FHI 059, Version 14		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 04/04/2025
Case No: 2025-0207			Date of visit: 18/06/2025
Additional inspector(s):		Main Inspecto	r:
Site No: FS1347 Business No: FB0568	Site Name: Business Name:	AGRF (Hatchery - RAS A) The Roslin Institute	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3	4 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 10	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed Y
Observations:	Region: LO	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Post mortem signs observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see additional infor	mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet. mation/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Health certificate ICE HLT 2505626 seen on site.

3000 eggs came on site 03/06/25 - only 2 morts since that time. Checking numbers of eggs used after import.

Any dead/culled fish are deemed "biological/clinical waste" and are bagged up, autoclaved on site and are then sent to be incinerated. University wide pick up of clinical waste therefore no transfer notes for waste are held on site. All movements off site recorded in the site's movement book are dead/culled fish being moved to a different part of the university to carry out the clinical waste process.

No treatments carried out on site except for culling by overdose of anaesthetics. Culls recorded on mortality sheet.

The only medicine on site is the anaesthetics MS222 (Tricane) for culling fish and is held in a fridge in the locked room. Only certain people have access.

Health screen panel - Microbacterium came back clear except mycobacterium chelonae and gordonae

FHI 059, Vers	ion 14			Issued by: F	FHI		Date o	of issue: 04/04/2025
Case No:	2025-0207		Site No:	FS1347	7			
Date of Visit:		18/06/2025]		Main Insp:			
Registration/	Authorisatio	n Details						
1. Business/si	te details sun	nmary checked	by site repre	esentative?			Υ	
2. Changes m		•					N	
Site Details (include clear	ner fish for all	sections)					
Total No facili		16	Facilities sto	cked	3	No facilities	inspected	16
0	Atlantic	Atlantic						
Species	salmon	salmon						
Age group	2025	2024						
No Fish	4 trays	13						
Name Cink MA	<1g	40g						
Mean Fish Wi		N			(01)	1 0000		
Next Fallow D	, ,	No plans to t	allow	Next Input D	_ ` '	August 2025		
Recent (last 4	wks) disease	e problems?		I	Any escape	s (since last vi	sit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
Massamant D								
Movement Ro		I amaaisa bald	available for	in an a ati a m O				V
		I species held	avallable for	inspection?			00/44/0000	T
2. Date of last	•	.1	10				09/11/2022	V
	•	d correctly ent						Y
		vailable for de		aste?				Y NI/A
	•	d correctly ent						N/A
		d imports (sind	ce last inspec	tion) from ou	twith the GB h	nealth zone be	en recorded	Y
the movemen	t records?							
Transport Re	cords							
1. Are any mo	vements carr	ied out not usi	ng a STB (by	(or on behalf	of) the busin	ess)?		Y
If yes, is there	a system in p	place for maint	enance of tra	ansportation r	ecords?			Y
Mortality Red								
		species held a	vailable for in	spection?				Y
2. How are mo					Other (detai	l)		
If other detail:								
3. Mortality re-	cords comple	te and correctl	y entered?					Y
4. Recent mo	rtality (last 4 v	vks):	In the last 4	weeks: 2 dea	ad eggs			
5. Evidence of	f recent increa	ased/atypical n	nortalities?					N
If yes, facility	nos/no mortal	lity per facility/r	no stock per f	acility/reason	:			
0 1								
	eaks in morta	ality during peri	od checked?					IN
If yes, detail:					FLUO			N1/A
	•	ained) mortaliti	es been repo	rted to vet or	FHI?			N/A
If yes, detail a			EL IIO 11					N1/A
8. Have 'morta	ality events' b	een reported to	o FHI? If no. (enter details d	on mortality e	vents sheet.		N/A

Taraturanta and Madiainaa Basanda					
Treatments and Medicines Records 1. Recent treatments (see comment)?					N
If yes, detail:	_			_	14
If other, detail:	_				
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 remova	al, recording an	d safe disposa	al been consid	dered?	Y
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will r	otify Scottish M	linisters or vet	erinary profes	ssional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been in	cluded?				Y
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the	•	•	•		
disease is detected been included and how and whe					Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being higher health status, certification if required)?	stocked on the	e farm site bee	en covered (e	qual or	Y
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures imprinimise transmission of disease been covered (movetc.)?		•	•		Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measure	s in place to ma	intain the phy	sical containn	nent of	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?				'	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately	implemented or	n site?			Y
If no, detail:					
Results of Surveillance					
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried o	ıt by, or on beh	alf of, the bus	iness?		Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?					Y
3. Any significant results?					N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease pro	olems).				
Records checked between:	09/11/2022 -	18/06/2025			

FHI 059, Version 14		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issu	ie: 04/04/202
Case Number:	2025-0207		Site No:	FS1347	Main Ins	p:	
Date of Visit	18/06/2025		No of me	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of mo (non-GB).	ovements on from British Islands	0	5	10	14	
species		ovements on from a third country	0		18	26	9
	Number of supp	liers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of mo		0		6	10	0
Evenesure vie weter	Number of desti		0		6	10	0
Exposure via water Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protecte disinfection or be	Site contacts of (secure water supply through orehole)	0	1-5	6-10		0
susceptible to same diseases)	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category I or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing waters	plant discharging into adjacent	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm proc	essing	T 0				0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	fish (re-cycling risk)	1				Ü
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent status		4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by- products		· ·	0				0
	•	sses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5	J			
Use of unpasteurised feeds		pasteurised feed	0				0
	Feeding unpaste		5				
Biosecurity	10::	Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4		
Contacts with other sites	. •	from single shorebase aff and equipment	0		2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		 	<u> </u>	_		
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		0				0
CoGP/Regulator			<u> </u>	J			
Practices in accordance	Yes		Το	1			0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				J
Platform access to cages	Yes		0	1			0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		16 MEDIUM
					···		

FHI 059, Version 14	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 04/04/202
Case No: 2025-0207	Site No:	FS1347
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)		
Has the site experienced sea lice problems in	the previous 4 years?	
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equi		ar class basis?
Does the site have access to a range of licend azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well can these be deployed in a reasonable period of	l as access to suitable biological and/or mecha	
 Is there a signed documented farm managem Management Area (or equivalent)? 	ent agreement or statement relevant to the site	
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspec	ction? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
6. Do records adequately reflect the required sta	ndard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Le	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoC	P during the period that
8. Have weekly average adult female sea lice co	unts at or above the intervention level been re	ported accurately?
If no, please detail in additional information.		
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which is	considered to cause significant welfare probler	ns? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administe suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elon</i>		
11. Has any other action been taken (where app	licable)?	
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions to		els recorded?
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried ou	it in cooperation between participating farms?	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, wh lice?	ere fewer populations or part populations are h	neld without treatment for sea
15. Is there a site specific written lice management scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infe		tions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks re	flect sea lice count data? If no please detail rea	asons.
Containment Inspection		
Has the site experienced equipment damage		duction cycles?
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the	predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y
Tank lids/covers Traps If other, detail below:		
ii other, detail below.		
3. Have escape incidents or events been experie	enced 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 Minister	s?	
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forth		
Have these been reported to the SSPO and Ic	cal fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escape	ees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agre	ed with local wild fish interests and was permis	ssion given by Scottish
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	The state of the s	3.13.1 2, 230.113.1
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimis		code but could
be considered under satisfactory measures		n(s)
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with rega	ilus to containinent? Il 110, piease detail reasor	1(0)

Date of issue: 04/04/2025

		_									
Case No:	2025-0207	J		Date of vis	sit: 18/06/20	025					
Site No:	FS1347	1		Main Ins	sp:						
Results Summary	Freq.	Database	Date of Notification Database Insp Phone Insp Writing Insp 2 nd Ins								
		Database	ПЭР	i none	Insp	witting	Insp	2 nd Ins			
	+										
	_										
		 									
	_										
	+										
		1									
		1									
Report Summary		I		1							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI	27/06/2025										
	+										
	+										



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0568 DATE OF VISIT 18/06/2025

SITE NO FS1347 SITE NAME AGRF (Hatchery - RAS A)

CASE NO 20250207 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.

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 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: 27/06/2025
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)