

Case No:	2021-0186	Date of visit:	17/06/2021			
Time spent on site:	1 hour	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0551	Site Name:	Frandy			
Business No:	FB0456	Business Name:	Dawnfresh Farming Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 MIX	4 VMD	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	9.6	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region:	TA	Water type:	F	CoGP MA	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	Y	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:**

Paperwork completed by [REDACTED] via Microsoft Teams with [REDACTED] present on 16/06/2021. The physical inspection was completed on 17/06/2021 by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Fish sampled for VMD by [REDACTED] observed by [REDACTED].

Most eggs from Denmark at the moment, from Trout Ex. All eggs sent to St. Mungos before moving to Frandy. All eggs hatched at St. Mungos. Can't get fish in from Denmark at the moment so next import will be from USA if required. Next import expected in Sept 2021.

Mortality from St Mungos taken to ensiler at Frandy. Morts transported in a designated closed bucket and they are transported using a pick-up truck.

A small number of fish on site observed with a loss of equilibrium but were unable to be caught.

System in place on site to measure oxygen in each tank. If oxygen levels drops below a pre-set parameter, the system automatically increases oxygen saturation to the required level.

Each tank has a separate hand net, cleaning brush and bucket of disinfectant.

Staff shared between St. Mungos and Frandy, but site specific PPE is used at each. Equipment is rarely transferred between sites but if it is, a disinfection note will be filled in before transfer.

Case No: 2021-0186 Site No: FS0551

Date of Visit: 17/06/2021

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	37	Facilities stocked	27	No facilities inspected	37
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR
Age group	2020	2020	2020	2020	2021
No Fish	58,062	56,845	44,688	23,026	18,268
Mean Fish Wt	12g	36g	85g	215g	271g
Next Fallow Date (Site)	No plans			Next Input Date (Site)	September 2021
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	Y			Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	RTFS diagnosed in March. Company vet used to diagnose the fish with RTFS. Low level event, very few				

**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
30/04/2019
Y
Y
Y
N/A

**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?
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?
8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Ensiled - on site

If other detail:

Y
Ensiled - on site
Y
wk 23: 322 fish (0.09%), wk 22: 334 fish (0.16%), wk 21: 540 fish (0.25%), wk
N
2020 wk 36: 0.87% due to RTFS infection. Fish were treated with RTFS treated with florocal and aquatet. Treatments successful.
Y
RTFS diagnosed by Dawnfresh vet and prescription prepared.
N/A

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?

Y

Cress (in feed),  
formalin,  
florocol,  
cress (bath)

If yes, detail:

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)?

Cress (in feed), florocol, cress (bath)

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 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?

Y

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

Y

3. Any significant results?

N

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

Records checked between:

30/04/2019 - 17/06/2021

Case no:	2021-0186	Site No:	FS0551	Date of visit/ Sampling:	17/06/2021
Priority samples:	VI <input type="text"/>	BA <input type="text"/>	PA <input type="text"/>	MG <input type="text"/>	HI <input type="text"/>
Time sampling starts/ends:	14:45:00	14:50:00	Inspector:	<input type="text"/>	VMD No. <input type="text" value="1"/>
Environmental conditions:	1 <input type="text" value="Indoors"/>	2 <input type="text"/>	3 <input type="text"/>	4 <input type="text"/>	5 <input type="text"/>
Summary samples	HIST <input type="text"/>	BA <input type="text"/>	MG <input type="text"/>	VI <input type="text"/>	PA <input type="text"/> Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No													
Fish nos	1												
Pool Group													
Species	RTR												
Average weight	0.2700												
Sex													
Water Type	FW												
Stock Details													
Stock Origin	St Mungos												
Facility No	21												

### Additional Sample Information:

0

Total Tests assigned

0

[illegible]

Case Number:	2021-0186	Site No:	FS0551	Insp:		
Date of Visit	17/06/2021	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	0
	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	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3
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		2
	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				
	Collection point for waste from other farms	5				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		2
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					22	MEDIUM



Case No:

2021-0186

Site No:

FS0551

**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) fallowed 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 ☐
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? ☐ N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) ☐ Y

Site inside ☐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? ☐ 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



Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible]

# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0456	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	17/06/2021
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0551	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Frandy
<b>CASE No</b>	20210186	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	

### 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.

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.

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 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 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: 22/06/2021

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/>