FHI 059, Version 13	I:	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020				
Case No: 2024-0375			Date of visit: 17/09/2024				
Time spent on site:	1	Main Inspect	or:				
Site No: FS0300 Business No: FB0341	Site Name: Business Name:	Loch Damph South Migdale Smolts Ltd					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3	4 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 of Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:					

Additional Case Information:

Site has also transferred from Bakkafrost to Migdale since the last Inspection, the fish onsite are the first cycle for Migdale.

Mortalities last four weeks: week 16th Aug to 22nd Aug 8630 (1.4%), 23 Aug to the 29th Aug 1641 (0.3%), 30th Aug to 8th Sep 289, 9th to the 15th September 1012 (0.2%). Morts had been low post input until 16th August when a marked increase occurred, samples were taken and furunculosis was identified. Florocol was used for a 10 day course, this reduced the mortalities.

Furunculosis has been an issue, one treatment of florocol has been administered which was very effective.

Aquacen has been used for white spot/costia.

Pens have been slightly relocated, they are now further offshore. Site can still be accessed by a walkway.

Vaccination is due to commence in the coming days.

Surveillance frequency, movements offsite could not be calculated as this is the first cycle so no fish have moved off, data from the other Loch Damph site used as similar in stocked numbers and fish transfer method.

FHI 059, Version 13	_	_	Issu	ed by: FHI	_		Date of issu	ie: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0375	J	Site No:	FS0300)			
Date of Visit:		17/09/2024]		Inspector(s)	:		J
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site det			ite representa	ative?			Y	1
2. Changes made t	•						Y	1
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		14	Facilities sto	cked	8	No facilitie	es inspected	14
Species	SAL	SAL					T :	
Age group	2024 Q3	2024 Q1						
No Fish	431,652	184,995						
Mean Fish Wt	65g	50g						
Next Fallow Date (S		April 2025		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	May/June	2025	
Recent (last 4 wks)				•	Any escape			N
If yes, detail:	Furunculosis					,	,	
4. Are movement re 5. Are records com 6. Are health certific Transport Record 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a sys	plete and corr cates for introd s ents carried ou	ectly entered' ductions (outv	? vith GB) availa half) of the bu	able? usiness (not us	•			N/A N/A N/A
Mortality Records								
Mortality records		nspection?						
2. How are mortaliti		•			Incinerated	- on site		
If other detail:	lee diopeced e				momorated	011 0110		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					I Y
4. Recent mortality	•	. corroonly orn		al information				
5. Evidence of rece		atypical morta		ar imorridaeri				Y
If yes, facility nos/ne		• •		/reason:				
see additional infor		,	, ,					
6. Any other peaks		iring period ch	necked?					N
If yes, detail:								•
7. Have increased ((unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events	sheet.		N/A
								_

Treatments and Medicines Records						
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y					
If yes, detail: Florocol, Aquacen						
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)? Florocol and Aquacen						
If other, detail:						
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y					
Biosecurity Records						
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y					
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y					
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?	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 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	Y					
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						
aguaculture animals held on site?						
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y					
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?	Y					
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).						
Records checked between: 16/5/2023 to 17/9/2024						

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0375			FS0300		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	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	10
эролоо	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0			14	18 5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Exposure via water	rtamber er deet	Site contacts					•
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	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 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	e only processed.	Ιο	1			0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed		1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	<u> </u>	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
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			1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		41 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2024-0375		Site No:	FS0300	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Site	es Only)			
 Has the site experienced sea lice Is the CoGP Farm Management A Does the site have access to a rai 	problems in the previous 4 years? Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously onge of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medoate) as well as access to suitable biological	dications (i	ncluding deltamethrin,	
	m management agreement or statement relev	vant to the	site and CoGP Farm	
	ole for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6 required standard specified in the SSI and the	•	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record liceords are inspected? (CoGP Anne	levels below the suggested criteria for treatm ex 6)	ent in the (CoGP during the period that	
	ce (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a leg the period that records are inspected?	evel of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or	
•	the Fish Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see of the vel which is considered to cause significant w		olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	
•	en administered or other actions taken when where <i>C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welt			
11. Has any other action been taken				
·	he actions taken had a significant impact upo			
	d, carried out in cooperation between particip the site, where fewer populations or part pop	~		
15. Is there a site specific written lice recognised scenarios during the esc	e management procedure with waypoints des calation of a sea lice infestation?	scribing set	actions to deal with	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed of	on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ease detail	reasons.	
Containment Inspection				
	ent damage due to predators in the current or		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	N
	against the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	w)	Y
Dyneema nets, top nets, tensione If other, detail below:	ed nets.			
 Have escape incidents or events Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. 	been experienced on or in the vicinity of the	site since t	he last FHI inspection?	N
4. Have these been reported to Scot			r	
	I DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP -	- 4.4.37. 5	.4.17)	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (whe			
7. Were methods (if any) used to rec	cover escapees? If yes give detail			
8. If gill nets were deployed was this Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.	action agreed with local wild fish interests ar .4.18)	nd was per	mission given by Scottish	
9. What action was taken to prevent	and minimise the risk of further escapes? (N	lot covered	in code but could	
be considered under satisfactory	measures of the Act)			
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactor	ory with regards to containment? If no, please	e detail rea	son(s)	Y

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2024-0375			Date of visit:	17/09/2024				
Site No:	FS0300]		Inspector:		ı			
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification							
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
Case Type ECI,CNI	25/09/2024								



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0341 Date of Visit 17/09/2024

SITE NO FS0300 SITE NAME Loch Damph South
CASE NO 20240375 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 high. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted annually. 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.

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.

R04



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)