FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0415			Date of visit: 01/11/2024
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspect	or:
Site No: FS0567 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Furnace Bakkafrost Scotland	
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 WEL 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.6	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-42
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observe Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional info	rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet. rmation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	il reason below:	

### **Additional Case Information:**

Wild caught wrasse on site

Freshwater only (no FLS) used to treat the AGD.

Two full cages harvested on 07/10 (cage 3) and 09/10 (cage 4). These were harvested due to high mortality from AGD Pseudo-nitzschia plankton bloom in the area over the last month had caused some mortality.

Last biologist report (from 21/10/24) states that the fish showed signs of PGD but little sign of AGD since last treatment. Also some sign of lesions. Gill health is reported to be stable

Biologist visits twice weekly.

During blooms fish fed alternate days

Freshwater treatment occurred on 29/07/24 all cages for AGD. Second freshwater treatment occurred on 05/09/24 also for AGD. No FLS used. Gill swabs reportedly have shown the treatments have been successful at reducing AGD.

Moribund fish are removed as and when observed by site staff. Each cage is walked around everyday to remove moribund fish.

Wrasse numbers at harvest do not match-up with numbers counted or removed at harvest time. These losses are classed as black loss on the system. Up to 52% weekly black loss for wrasse on site since input. Input of 1,367 wrasse to cage 3 out of these 985 attributed to black loss. Input of 1,455 wrasse to cage 4 and 680 attributed to black loss. Both cages have now been harvested. Total wrasse black loss over the site is 51.32% (4,385 fish). Manager does not know how this discrepancy has come about.

All ballan wrasse stocked on site. Agreement written by Bakkafrost and signed by wrasse supplier states that all wrasse must be between 12-24cm. Wrasse supplier and site staff perform a visual check of wrasse size before/at input.

Environmental conditions are more favourable and mortality is reportedly reducing.

Site manager will continue to monitor fish health with the help of biologists and if health issues occur again the site will be harvested.

One moribund fish was observed on site during the inspection but was too deep to catch with a hand net

Accompanied by **Example 1** from the Animal and Plant Health Agency who asked questions regarding fish welfare and inspection of livestock. The case was referred to APHA following reports in increased mortality from the business

FHI 059, Version 13			lssu	ed by: FHI		Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2024-0415	]	Site No:	FS0567	]		
Date of Visit:		01/11/2024	]		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Author 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summar		ite representa	ative?		Y	7
-							-
Site Details (includ Total No facilities	le cleaner fi	sh for all sect	ions) Facilities sto	akad	4	No facilities inspected	6
Species	SAL	WRS	Facilities Sto	l	7	No facilities inspected	0
Age group	23 Q4	mixed wild					
No Fish	53,025	1,348					
Mean Fish Wt	4.632kg	mixed wild					
Next Fallow Date (S		Feb 2025		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	Jan 2026	
Recent (last 4 wks)					_ ` `	(since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail:		med on site an	nd SRS.			(,,,,	
Maximum A Damand							
Movement Record		or increation?					
<ol> <li>Movement record</li> <li>Date of last inspe</li> </ol>		or inspection?				12/10/2022	T
3. Are records comp		rootly optorod?	,			12/10/2022	
4. Are movement re				,			Y
5. Are records comp							Y
6. Are health certific				able?			N/A
o. Are nearly certine							
Transport Records	5						
1. Are any movement		ut by (or on be	half) of the bu	usiness (not usi	ing a STB)?		Ν
If yes, is there a sys							
Martality Decerda							
Mortality Records 1. Mortality records	ovoilable for	increation?					V
2. How are mortalitie		•			Whole fich	Dundas Chemicals	· ·
If other detail:		01?			whole lish -		
3. Mortality records	complete an	d correctly ent	ered?				
5. Mortality records	complete an	a concerty enti		3· 1 225 fieb (2	21%) w/ 12.	966 fish (1.73%), wk 41	· 1 336 fich
					1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	attributed to environme	
						3: 1,513 fish (52%), wk	
4. Recent mortality (	(last 4 wks):					619 fish (17.57%)	
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/	atypical mortal		× *			Y
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality pe	er facility/no sto	ock per facility	/reason:			
See additional comr	nents. Cage	s 3 and 4 were	worst affecte	ed before harve	esting.		
6. Any other peaks i	in mortality d	uring period ch	necked?				Y
	Increase in	mortality bega	in in early Sep	otember (wk 36	δ). Mortality ve	ry low levels before this.	Attributed on
				•		D. There was also som	-
						rate: wk 36: 4,728 fish	
If you dataily		sh (1.96%), wł	< 38: 2,084 fis	h (2.44%), wk	39: 4,626 fish	(5.54%). This was repo	rted to the
If yes, detail:	FHI		an namente dit				
7. Have increased (	unexplained)						Y
If yes, detail action:	(onto! home		d head vet not			haat	
8. Have 'mortality ev	vents been r	eported to FHI	r in no, enter	details on mon	anty events sr	leet.	r

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: Optomease	
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)? Optomease	
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	Y
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	Y
transmission of disease been covered (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 held on site?	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	v
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	V
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
<ol> <li>If yes, are results available for inspection?</li> <li>Any significant results?</li> </ol>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y Y

FHI 059, Version 13

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, VEISION 15		Issued by. FHI			Date t	JI ISSUE	. 12/03/2020
Case Number:	2024-0415		Site No:	FS0567		Insp:	
Date of Visit	01/11/2024		No of mo	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible		novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
species		novements on from equivalent zone or ncluding third country	0	9	18	26	
	Number of sup		0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of n	novements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of des	tinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or	ted (secure water supply through borehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
	farms upstrean	or in a coastal zone with category III n 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	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing ow	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	n from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent stat	n from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	n from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	n from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	Inpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites		from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance	Yes		0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		20 MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0415	Site No:	FS0567
3. Does the site have access to a range of lice	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in well as access to suitable biological and/or medi	ncluding deltamethrin, Y
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm Y
<ol> <li>5. Are sea lice count records available for insp</li> <li>6. Do records adequately reflect the required</li> </ol>	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (	Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6) Y
7. Are sea lice ( <i>L. salmonis</i> ) record levels bel records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that Y
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salı</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the perio	<i>nonis</i> ) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or od that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or N
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H 9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment. is considered to cause significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50) N
suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C.</i> e 11. Has any other action been taken (where a 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the action 13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> <i>longatus</i> is considered to have welfare implica upplicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le out in cooperation between participating farms where fewer populations or part populations ar	ations? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51) evels recorded? s? Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice in	ment procedure with waypoints describing set nfestation?	actions to deal with recognised Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons. Y
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against t	ge due to predators in the current or previous p he predation experienced on site? (Detail belov ets, pest control contract on shore base, fe	w) Y
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB for	•	4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18) 9. What action was taken to prevent and mini be considered under satisfactory measure	greed with local wild fish interests and was perm mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered res of the Act) egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	in code but could

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2024-0415	Site No: FS0567	
Date of Visit: 01/11/2024	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located If N, no further questions require compl	_	Y
<ol> <li>Has a current farm management agr</li> <li>Is the current FMAg/S available for in</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant</li> <li>Does the FMAg/S identify the fish fait</li> </ol>	nt farm management area? rm site(s) to which it applies? f commencement of the agreement or sta	pared? Y Y Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Manager 8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum farm?	<b>gement</b> um health standards for the stocks to be i	introduced to the area or Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccin 10. Does the FMAg/S identify the speci	ation requirements for stocks held in the ies of fish which may be stocked into the mum stocking density of any pen on any f	area or farm? Y
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arran fish farm in the area or the individual fa	gements for the storage and disposal of a arm?	any dead fish from any Y
Arrangements for The Management 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangen	of Sea Lice nents for the sharing of data on sea lice n	numbers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availa of statement?	ability and the use of medicines on farms	covered by the agreement Y
	irements for the sensitivity testing of avail arms?	able treatments for sea
	mstances under which biological controls	
	gements for synchronous treatments on t	farms within the area? Y
Live Fish Movements 18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circur area or farm?	mstances when live fish may be introduce	
	gements for the movement of live fish on	and off sites in the area Y

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptabl	e harvest practices on farms in the area or individual	farms? Y
Fallowing		
21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates date when a farm or area may be restor	by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and cked?	d the earliest Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether or agreement or statement?	one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites o	covered by the Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether b covered by the agreement or statement	proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on a ?	any site Y
<b>Point of Compliance for Farm Manag</b> 24. Does the farm management agreen parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to become, or	r cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or stater of the FMAg/S? 01/08/2023	ment? Y

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2024-0415	]		Date of visit:	01/11/2024	]		
Site No:	FS0567	]		Inspector:		I		
Results Summary	Freq.			Da	te of Notifica	tion		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
	1							
	1							

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI, CNI, SLI	13/11/2024		



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

# SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0169

 SITE NO
 FS0567

 CASE NO
 20240415

DATE OF VISIT01/11/2024SITE NAMEFurnaceINSPECTORInspector

## 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.

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.

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, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

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



Date: 20/11/2024

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)