

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: ST 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:

Unreported mortality 2022/wk21 5g to smolting 2.03% (27,952); first feed to 5g - 0,72%; whole site 1.4%

stock split: for 2023/wk06 whole site 2.02% (64,286) of which 55,000 failed ova.

Ensiled wasted collected by Denam environmental.

Water temperature: UnitB = 9.5C, Unit C = 9.4C, Unit E = 3.6C

Smolts: Some fin damage was evident in some tanks, some tanks this seemed to be more the pectoral fin in other tanks this seemed to be more the dorsal fin. Water very clear and otherwise fish appeared to be in good condition. Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy.

Fry: These appeared to be in good condition. Aquagen (from Quoys) and Stofnfiskur stock on site. Aquagen stock seemed to be moving through the water column more freely, whereas Stofnfiskur stock appeared to congregate at the bottom of the

Alevins: Appear to be in good condition. The way these are hatched in small tanks, rather than comp hatch tray makes removal of dead eggs more difficult. Dead egg with fungus were observed in a few tanks. These don't appear to cause any issues and will be removed once fish are moved. Site generally very little fungus problems.

Surveillance Frequency assessment amended 16/10/23: Compliance with CoGP/Regulator changed from Yes to No, adding 3 points. Changing the surveillance frequency from Medium to High. EC report reissued with amended surveillance frequency.

Case No: **2023-0063** Site No: **FS0323**

Date of Visit: **28/02/2023** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

	1 hatchery, 75 tanks	Facilities stocked	63 tanks	No facilities inspected	1 hatchery, 75 tanks
Total No facilities					
Species	SAL	SAL			
Age group	Alevins	Fry	Smolts		
No Fish	1,045,000	1,782,148	287,651		
Mean Fish Wt	0.2g	0.4g	146g		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	N/A		Next Input Date (Site)	December 2023	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? Y
- 2. Date of last inspection: **02/12/2021**
- 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)? Y
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? Y

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? Y
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Ensiled - on site**
- If other detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **2023/wk5: whole site - 0.56% (17,925 total of which 13,941 due to deformities (cull), 3,200 failed ova); 2023/wk6: whole site - 2.02% (64,286 total of which 55,000 failed ova, 7,053 deformities); 2023/wk7: whole site 0.22% (6,975 all due to cull); 2023/wk8: whole site - 0.06% (1,909)**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? N
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? Y
- If yes, detail: **2021/wk51: failed hatch 5.94% (below reporting threshold); first mortality attributed to IPN 2022/wk12 with ongoing mortality well under the threshold for reporting until 2022/wk 21 site mortality: 1.4% (below), however <5g at 2.03% (over and not reported); 2022/wk22 4.32% (90,352) - reported, which represented the peak in mortality attributed to IPN. Below reporting threshold following week.**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? Y
- If yes, detail action: **Call out March 2022, when increased moratlity was first observed. Then identified as IPN.**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet. N

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
If yes, detail: <input type="text"/>		
If other, detail: <input type="text"/>		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	<input type="text"/>	
If other, detail: <input type="text"/>		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
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.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If no, detail: <input type="text"/>		

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). <input type="text"/> IPNV (2022)		

PCR positive for IPNV (March 2022). On-going issue with IPN through April & May 2022 with grumbling mortality noted.

Records checked between: 02/12/2021 - 28/02/2023

Case no: Site No: Date of visit/
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No												
Fish nos	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8								
Pool Group												
Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL								
Average weight	146g	146g	146g	146g								
Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
Water Type	FW	FW	FW	FW								
Stock Details		Stofnfiskur	Stofnfiskur	Stofnfiskur	Stofnfiskur							
	Stock Origin											
Facility No	E1	E3	E5	E7								

Case Number:	2023-0063	Site No:	FS0323	Insp:	
Date of Visit	28/02/2023	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
Live fish movements		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
Exposure via water	Site contacts	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	1
	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	
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 processing	0			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			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			0
	Feeding unpasteurised feed	5			
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	0
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0			0
	No	1			
CoGP/Regulator					
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0			0
	No	3			3
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			0
	No	2			
Total Rank					27 HIGH

Case No: **2023-0063**

Site No: **FS0323**

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) followed 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? N
 - 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) Y
- If other, detail below:
site inside, pest control
- 3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection? N
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) Y

Site No: FS0323
Case No: 2023-0063
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):	Yearclass Year
	27952		historic report, collected during site inspection 2023-0063	



AMENDED FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0235	DATE OF VISIT	28/02/2023
SITE No	FS0323	SITE NAME	Cairndow Hatchery
CASE No	20230063	INSPECTOR	██████████

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

This report replaces the fish health report R04 issued on 01/09/2023 by ██████████. The previous report should be discarded. The surveillance frequency of the site was incorrectly assessed as medium and an inspection would have been conducted every second year, however after review the site should have been assessed as high and an inspection under the Aquatic Animals Health (Scotland) Regulation 2009 will be conducted annually.

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.

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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

R04 UKAS accredited testing laboratory No. 1964
Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel - 0131 244 3498 Email - ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - <https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/>

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 inadequately maintained.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

- The withdrawal period was not recorded for some treatments. This was addressed during the visit and has been inspected as rectified at the time of visit. No further action required.

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: 16/10/2023

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 \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)