FHI 059, Version 13	I	ssued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0387			Date of visit: 09/10/2024
Time spent on site:	hours	Main I	nspector:
Site No: FS0260 Business No: FB0456	Site Name: Business Name:	Braevallich Farm Dawnfresh Farming Ltd	d
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.6	Thermometer No:	T155	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	·	Y If yes, see addition	nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet. nal information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

### **Additional Case Information:**

Most pens very low mortality recently. A couple of cages slightly higher due to predation.

TMS only used to euthanise fish.

Fish looked in good condition. One moribund fish removed, no diagnostic samples taken. One fish sampled for VMD - no clinical signs or gross pathology of disease.

A few side swimmers seen across the site but otherwise fish in good condition.

FHI 059, Version 13	3		Issu	ıed by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0387		Site No:	FS0260				
Date of Visit:		09/10/2024	]		Inspector(s)	:		
Registration/Author	orisation Deta	nils						
1. Business/site det			ite representa	ative?			Υ	1
2. Changes made to	o details?	·					Υ	
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fis	h for all sect	ions)					
Total No facilities		28	Facilities sto	ocked	16	No facilitie	es inspected	28
Species	RTR							
Age group	2023							
No Fish	130,170							
Mean Fish Wt	2.68kg							
Next Fallow Date (S		December 2	024	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Uncertain		_
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		N	Any escape	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:							·	
Movement Record	lo.							
Movement record		r inspection?						
2. Date of last inspe		i ilispection:					06/06/2022	'
3. Are records comp		actly entered?	•				00/00/2022	· Y
4. Are movement re		•		>				Ÿ
5. Are records comp				•				Ÿ
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records	\$							
1. Are any moveme		t by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not us	ing a STB)?			N/A
If yes, is there a sys					_			
Mortality Records								
Mortality records	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti		•			Biogas - Ba	rkip		•
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ente	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality	•	,	0-50/cage/d	av				
5. Evidence of rece		typical mortal		<u>~,</u>				N
If yes, facility nos/no		* *		//reason:				
			1 10					
6. Any other peaks If yes, detail:	in mortality du	ring period ch	ескеа?					N
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on more	tality events s	sheet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records		
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?		N
If yes, detail:		
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?		N/A
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?		
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?		
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Records		
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording	ng and safe disposal been considered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scott	ish 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 present		
is detected been included and how and when that will be notified		Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked of	on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certification if required)?		
C. Have the book and a condition of the control of	hatinaan aask anidamialaniaal mitta minimiaa	V
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	•	1
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visite	- · · · · · - · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place aquaculture animals held on site?	to maintain the physical containment of	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implement	ted on site?	
If no, detail:	led on site:	
ii iio, actaii.		
Results of Surveillance		
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or or	n 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: 06	6/06/2022-09-10-2024	

Г	al 059, version 13							1551	ueu by. Fr	11			
	Case no:	2024-03	387	Site No:		FS0260			Date of vis		09/1	0/2024	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling.	н			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:1	5:00	12:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	). <b>[</b>	2
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	2.6000											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
Details													
Ď.		φ											
7		Frandy											
Stock	Stock Origin												
Ġ,	Facility No	0303											

	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
0 Total Tests assigned 0														

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0387		Site No:	FS0260		Insp:	
Date of Visit	09/10/2024		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		9	10	26	0
ороскоо Станата и постава	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	14	0
Mayamanta off						10	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10	0
Exposure via water		Site contact	:s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent water	rs 0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	te only processed.	0	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	1			0
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of site	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	ĺ			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				0
CoGP/Regulator				-			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2	J			
					<b>Total</b> Rank		3 LOW

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2024-0387	Site No:	FS0260
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites On	lv)	
Has the site experienced sea lice problem.		
	or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	year class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of	f licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in as well as access to suitable biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm mar Management Area (or equivalent)?	nagement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
<ul><li>5. Are sea lice count records available for</li><li>6. Do records adequately reflect the require</li></ul>	inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) red standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	below the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L.</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the p	salmonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or eriod that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
•	sh Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. ich is considered to cause significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	ninistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis C. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications.	
11. Has any other action been taken (whe	re applicable)?	
•	ions taken had a significant impact upon the lice I	
	ied out in cooperation between participating farms	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the si sea lice?	ite, where fewer populations or part populations ar	re held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice man scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	agement procedure with waypoints describing set ce infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on sto	cks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		No. of the control of
	mage due to predators in the current or previous p	
	st the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	w) f
Dyneema nets, top nets, tensioned ne If other, detail below:	is	
n curer, actain peren.		
3. Have escape incidents or events been If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No	experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the skip to question 10	he last FHI inspection?
4. Have these been reported to Scottish M		
•	B forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.	.4.17)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover	escapees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	n agreed with local wild fish interests and was peri	mission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and n	ninimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory mea		son(s)
To. is the site inspected as satisfactory wit	th regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	5011(5)

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

0 N -	0004.0007			5		004						
Case No:	2024-0387	J		Date of vi	sit: 09/10/20	024						
Site No:	FS0260	]		Inspect	or:							
D	I											
Results Summary	Freq.	Databas	e Insp	Phone	Date of Noti	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp				
		Databas	ПЗР	THOTIC	шэр	witting	Шэр	2 insp				
	_											
	+											
	+											
	+											
	+											
	+											
Report Summary		I										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp									
ECI, CNI, VMD	11/10/2024		2 11135									
	_											
	+											
	+											



## FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business No FB0456 Date of Visit 09/10/2024
Site No FS0260 Site Name Braevallich Farm
Case No 20240387 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 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.

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.



# 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: 11/10/2024
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Scottish Government website at <u>Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter - gov.scot</u> (www.gov.scot)