FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ied by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2025-0018			Date of visit: 27/01/2025
Time spent on site:	า	Main Inspecto	pr:
Site No: FS1321 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Barcaldine Hatchery Incubatio Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	n 1
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 6.5	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y
Observations:	Region: ST	Water type: F	CoGP MA
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed?	•		mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
Diagnostic samples taken?			
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail rea	ason below:	

## FHI 059, Version 13 Additional Case Information:

A couple of dead ova noted, site stocked with Elite broodstock (Aquagen)

Increased mortalities 2024 wk 23 54381 (3.56%) non viable ova, wk 34 42268 (3.14%) unviable/failed hatch. Wk 35 29797 (2.29%) unviable/failed hatch.

No treatments have been administered.

Health screening is undertaken prior to transfers offsite.

Site thermometer is calibrated once a year by an Electronic Temperature Instruments. This is used to recalibrate all the probes on site.

FHI 059, Version 13			lssu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2025-0018	]	Site No: FS1321					
Date of Visit:		27/01/202	5		Inspector(s):			I
Registration/Author 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y Y	}
Site Details (includ	le cleaner fis	The second se	tions)		-	_		-
Total No facilitian		5 comp hatches	Facilities sto	akad	24 baskets	No focilitio	ainonaatad	5 comp hatches
Total No facilities Species	SAL	natches	Facilities sto	скеа	24 Daskels	NO TACILITIE	s inspected	natches
Age group	Ova 2025							
No Fish	534,945		-					
Mean Fish Wt	N/A							
Next Fallow Date (S		Early Feb 2	025	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	End of Feb	2025	
Recent (last 4 wks)	,				Any escapes	(since last v	/isit)?	N
If yes, detail:							·	
Movement Records	e							
1. Movement record		or inspection?	)					Y
2. Date of last inspe							16/04/2024	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?					Y
4. Are movement re	cords availab	le for dead fi	sh and waste?	•				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certific	ates for intro	ductions (out	with GB) availa	able?				N/A
Transport Records								
1. Are any movement		it by (or on be	ehalf) of the hu	isiness (not us	ing a STB)?			Y
If yes, is there a sys		• •		•	-			Y
Mortality Records	ovoiloble for i							
1. Mortality records					Ensiled - on s	vito		1
2. How are mortalitie If other detail:	es disposed c	)) <u>(</u>			Ensiled - on s	Sile		
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly en	tered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (	•	concetty en		e last four weel	ks unviable ov	/2		
5. Evidence of recer		atypical morta				/u.		N
If yes, facility nos/no		••		/reason:				
			. ,					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	uring period c	hecked?					Y
If yes, detail:		al information						
7. Have increased (	unexplained)	mortalities be	een reported to	o vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	eported to FH	I? If no, enter	details on mor	tality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	N/A
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/A
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	N/A
Biosecurity Records	
1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recordir	ng and safe disposal been considered?
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scott	tish 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	ce or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease
is detected been included and how and when that will be notifi	ed to Scottish Ministers?
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked (health status, certification if required)?	on the farm site been covered (equal or higher Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visit	
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 implement	ted on site?
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or or	n behalf of, the business?
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: 16	6/4/2024 to 27/1/2025

FHI 059, Version 13

Case Number:	2025-0018		Site No:	FS1321		Insp:	
Date of Visit	27/01/2025		No of me	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of r	movements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species	compartment in	movements on from equivalent zone or including third country	0				9
	Number of sup	pliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of r	movements off	0	3	6		3
	Number of des	stinations	0	3	6	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	s 0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or	•	0				0
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	e or in a coastal zone with category I m or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstream	e or in a coastal zone with category III m or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		e or in a coastal zone with category V m or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processinç	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	ocessing	0				0
	Processing ow	vn fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	h from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	h from zone or compartment of tus	4				
	Processing fish	h from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	h from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	ste only processed.	0				
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	nt for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	unpasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpas	steurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	s 1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	g from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing s	staff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0				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				
					<b>Total</b> Rank		27 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2025-0018	Site No:	FS1321
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 ed	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	year class basis?
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (ir	
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as a and can these be deployed in a reasonable pe	well as access to suitable biological and/or mederiod of time?	chanical control measures,
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Management Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the s	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for insp	pection? (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 ( <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
8. Have average adult female sea lice ( <i>L. salr</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period	<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
If yes, have these been reported to the Fish H	lealth Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare prob	lems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis</i> <i>longatus</i> is considered to have welfare implica	
11. Has any other action been taken (where a	pplicable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions	s taken had a significant impact upon the lice le	evels recorded?
	out in cooperation between participating farms	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, sea lice?	where fewer populations or part populations are	e held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage recognised scenarios during the escalation of	ment procedure with waypoints describing set a sea lice infestation?	actions to deal with
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
-	ge due to predators in the current or previous p	roduction cycles?
	he predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
Site indoors, vermin control points.	· · · ·	
If other, detail below:		
<ol> <li>Have escape incidents or events been exp</li> </ol>	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	ne last FHI inspection? N
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip	-	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	ters?	
•	rthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP - 4.4.37, 5.	
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and	l local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exis	st)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esca	apees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action ac	reed with local wild fish interests and was per	nission given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		
9. What action was taken to prevent and minin	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory measur	es of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re-	egards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s) Y

FHI 059, Version 13

Case No:	2025-0018	Date of visit: 27/01/2025
Site No:	FS1321	Inspector:

Results Summary	Freq.			Da	ate of Notifica	ation		
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
					_			
					-			
	-				-			
					-			

Report Summary			
	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp
ECI,CNI	05/02/2025		



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

### SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 BUSINESS NO
 FB0125

 SITE NO
 FS1321

 CASE NO
 20250018

DATE OF VISIT 27/01/2025 SITE NAME Barcaldine H INSPECTOR

27/01/2025 Barcaldine Hatchery Incubation 1

### 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 high. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted annually. 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.

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 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: Fish Health Inspector

Date: 5/2/2025

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)