

Case No:	2022-0083	Date of visit:	29/03/2022			
Time spent on site:	2hrs	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0260	Site Name:	Braevallich Farm			
Business No:	FB0456	Business Name:	Dawnfresh Farming Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 ECS	4 VMD	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	8.8	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed	Y	
Observations:	Region:	ST	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:

Inspector thermometer did not work whilst out on site, therefore site thermometer used.

Couple of moribund fish were observed on site but no concerns regarding fish health were noted.

The fish on site all originate from Frandy. The fish that are farmed on site range from 350g to 3.5Kg.

Due to recent reports of escaped rainbow trout being found in Loch Awe, inspectors visited the site to acquire more information regarding the potential escape. Harvest and grading procedures were queried. During harvest, harvest pens are tied to a temporary mooring, about 20-30ft from the shore. The nets are sowed onto the handrail via a rolling knot. 40 tonnes of fish were harvested out over the last month, and two cages were emptied 2 weeks prior. Due to the processor of Dawnfresh going into administration, there have been disruptions in the processing site. As a result there have been discrepancies in fish counts (~100 fish).

Fish on site are graded at 600-700g. Swim throughs are done at 1kg. Grading and swim throughs are not considered by manager to be a potential source of the fish due to size. Swim throughs were described as straight forward with no chance of escapes. Two cages are placed next to each other and a separate piece of net is sewn into place between the adjoining cages before the sides are dropped for the swim through.

When asked if the fish had come from Braevallich what would be the most likely source the manager said someone on a paddle board or similar lowering the net on the harvest pens when they are at the wooden pontoons and the top nets are not sewn closed. There is no CCTV or staff at site after 5pm until 8am.

Remote paperwork conducted on 24/03/2022 by [REDACTED] and supervised by [REDACTED].

Site inspection conducted by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on 29/03/2022.

VMD sampled on 29/03/2022 by [REDACTED]. Fish sampled for VMD was found to be in good condition, and exhibited no signs of disease.

Case No:

2022-0083

Site No:

FS0260

Date of Visit:

29/03/2022

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities

28

Facilities stocked

Species

RTR

Age group

2021/2022

No Fish

264,666

Mean Fish Wt

1.73kg

Next Fallow Date (Site)

ongoing cycle

Next Input Da

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?

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?

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?

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection?
2. How are mortalities disposed of?

If other detail:

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):

2022: Wk11,513, 0.19%; W

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

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

If yes, detail action:

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

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?

If yes, detail:

If other, detail:

2. Medicines records available for inspection?

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?

4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?

5. If yes, what treatment(s)?

If other, detail:

6. Are medicines stored appropriately?

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?

2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?

3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any *increase* been included?

4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the presence or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease is determined 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)?

6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise transmission (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 aquaculture animals?

8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?

If no, detail:

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?

2. If yes, are results available for inspection?

3. Any significant results?

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

Records checked between:

28/04/2021-24/05/2021

Inspector(s): [redacted]

Y
N

25	No facilities inspected	25
te (Site)		W/b 4th April 2022
Any escapes (since last visit)?		N

	Y
28/04/2021	
	Y
	Y
	Y
	N/A

Y
Y

	Y
Ensiled - on site	
	Y
k10, 585, 0.22%; Wk9, 661, 0.24%; Wk8, 672,	
	N
	N
	N/A
	N/A

	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	N
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
d (<i>unexplained</i>) mortality at the site	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
ected been included and <i>how</i> and	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
tatus, certification if required)?		
ission of disease been covered	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
imals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
BKD (positive from kidney samples)		
4/03/2022		

Case no: 2022-0083 Site No: FS0260 Date of visit/ Sampling: 29/03/2022 29/29/0.

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: 12:30:00 12:40:00 Inspector: VMD No. 3

Environmental conditions: 1 Dry 2 Sunny 3 Cloudy 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No													
Fish nos	1												
Pool Group													
Species	RTR												
Average weight	450g												
Sex	N/A												
Water Type	FW												
Stock Details													
Stock Origin	Frandy (FS0551)												
Facility No	H2												

3/2022

Additional Sample Information:

0

Total Tests assigned

0

[illegible]

Case Number:	2022-0083	Site No:	FS0260	Insp:		
Date of Visit	29/03/2022	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	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	0
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		
	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		4
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				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				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		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					6	LOW

Case No:

2022-0083

Site No:

FS0260

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 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?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

Dyneema nets,
Bird nets

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]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0456**SITE No** FS0260**CASE No** 20220083**DATE OF VISIT** 30/03/2022**SITE NAME** Braevallich Farm**INSPECTOR** [REDACTED]

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 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.

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: 04/04/2022

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/>

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No FB0456

SITE No FS0260

CASE No 20220083

DATE OF VISIT 30/03/2022

SITE NAME Braevallich Farm

INSPECTOR [REDACTED]

Escape Investigation

The site was inspected following reports of large number of rainbow trout having escaped and were being caught in Loch Awe.

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.

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.

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

Signed: [REDACTED]

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 04/04/2022

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/>