

Case No:	2024-0402	Date of visit:	22/10/2024			
Time spent on site:	2hrs	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0560	Site Name:	Torhouse Mill			
Business No:	FB0134	Business Name:	Kames Fish Farming Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 MIX	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	11.7	Thermometer No:	T306	FHI 045 completed		
Observations:	Region:	DG	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:**

Ova comes on from Kames own stock at Allt Mhor (FS0106) and Costa Springs. Fish on site have been performing well with low mortality observed across the stocks. RTFS, PKD, Costia and whitespot have been present on site but are managed using medicated feed and good husbandry/biosecurity.

The whole site is never fallowed, but the hatchery, individual ponds and raceways are fallowed, cleaned and disinfected with lime chalk between batches of fish.

Fish have recently been vaccinated with Alphaject Micro6 and Ridgeway and are scheduled to be moved off to Kames Bay (East) (FS0462) later this week. Prior to movements off the site, samples are taken for PCR. Most recent results were negative for all pathogens screened.

Paperwork inspected remotely on 15/10/24.

It was difficult to observe the fish on site due to the dark colour of the water and how deep they were sitting in the ponds. However some were removed using a handnet for closer inspection and these fish appeared in good condition. Although difficult to observe, the fish were extremely active in the raceways/ponds when approached. 2 mortalities were observed across the site but were not fresh dead and no clinical signs of disease were observed so no diagnostic samples were taken on this occasion.

Case No: 2024-0402

Site No: FS0560

Date of Visit: 22/10/2024

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	60	Facilities stocked	20	No facilities inspected	60
Species	RTR				
Age group	2024				
No Fish	708,586				
Mean Fish Wt	70g				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Never fallow	Next Input Date (Site)	Dec 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:

01/03/2022

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?

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?

Ensiled - on site

If other detail: Fish waste is ensiled on site then uplifted and taken to Dundas chemicals. Site generates ~2 IBCs of ensiled waste, twice a year (~4T per year)

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

Y

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Wk42: 569 (0.8%), Wk41: 1,148 (0.16%), Wk40: 874 (0.13%), Wk39:1,925 (0.31%), Wk38: 2,066 (0.33%)

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?

Y

If yes, detail: Wk17 2024: 1.11% (&lt;750g), Wk16 2024: 1.47% (&lt;750g) - post treatment mortality for RTFS. Wk24 2023: 18,174 (4.18%), Wk25 2023: 20,364 (4.58%) - environmental (spike in water temperature). Wk14 2023: 1.07% (&lt;750g) - smolt stress

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

Y

If yes, detail action: FHI notified and samples taken by company in wks 24 and 25 2023. No pathogen identified, attributed to environmental insult.

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

Y

**Treatments and Medicines Records**

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?

Y

If yes, detail:

TMS

Aquacen in August 24 for costia and white spot. Chloramine T in June 24 and Florocol in April 24 for RTFS

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?

N

5. If yes, what treatment(s)?

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:

01/03/2022 - 22/10/24

Case Number:	2024-0402	Site No:	FS0560	Insp:		
Date of Visit	22/10/2024	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		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	3
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	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		1
	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		
<b>Management practices</b>		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				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>19</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No: 2024-0402

Site No: FS0560

**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)
- Screens are in place at inlets and outlets to the site and at each pond/raceway. Top netting used to prevent aerial access
- 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)

Case No: 2024-0402 Site No: FS0560 Date of visit: 22/10/2024

[illegible]

[illegible]



Case No: 2024-0402

Date of visit: 22/10/2024

Site No: **FS0560**

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0134	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	22/10/2024
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0560	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Torhouse Mill
<b>CASE No</b>	20240402	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	[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 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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

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.

R04



**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.

**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: 30/10/2024

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/)