

Case No:	2024-0043	Date of visit:	26/02/2024			
Time spent on site:	3.5hrs	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0577	Site Name:	Kindrochet Fish Farm			
Business No:	FB0070	Business Name:	Kindrochet Fish Farm			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 VMD	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	5.4	Thermometer No:	T308	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?	Y	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 on site originate from Selcoth, Ae Fishery and Westmill.

Site has historically been diagnosed with ERM, Costia and gill disease. Linacivet and Aquatet treatments were completed in June 2023 for ERM and were reported to be successful. Fish were last treated with Chloramine T in October 2023 for gill disease and haven't had any medicinal treatments since. The largest of the brown trout on site were observed to be infected with a fungus but only a few individuals were affected. The general populations of fish on site appeared in good physical health and were active in response to feed. <5 mortalities were observed across the site but were not fresh dead so not sampled. No moribunds observed.

Mortalities removed from the ponds are stored in black bins around the site. These are emptied at least weekly and carcasses are buried in the woods within the land owners boundary for the site. Lime is used to facilitate biological breakdown. Site is generally losing 1-2 fish per pond per day. Only a total monthly mortality figure for January 24 and a total annual mortality figure for 2023 were available for the whole site during the inspection. Requirements were explained to site manager and FHI agreed to supply a mortality record template to facilitate the calculation of mortality reporting thresholds which the site owner/manager agreed to use going forward.

Although the movement records were complete, FS and FIS numbers were missing from some individual entries. FHI explained that these should be included for every entry to facilitate contact tracing in the event of a disease outbreak. Site manager explained he had misunderstood what was required following the last inspection and has agreed to record FS and FIS numbers for all entries going forward, NFA.

Tiger trout had been stocked on site from Westmill. APB is not currently authorised to hold that species at this site. The site's BMP and operating procedures were revised and updated where required during the site inspection. An authorisation amendment application was completed during the site visit and the outcome of this application will be issued separately.

Site is never fallow, however individual ponds are fallowed for 10 days and limed at least once a year.

Fish sampled for VMD appeared healthy externally and internally upon examination.

Case No: 2024-0043

Site No: FS0577

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	16	Facilities stocked	16	No facilities inspected	16
Species	RTR	RTR	TRT	TRT	TTR
Age group	2022	2023	2022	2022	2023
No Fish	11,000	27,000	970	200	1,000
	900g	350g	330g	900g	100g
Mean Fish Wt					750g
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Never fallow.		Next Input Date (Site)	April 24	
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?			N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:					

Movement Records

1. Movement records available for inspection?

Y

2. Date of last inspection:

31/10/2022

3. Are records complete and correctly entered?

N

4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?

N/A

5. Are records complete and correctly entered?

N/A

6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available?

N/A

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: Mortalities and culls are buried in woodland next to the farm using lime to hasten decomposition and prevent scavenging.

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

N

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): 109 mortalities (culls included) for January 24. Generally losing 1-2 fish per pond per day.

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)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>
If yes, detail: <input type="text"/>	
If other, detail: <input type="text"/>	
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="text" value="N"/>
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	<input type="text"/>
If other, detail: <input type="text"/>	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="text" value="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?	<input type="text" value="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?	<input type="text" value="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)?	<input type="text" value="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.)?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>
If no, detail: <input type="text"/>	

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="text"/>
3. Any significant results?	<input type="text"/>
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). <input type="text"/>	

Records checked between:

31/10/22 - 26/02/24

Case Number:	2024-0043	Site No:	FS0577	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	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	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		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				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		0
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:

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 emamectrin benzoate)? If yes, have these been 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?
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 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?
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 period that records are inspected?
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)
- Inlet, outlet and individual ponds are screened to prevent entry to the site by wild fish and escape of farmed fish. Pest control is in place.
- 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 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
 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)

2024-0043

Site No: FS0577

ectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can

valent)?

d? (CoGP Annex 6)

w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?

r treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)

the escalation of a sea lice infestation?

iP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)

Case no: 2024-0043Site No: FS0577Date of visit/ Sampling: 26/02/202426/02/2024

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: 15:50:0015:55:00Inspector: VMD No. 1

Environmental conditions: 1 Dry2 Sunny3 Cloudy45

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1											
	Pool Group												
Stock Details	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	400g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
	Stock Origin	Westmill Fish Farm											
	Facility No	FS0606											
		1											

02/2024

Additional Sample Information:

Fish dispatched by percussive blow.

0

Total Tests assigned

0

[illegible]

Site No: FS0577
Case No: 2024-0043
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



Case No: 2024-0043

Date of visit: 26/02/2024

Site No: FS0577

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0070	DATE OF VISIT	26/02/2024
SITE No	FS0577	SITE NAME	Kindrochet Fish Farm
CASE No	20240043	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 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 found to be inadequately 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 inadequately maintained.

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 Directorate since the last Marine Directorate inspection.

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

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection:

- Site was stocked with tiger trout; a species that the APB is not currently authorised to farm at this location. A retrospective 'authorisation amendment application' was completed on site and the BMP was reviewed and amended where required. The outcome of this application will be issued separately.

R04

- Although the movement records were complete, FS and FIS numbers were missing from some individual entries. FHI explained that these should be included for every entry to facilitate contact tracing in the event of a disease outbreak. Site manager explained he had misunderstood what was required following the last inspection and has agreed to record FS and FIS numbers for all entries going forward. No further action will be taken on this occasion.
- Only a total monthly mortality figure for January 2024 and a total annual mortality figure for 2023 were available during the inspection. Mortality recording requirements were explained to the site manager and FHI agreed to supply a mortality record template. This will facilitate mortality recording in future and the calculation of mortality reporting thresholds for the site. The site manager agreed to use this going forward. No further action will be taken on this occasion.

These must be addressed to ensure the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met. The site may be subject to further inspection or enforcement action should the appropriate action regarding the above points not be taken.

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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.



Signed:

Date: 07/03/2024

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/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)

Case No:	2024-0049					Date o
Time spent on site:	3 hours				Main Inspector:	
Site No:	FS1294	Site Name:	Wyre			
Business No:	FB0125	Business Name:	Scottish Sea Farms Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 SLI	4 VMD	5 6	
Water Temp (°C):	7.63	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 04		
Observations:	Region:	OR	Water type:	S		
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	<input type="checkbox"/> N		If yes, see additional information/clinical sco			
Clinical signs of disease observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N		If yes, see additional information/clinical sco			
Gross pathology observed?	<input type="checkbox"/> N		If yes, see additional information/clinical sco			
Diagnostic samples taken?	<input type="checkbox"/> N					

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below: