

Case No:	2024-0002	Date of visit:	26/02/2024			
Time spent on site:	2 hours	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):	7.6	Thermometer No:	T155	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:

Imports 11/1/24 RTR OVA 100000 USA Trout Lodge Bonny Lake

Imports 2023 RTR Ova USA trout Lodge 12/1/23, 16/3/23, 15/6/23, 17/8/23, 23/11/23

Fish held on site until 2g then moved to Frandy. RTFS is usually an issue at Frandy but not at St Mungos. Next input March from Trout Loge USA.

Gut fungus an issue in every batch (saprolegnia) - treated with pyceze in feed mix under script with 500 0days withdrawal. Feed mixed at St Mungos. Issue appears 2 weeks after first feeding. Fish checked weekly and filaments are observed in gut. Last treatment 8/1/24. Update 15.3.24 discussion with site manager establish fed mixing was carried out at Frandy. Prescription supplied.

Morts are ensiled at Frandy and ensiled material disposed of at Gask Farm, Turriff.

Water supply is Borehole.

Two inputs currently on site. November input and Jan input which hatched about 1 month ago.

Case No: 2024-0002

Site No: FS0552

Date of Visit: 26/02/2024

Inspector(s):

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

Y

2. Changes made to details?

Y

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	17	Facilities stocked	9	No facilities inspected	17
Species	RTR	RTR- alvins			
Age group	23Nov input	24 Jun input			
No Fish	85,341	86,999			
Mean Fish Wt	1.28g	0.08g			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	no fallow		Next Input Date (Site)	March ova trout lodge	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	gut fungus				

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection?

Y

2. Date of last inspection:

20/02/2023

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?

Other (detail)

If other detail: ensiled off site

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

Y

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 29/1 0.01% (126), 5/2 0.07% (117), 12/2 3.19% (6292) - swim up cull, 19/2 0,12% (306)

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

N

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

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

N

If yes, detail:

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

N/A

If yes, detail action:

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: Pyceze | | |
| 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)? | Pyceze - in feed | |
| 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 <i>increased (unexplained)</i> 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 <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 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:

Jan 2023- 26/2/24

Case Number:	2024-0002	Site No:	FS0552	Insp:		
Date of Visit	26/02/2024	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	18
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	5
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				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		
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		0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				
	No	3				0
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					39 HIGH	

Case No: 2024-0002

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) 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)
- inside
- If other, detail below:
- Graham pest control
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)

Case No: 2024-0002

Date of visit: 26/02/2024

Site No: FS0552

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0456	DATE OF VISIT	26/02/2024
SITE No	FS0552	SITE NAME	St Mungos
CASE No	20240002	INSPECTOR	

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 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. 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 Directorate were available for 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.

R04

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

Signed:



Date: 22/03/2024

Fish Health Inspector

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/resources/publications/2024/03/fish-health-inspectorate-service-charter/)