Additional Case Information:

Inspection lead by _____, observed by _____. Remote inspection of biosecurity records undertaken 30/10/2024. Movement, transport, treatment and health surveillance records inspected on site 04/11/2024. Remote inspection of mortality records undertaken 11/11/2024 due to the software being down at the time of visit.

Mortalities can also be disposed of via Billy Bowie as whole fish if they cannot be incinerated onsite. Two uplifts during previous cycle and waste transfer notes available and adequate.

No disease issues observed on site at time of inspection. Fish sampled for VMD showed no clinical signs of disease.

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI		Date of i	ssue: 12/05/2020					
Case No: 2024-0417	Site No: FS043	4							
Date of Visit: 04/1	1/2024	Inspector(s):							
Registration/Authorisation Details 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? 2. Changes made to details?									
Site Details (include cleaner fish for Total No facilities Species SAL Age group 2024 Q4 No Fish 1,010,874 Mean Fish Wt 71.53 g Next Fallow Date (Site) 24/12/Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	Facilities stocked Next Input		No facilities inspected 01/07/2025 (since last visit)?	18 N					
Movement Records 1. Movement records available for inspection? 2. Date of last inspection: 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? Transport Records 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?									
Mortality Records	ation?								
 Mortality records available for inspect How are mortalities disposed of? 	MOIT:	Incinerated -	on site	1					
If other detail:									
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? N wk 41: site fallow, wk 42: site fallow, wk 43: 0.03 % (140 fish), wk 44: 0.03 %									
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical	(295 fish) al mortalities?			N					
If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:									
6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? Peaks attributed to fungus mortality observed in wk 29 2024 pens 10 to 15; highest mortality pen 12 2175 fish, site mortality 1.04%. Wk 30 pens 10 to 15; highest mortality pen 14 1940 fish, site mortality 0.92 %. Wk 33 pens 5, 11 to 17; highest mortality pen 15 2485 fish, site mortality 1.18 %.									
7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?									
If yes, detail action: 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)?
If yes, detail: Aquacen, Cress and Tricaine
If other, detail:
2. Medicines records available for inspection?
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?
5. If yes, what treatment(s)? Aquacen and Tricaine
If other, detail:
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?
Biosecurity Records
Biosecurity records available for inspection?
Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?
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?
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?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher
health status, certification if required)?
C. U
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.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of
aquaculture animals held on site?
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:
ii iio, detaii.
Results of Surveillance
Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?
3. Any significant results?
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).
Pre-transfer health report inspected, detection of Saprolegnia so treated with Aquacen and Cress during transfer.
Records checked between: 26/07/2023-04/11/2024

	ii 000, version 10					1330	aca by. i						
	Case no:	2024-0417		Site No:		FS0434			Date of		04/	11/2024	04/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	ig. HI]	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	14:00:0	00	14:1	5:00	١	Inspecto	r:			VMD N	0.	8
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5		1	
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-16	17-32										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	0.0715	0.0715										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	FW	FW										
stock Details	Stock Origin Facility No	Lochailort Hatchery (FS1007)	Lochailort Hatchery (FS1007)										
(O)	I donity 140	4											

Additional Sample Information: VMD samples sampled by
VMD samples sampled by . Fish killed by anaesthetic overdose.
Total Tests assigned 0

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2024-0417		Site No:	FS0434		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/11/2024		No of m	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 including third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup		0		10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m	novements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of desi		0	3	6	10	10
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,	0				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 n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		0
		or in a coastal zone with category V n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		0
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 the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
		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]			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	1			
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	ĺ			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		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		0
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator							
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2	1			
					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) 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 emame 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 equiv
- 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 inspecte
- 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

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
- 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
- 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?
- Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)

Top nets and pest control contract for shorebase.

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?
- 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, CoG
- 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)

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
2024-0417	Site No: FS0434	
ectin benzoate) as well as access to suitab	le 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 <i>C. elongatus</i> is consid	dered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	
the escalation of a sea lice infestation?		
		N Y
		N
iP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
		Y
		1

Casa Na	2024 0447			D-46-:-:	. 04/44/20	24			
Case No:	2024-0417	J		Date of visi	t: 04/11/20	24			
Site No:	FS0434]		Inspector	r:				
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp							
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp	
	+								
	+	 							
	+	-							
	+								
	1								
	+	-							
	1								
Report Summary									
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp						
ECI, CNI, VMD	11/11/2024								
	<u> </u>								
	+								
	+								
	1								



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 04/11/2024

 SITE NO
 FS0434
 SITE NAME
 Loch Ness

 CASE NO
 20240417
 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 appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be inadequately maintained. Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. However, the figure submitted for week 34 of 2024 was estimated by weight. Upon transfer to sea the stock was counted and a more accurate figure was obtained which was under the reporting criteria. This amended figure had not been communicated to the Fish Health Inspectorate resulting in a discrepancy in records during the inspection. Following the inspection the figures have been amended.

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: 11/11/2024
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)