

Case No:	2020-0491	Date of visit:	12/11/2020			
Time spent on site:	30mins	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0552	Site Name:	St Mungos			
Business No:	FB0456	Business Name:	Dawnfresh Farming Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	8.9	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region:	TA	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Gross pathology observed?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?	N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Fish will be moved to Frandy in March (approx.)

Ova to be received in the week of the inspection from Dunkeld Trout hatchery (in South Africa)

Site will never be fallow due to the cycle of eggs and fry.

Eggs from Denmark and South Africa most years

Waste disposal note emailed post inspection. Inspected to be satisfactory on 13/11/2020

Remote inspection carried out on 10/11/2020

Case No: 2020-0491 Site No: FS0552

Date of Visit: 12/11/2020

Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Y
N

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	16	Facilities stocked	4	No facilities inspected	16
Species	RTR				
Age group	Oct-20				
No Fish	88,000				
Mean Fish Wt	0.59g				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	No plans	Next Input Date (Site)	12/11/2020		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		N	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:					

Movement Records

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

Y
10/07/2019
Y
N
N/A
Y

Transport Records

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

Y
Y

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection?
 2. How are mortalities disposed of? Other (detail)
- If other detail: Ensiled at Frandy. Transported to Frandy in a secure bucket with a lid in a pickup.
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 2,700 attributed to runts and deformities mainly.
 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

Y
Y
N

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

N

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

If yes, detail action:

N/A

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?

Y

If yes, detail:

Cress in-
feed
treatment
used to
treat gut
fungus

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:

Cress

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 disease is detected been included and *how* and *when* 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 health status, certification if required)?

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.)?

Y

7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?

Y

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?

N

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

N/A

3. Any significant results?

N/A

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between:

10/07/2019 - 12/11/2020

Case Number:	2020-0491	Site No:	FS0552	Insp:	
Date of Visit	12/11/2020	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			
	Common processes with other farms	3			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	1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	1
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			
Platform access to cages	Yes	0			0
	No	2			
Total Rank					38 HIGH

Case No: 2020-0491

Site No: FS0552

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 are these being 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 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
15. Is there a site specific written lice management 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

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)

Site indoors, screens on inlet and outlet, contract with pest control for rodents

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?
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)

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible]

██████████
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 FS0552
INSPECTOR ██████████

DATE OF VISIT 12/11/2020
SITE NAME St Mungos
CASE No 20200491

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 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 found to be inadequately maintained. Since the inspection adequately maintained movement records have been submitted via email. No further action required.

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.

R04

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

No animal health surveillance had been carried out on behalf of the business and/or Marine Scotland since the last Marine Scotland Inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

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.

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

Signed:



Date: 18/11/2020

Fish Health Inspector

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