

Case No:	2025-0046	Date of visit:	04/02/2025			
Time spent on site:	2.5hrs	Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS1362	Site Name:	Applecross Smolt Unit 2			
Business No:	FB0169	Business Name:	Bakkafrost Scotland			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 VMD	4	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	9	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed	Y	
Observations:	Region:	HI	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:

Site had been experiencing increased mortalities at the end of 2024 due to flavobacterium and fungal issues, during this time stock was treated with increased salinity (mortality events had been reported to the FHI). Following week 52 2024 mortalities began to decrease with week 1 2025 mortalities dropped to 0.69%(7250) then dropped significantly in week 2 to 0.32% (3325). Mortalities have continued to drop. Mortalities are currently low on site however background mortalities have been attributed to flavobacterium and Saprolegnia.

Recent health surveillance was conducted observed flavobacterium, Saprolegnia and salmon gill poxvirus at low levels.

Elevated mortality was noted during week 51 1.35% (10,365) which was attributed to flavobacterium and fungal issues. This is below reporting threshold.

Tanks 1&2 were on a separate recirc system to tanks 3&4. Due to this there was slight variations in water temperatures tank 4 was 8 degrees, tank 1&2 were 10 degrees.

The general population of the stock were shoaling and swimming well. Fish were feeding well and had a good response to stimuli. Few fish were observed to have lesion that had healed from previous fungal issues but were swimming and feeding well. It was observed that there was poor water quality which is attributed the stress on ozone system, however this was not impacting the fish. 18 fish were sampled from 3 tanks for VMD, fish internally were observed to be in good condition, with 2 sampled fish had pectoral damage.

Site thermometer was used due to biosecurity risks. Thermometers are calibrated before every intake and checked daily with oxyguard probes. Records and procedures of calibrations were checked and found to be satisfactory.

Site records were inspected in person on 04/02/2025 by [REDACTED] whilst supervised by [REDACTED].

Site inspection of stock conducted on 05/02/2025 by [REDACTED] whilst supervised by [REDACTED]. VMD fish were sampled on 05/02/2025 by [REDACTED] whilst supervised by [REDACTED].

Case No:	2025-0046		Site No:	FS1362	
Date of Visit:	04/02/2025		Inspector(s):		

Registration/Authorisation Details

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? Y

2. Changes made to details? N

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	4	Facilities stocked	3	No facilities inspected	4
Species	SAL	SAL	Sal		
Age group	Smolt	Smolt	Smolt		
No Fish	208,650	317,282	381,395		
Mean Fish Wt	189.2	168.9	93.5		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	unknown		Next Input Date (Site)	FEB 2025	
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: 19/11/2024

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)? N

If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records available for inspection? Y

2. How are mortalities disposed of? Biogas - Barkip

If other detail: collected into mort bins and billy bowie collects to take to barkip

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): wk5 - 0.13% (1292), wk4 - 0.17%(1795), wk3 - 0.32% (3325), wk2 - 0.69%(7250)

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: see additional information

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

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)?

N

If yes, detail:

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)?

TMS

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:

19/11/2024 - 04/02/2025

Case no: 2025-0046 Site No: FS1362 Date of visit/ Sampling: 04/02/2025 05/0

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: 11:00:00 12:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. 9

Environmental conditions: 1 Indoors 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

	Pool/Fish No											
	Fish nos	1-7	8-14	15-18								
	Pool Group											
Stock Details	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL								
	Average weight	150.5g	150.5g	150.5g								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	FW	FW	FW								
	Stock Origin											
	Facility No	4	2	1								

Fish sampled for VMD were dispatched via TMS

0

[illegible]

Case Number:	2025-0046	Site No:	FS1362	Insp:		
Date of Visit	04/02/2025	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
Live fish movements		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
Exposure via water	Site contacts	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				0
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	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		
Management practices		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				
Biosecurity	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
CoGP/Regulator						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
Total Rank					20	MEDIUM

Case No: 2025-0046

Site No: FS1362

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) followed 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? ☐ N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below) ☐ Y

Indoors, pest control, mesh screens (outflow mesh 6mm)

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? ☐ N
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) ☐ y

Case No: 2025-0046

Date of visit: 04/02/2025

Site No: **FS1362**

Inspector: [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	05/02/2025
SITE No	FS1362	SITE NAME	Applecross Smolt Unit 2
CASE No	20250046	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 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.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

R04



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: 11/02/2025

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/)