FHI 059, Version 13	Iss	ued by: FHI		Date o	f issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0479			[	Date of visit:	26/11/2020
Time spent on site:	hours	Ma	ain Inspector:	ı	
Site No: FS0268 Business No: FB0456	Site Name: Business Name:	Tervine Dawnfresh Farming	g Ltd		
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 VMD	4 MIX 5		6	
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	T205	] '	FHI 045 comp	leted
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	Y If yes, see add If yes, see add If yes, see add If yes, see add	litional informa	ation/clinical s	core sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail re	eason below:			

### **Additional Case Information:**

All stock on site from Kinnaird Mill. Did have fish from Rocks Lodge, last input 1/10/19. No plans to import from Rocks Lodge to Tervine again.

Site manager reported a great survival rate at the site with morts being exceptionally low. No treatments had been administered in 2020. No feed mixing had taken place at the site since May 2017.

Predators not an issue on site. Dynema nets and top nets keep the bird issue under control and Grahams for vermin control.

Dead fish thought to be a 2kg RTR, observed floating outside pen B10. Badly degraded. Site is checked by ROV's. Informed it takes 2 weeks to check whole site. Staff told to check pen B10 and the ones in the vicinity ASAP. No incidences of mortalities being spilt into the loch. Site manager considered it to be an escapee from either Braevallich or Loch Etive some time ago.

Paperwork completed remotely 17/11/20

FHI 059, Version	13		Issi	ued by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2020-0479		Site No:	FS02	68			
Date of Visit:		26/11/20	20		Inspector(s	s):		
Registration/Aut	horisation De	etails						
1. Business/site d			v site represent	ative?			Υ	
2. Changes made		,	, '				N	
Site Details (incl	ude cleaner f	ish for all se	ections)					
Total No facilities		27	Facilities st	ocked	26	No facilit	ies inspected	27
Species	RTR	RTR						
Age group	20019	2018						
No Fish	200,000	80,000						
Mean Fish Wt	1.5kg	2.9						
Next Fallow Date	(Site)	none		Next Input	Date (Site)	23/11 - K	innaird Mill	
Recent (last 4 wk	s) disease pro	blems?			N Any escape	es (since las	t visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						·		
<ol> <li>Are records co.</li> <li>Are movement</li> <li>Are records co.</li> <li>Are health certification</li> <li>Are any moven</li> <li>yes, is there a second</li> </ol>	records availar mplete and co ificates for introds nents carried of	able for dead rrectly entere oductions (or out by (or on	fish and waste ed? utwith GB) avail behalf) of the b	lable?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Y Y Y
Mortality Record	ls							
1. Mortality record	ds available for	r inspection?						Y
2. How are morta	lities disposed	of?			Whole fish	- Dundas Cl	hemicals	
If other detail:								
<ol><li>Mortality record</li></ol>	ds complete ar	nd correctly e	entered?					Y
<ol><li>Recent mortalit</li></ol>	ty (last 4 wks):		wk 19/10 0.	1%, wk 26/10	0 0.13%, wk 2/	11 0.19%, w	ık 10/11 0.12%	
<ol><li>Evidence of red</li></ol>	cent increased	/atypical mo	talities?					N
If yes, facility nos	no mortality p	er facility/no	stock per facility	y/reason:				
6. Any other peak	s in mortality	during period	checked?					Y
If yes, detail:			rts. Wk morts/s	site 0.27%				
7. Have increased								N/A
If yes, detail actio	•							
8. Have 'mortality		reported to F	HI? If no, enter	details on m	ortality events	sheet.		N/A

ii otilor, detail.	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N/A
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
1. 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 disea	ise
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	Y
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	Y
aquaculture 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).	ties and no
Records checked between: 29/3/18-26/11/20	

Case no: 2020-0479 Site No: FS0268 Date of visit/ 26/11/2 Sampling: Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI	2020
Time sampling 10:30:00 11:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. starts/ends:	5
Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5	
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA To	tal Samples
Add Fish/Pools - click	
Pool/Fish No	
Fish nos 1	
Pool Group	
Species RTR	
Average weight 2kg	
Sex	
Water Type FW	
Stock Origin  Kinnaird Mill	
ਲ Facility No G3	

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:						
0		Total To	ests ass	igned	0					

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2020-0479		Site No:	FS0268		Insp:	
Date of Visit	26/11/2020		No of me	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	40	20	
Ороско	Number of sup	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	
Movements off	Frequency of n		0		6 6	10	0
Exposure via water	i tambér er dec	Site contacts			6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or I	red (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	farms upstrean	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	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of us	4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	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	·	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 s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
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				
					Total		2
					Rank		LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2020-0479	Site No:	FS0268
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?	
·	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	vear class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (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 ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the 0	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (L. sali	monis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> elongatus is considered to have welfare implications.	
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	applicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice I	evels recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	out in cooperation between participating farms	s?
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site,	where fewer populations or part populations as	re held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage	ement procedure with waypoints describing set	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
•	ge due to predators in the current or previous p	production cycles?
	he predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	
see additional info		
If other, detail below:		
3. Have escape incidents or events been exp	perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since t	he last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	to question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	sters?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5	.4.17)
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
0.17.30		
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 per	mission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measur	res of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail rea	son(s) Y

Site No: FS0268

Case No: 2020-0479

Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2020-0479			Date of visit:	26/11/2020	]					
Site No:	FS0268	Inspector:									
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	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								
MIX ECI,CNI, VMD, MIX	04/12/2020										
ECI,CNI, VMD, MIX	16/12/2020										





Dawnfresh Farming Ltd Bothwellpark Industrial Estate Uddingston Lanarkshire G71 6LS

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

#### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0456 SITE NO FS0268 INSPECTOR DATE OF VISIT 26/11/2020 SITE NAME Tervine CASE NO 20200479

# Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

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 low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third 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.

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.

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.

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 recommendations were issued:

An extensively degraded dead fish, thought to be a 2kg rainbow trout was observed floating outside pen B10. Net checks on site are conducted using ROV's and site staff agreed to check the nets of pen B10 and those in the vicinity as a priority. The site manager did not consider the fish had come from Tervine but had come from another site in the vicinity which had reported escaped fish previously.

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

Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at <a href="https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/">https://www.gov.scot/publications/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/</a>

Date: 16/12/2020