	No facilitie	es inspected	19
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group No Fish	2024 Q3	2025 Q1						
Mean Fish Wt	529,200	226,800				-		
Next Fallow Date (S	75g	55g April 2025		Next Input Da	ato (Sito)	May/June	2025	
Recent (last 4 wks)	,				Any escapes			N
If yes, detail:	Furunculosi			· · · ·	, any occupied		(ion)	
, ,		-						
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record	s available fo	or inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe							07/11/2023	
3. Are records comp		•						Y
4. Are movement re				•				N/A
5. Are records comp		•						N/A N/A
6. Are health certific	ates for intro	auctions (outw	nth GB) availa	adie ?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		ut by (or on be	half) of the bu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst								
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records a		•						Y
2. How are mortalitie	es disposed o	of?			Incinerated -	on site		
If other detail:								X
3. Mortality records of	•	•						Y
4. Recent mortality (al information				V
5. Evidence of recer If yes, facility nos/no		••		/roason:				1
see additional inform				/1645011.				
6. Any other peaks in		uring period ch	ecked?					N
If yes, detail:		51						
7. Have increased (u	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:	,							
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	eported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	tality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Me	dicines Records		
1. Recent treatments	s (see comment)?		Y
If yes, detail:	Florocol Aquacen		
If other, detail:			
	s available for inspection?		Y
	lete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withdu	•		Ý
5. If yes, what treatm	ient(s)?	Florocol and Aquacen	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Ý
Biosecurity Record	Is		
1. Biosecurity record	Is available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner a	nd frequency of mortality remova	al, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Ý
3. Has the manner a	nd period in which the APB will r	notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
	<i>ned)</i> mortality at the site been in		Ý
4. Has the action that	t will be taken in the event that t	the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
is detected been incl	uded and how and when that w	vill be notified to Scottish Ministers?	Y
		g stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	ation if required)?		
6. Have the husband	Iry and biosecurity measures imp	plemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disea	ase been covered (movement of	f staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation	available regarding the measure	es in place to maintain the physical containment of	Ý
aquaculture animals			
-	rity procedures been adequately	implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:			
Results of Surveilla	ance		
		out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
•	available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant res	•		Y
	etailed under recent disease prol	blems).	
•			
F	Records checked between:	7/11/2023 to 17/9/2024	

FHI 059, Version 13							lss	ued by:	FHI			
Case no:	2024-03	374	Site No:		FS0375			Date of		17/0	09/2024	17/(
Priority samples:	VI		BA		PA		MG	Samplin	g: HI			
Time sampling starts/ends:		80:00	12:4	5:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. [3
Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Add Fish/Pools - click												
Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1-10	11-15										
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL										
Average weight Sex	75g	75g										
	FW	FW										
Water Type												
	~											
	her	her										
<u>م</u>	atcl	atc										
Details	Ϊ	Ϊ										
	Kintail Hatchery	Kintail Hatchery										
Stock Origin Facility No		<u>K</u> ir										
び Facility No	p12	р7										

)9/2024	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:							
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0						
								[_		

FHI 059, Version 13

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	JI Issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0374		Site No:	FS0375		Insp:	
Date of Visit	17/09/2024		No of m	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 not	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup		0	-	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of des		0	3	6	10	6
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or	ted (secure water supply through borehole)	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		2
	farms upstream	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	1			0
	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent stat	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	J	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				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0				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		0
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	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		18
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0374	Site No:	FS0375
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
 Has the site experienced sea lice problems Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or experience) 	s in the previous 4 years? quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single y	/ear class basis?
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or med d of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm manag Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
 5. Are sea lice count records available for ins 6. Do records adequately reflect the required 	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (I	_egal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	low the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	oGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. sal.</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or od that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare problem.	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> clongatus is considered to have welfare implication	
	applicable)? Is taken had a significant impact upon the lice le I 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 manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice it	ement procedure with waypoints describing set a infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail i	reasons.
	ge due to predators in the current or previous p the predation experienced on site? (Detail belov	
Dyneema nets, top net, tensioned nets		
If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	e last FHI inspection? N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	•	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis		
	both with (where they exist)? (CoGP $-$ 4.4.37, 5.4	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO an	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	st)? (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 as Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	greed with local wild fish interests and was perm	nission given by Scottish
	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measu		
To. is the site inspected as satisfactory with r	egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2024-0374			Date of visit:	17/09/2024]		
Site No:	FS0375	l		Inspector:		1		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp

Report Summary	-	1	
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp
ECI,CNI,VMD	25/09/2024	•	
MIX	08/10/2004	•	
	_		



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0224

 SITE NO
 FS0375

 CASE NO
 20240374

DATE OF VISIT17/09/2024SITE NAMELoch DamphINSPECTORInspector

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 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.

R04



Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

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:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 25/9/2024

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)