	Issued by: FHI		Date of issue: 1	2/05/2020
			Date of visit: 04/12/2	2023
Hours	N	Main Inspector	r:	
Site Name: Business Name:				
2 CNI 3 VMD	4	5	6	
Thermometer No:	Site]	FHI 045 completed	N/A
Region: DG	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
fish present? d?	Y If yes, see ac	dditional inforn	nation/clinical score she	et.
out intended visit detai	reason below:			
	Hours Site Name: Business Name: CNI 3 VMD Thermometer No: Region: DG fish present?	Site Name: Business Name: Page 1	Site Name: Business Name: Hoghill Fish Farm Hoghill Trout Farm Ltd CNI Thermometer No: Site Region: DG Water type: F fish present? Ty If yes, see additional inform N If yes, see additional inform N	Date of visit: 04/12/2 Hours Main Inspector: Site Name: Business Name: Hoghill Fish Farm Hoghill Trout Farm Ltd CNI 3 VMD 4 5 6 Thermometer No: Site FHI 045 completed Region: DG Water type: F CoGP MA: fish present? If yes, see additional information/clinical score shell fights, see additional information/clinical score shell fights, see additional information/clinical score shell fights.

Additional Case Information:

One or two moribund fish observed during the inspection, however overall there were no issues on site.

Last treatment in Dec 2022 - Aquatet for RMS.

VMD fish appeared healthy when opened.

Site temperature recorded as inspector's thermometer was unavailable.

FHI 059, Version	13		Is	sued by: FHI			Date of issue:	12/05/2020
Case No:	2023-054	7	Site No:	FS0	822			
Date of Visit:		04/12/20	23		Inspector(s	3):		
Registration/Aut	horisation D	etails						
1. Business/site d			v site represe	ntative?			Υ	
2. Changes made		,	,				N	
Site Details (incl	ude cleaner i	fish for all se	ections)					
Total No facilities		9	Facilities s	stocked	9	No faciliti	es inspected 9	
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	TRO	TRO		T	
Age group	2018	2022	2023	2022	2023			
No Fish	70	17,500	20,000	5,000	5,000			
Mean Fish Wt	3 Kg	800g	30g	1.2 kg	30g			
Next Fallow Date		No plans			t Date (Site)	No plans		
Recent (last 4 wk	s) disease pro	oblems?			N Any escape	es (since last	t visit)?	N
If yes, detail:						·		
3. Are records con 4. Are movement 5. Are records con 6. Are health certi Transport Recor 1. Are any moven If yes, is there a s	records available records available records available records for interest carried bystem in place	able for dead orrectly entere roductions (or out by (or on	fish and wasted? utwith GB) ava behalf) of the	ailable? business (no	-		E	N/A N/A N/A Y
Mortality Record							_	V
1. Mortality record		•			Other (deta	SilV		I
How are mortal If other detail:					Other (deta	iii)		
3. Mortality record	Landfill <2		ntorod?					V
4. Recent mortality	•	•		1 2 fish nor :	wools gorges the	oito		
 Kecent mortality Evidence of red 				~1-2 lish per v	veek across the	site		N
If yes, facility nos/		• •		lity/roacon:			L	
ir yes, racility rios/	Tio mortality p	er racility/110	Slock per racii	iity/reasori.				
6. Any other peakIf yes, detail:	s in mortality	during period	checked?					N
7. Have increased	•	d) mortalities	been reported	d to vet or FHI	?			N/A
If yes, detail actio 8. Have 'mortality		reported to F	HI? If no, ente	er details on r	nortality events	sheet.		N/A
			-,		7			

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?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
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	Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
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: 13/10/2021 - 04/12/2021	

ы	al 059, version 13		Issued by: FHI										
	Case no:	2023-05	547	Site No:		FS0822			Date of vi Sampling		04/	12/2023	04/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:3	0:00	14:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	о.	2
	Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2	Windy	3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
Г	Fish nos	F1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	600g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
									_				
		ge											
,,		3rid											
<u></u>		d G											
Details		sto											
<u> </u>	Stock Origin	Dunstop Bridge											
Stock	Facility No	6											
U,	, , , , , ,												

	_	_												
12/2023	12/2023 Additional Sample Information:													
0]	Total To	ests ass	signed	0									

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2023-0547		Site No:	FS0822		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/12/2023		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or	0	0	40	200	
орсою	Number of supp	ocluding third country	0			26 14	
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Exposure via water	Number of desi	Site contacts				10	10
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	ı	I-3	0-10		
farms (holding species	disinfection or b		0				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I	1	0	4		4
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		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	Any processing	plant discharging into adjacent waters					
processors			0	1	2		0
On farm processing within	No on farm pro	cessing	0]			0
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
		from zone or compartment of					
	equivalent statu	IS	4				
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	0				0
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	, 1			0
oco or ampaoroamoca rocac	Feeding unpas	<u>.</u>	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites		J 2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	0		2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes			1			
between sites, use of	No		0				0
footbaths etc	140		1	J			
CoGP/Regulator Practices in accordance	Yes			1			
with regulator or industry			0				
code of practice	No		3				3
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			
i lationii access to cages	No		2				0
	140			J			
					Total		24
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2023-0547	Site No:	FS0822
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only	v)	
Has the site experienced sea lice probler		
	equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	vear class basis?
3. Does the site have access to a range of	licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in section in section) as well as access to suitable biological and/or me	ncluding deltamethrin,
4. Is there a signed documented farm mana Management Area (or equivalent)?	agement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for in	nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
	ed standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	pelow the suggested criteria for treatment in the	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. s.</i> 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the pe	almonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or ariod that records are inspected?	r above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
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	ch is considered to cause significant welfare prol	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	inistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonia</i> . elongatus is considered to have welfare implications.	
11. Has any other action been taken (where	e applicable)?	
	ons taken had a significant impact upon the lice	
	ed out in cooperation between participating farm	
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the situsea lice?	e, where fewer populations or part populations a	re held without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice mana scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	gement procedure with waypoints describing set e infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stoc	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
-	nage due to predators in the current or previous	production cycles?
	st the predation experienced on site? (Detail belo	
Topnets on pond		<u> </u>
If other, detail below:		
If Yes proceed with questions $4-9$. If No s		the last FHI inspection?
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mil		4.4->
·	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5	,
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO a	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they ex	ist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover e	scapees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	agreed with local wild fish interests and was per	mission given by Scottish
9. What action was taken to prevent and m	inimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	I in code but could
be considered under satisfactory meas 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	sures of the Act) n regards to containment? If no, please detail rea	ison(s)
,		

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2023-0547			Date of visit:	04/12/2023	В					
Site No:	FS0822]		Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
							-				
	+										
							-				
Report Summary	1		<u> </u>	1							
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, VMD	23/02/2023		2 11150								
, ,											
	<u> </u>										
	 										

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0551 DATE OF VISIT 04/12/2023
SITE NO FS0822 SITE NAME Hoghill Fish Farm
CASE NO 20230547 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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last 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.



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)

Date: 23/02/2024

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2023-0548			Date of visit: 20/12/2023
Time spent on site:	Hours	Main In:	spector:
Site No: FS0537 Business No: FB0007	Site Name: Business Name:	Invicta Trout Invicta Trout Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 MIX 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8	Thermometer No:	Site	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type: F	CoGP MA:
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	Y If yes, see additiona	al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet. al information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	il reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

Increased mortality during summer months due to PKD, with secondary aeromonas infection, with mortalities averaging around 2000 per month across the site. Treatments were successful and mortality declined.

100,000 eggs were lost due to a failed pump. Alarm system also failed before alerting that there was an issue with the pump, which delayed the issue being fixed. Both these issues have since been addressed.

VMD fish appeared healthy when sampled.

Site thermometer used as inspector's thermometer unavailable.

FHI 059, Version 13	3		Iss	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	ue: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2023-0548		Site No:	FS053	7			
Date of Visit:		20/12/20)23		Inspector(s):		
Registration/Author	orisation De	tails						
1. Business/site det	tails summar	y checked b	y site represen	tative?			N	7
2. Changes made to	o details?						N]
Site Details (includ	de cleaner fi	ish for all se	ections)					
Total No facilities		50	Facilities st	ocked	42	No facilitie	es inspected	50
Species	RTR	RTR	RTR	RTR	TGR		T	
Age group	2021	2022	2023 (fry)	2023 (ova)	2022			
No Fish	550	42,400	50,000	130,000	3,700			
Mean Fish Wt	1kg	600g	1g	<1g	1.6kg			
Next Fallow Date (S	Site)	No plans		Next Input D	ate (Site)	Jan 2024		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease pro	blems?		1	N Any escape	es (since last	visit)?	N
 Are records completed. Are movement responds to the conditions of the condit	ecords availa plete and col cates for intro s ents carried c	ble for dead rrectly entered oductions (or	fish and waste ed? utwith GB) avai behalf) of the b	ilable? ousiness (not us	· ·			Y Y Y N/A
Mortality Records								
1. Mortality records	available for	inspection?						Y
2. How are mortaliti		•			Other (deta	il)		
If other detail:	Disposed of	of by local co	mpany and use	ed for energy p	roduction	·		
3. Mortality records	complete an	nd correctly e	entered?					Y
4. Recent mortality				onth across the	e whole site			
Evidence of rece		• •						N
If yes, facility nos/no	o mortality pe	er facility/no	stock per facilit	:y/reason:				
6. Any other peaks	in mortality o	during period	checked?					Y
If yes, detail:	See addition	nal informat	ion					
7. Have increased (to vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality e	vents' been i	eported to F	HI? If no, enter	r details on mo	rtality events:	sheet.		N/A

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?	N
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been cons	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary profe	essional 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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish	n etc.)?
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical contain	nment of Y
aquaculture animals held on site?	
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: 26/10/2023 - 20/12/2024	

1111 000, Version 10													
	Case no:	2023-05	548	Site No:		FS0537			Date of v		20/	12/2023	20/
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Sampling	g: HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	12:0	0:00	12:3	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No).	2
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4	\blacksquare	5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1											
	Pool Group												
	Species	RTR											
	Average weight	300g											
	Sex	N/A											
	Water Type	FW											
Details		엉											
)ets		stc											
X C		Own stock											
Stock	Stock Origin												
Ś	Facility No	Center	oond										

12/2023 Additional Sample Information:													
0		Total Te	ests ass	ianed	0								
				9 - 1									

FHI 059, Version 13				Date of	of issue	12/05/2020	
Case Number:	2023-0548		Site No:	FS0537		Insp:	
Date of Visit	20/12/2023		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		0	40	200	0
Species .	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
h							40
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10 10
Exposure via water	Trainibor or acco	Site contacts			6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
		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	plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2	1			
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of us	4				
	Processing fish	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	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3	Ì			
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		0
	Sites sharing st	taff and equipment	0	1	2		
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		0	1			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				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		36 HIGH

Case No:	2023-0548		Site No:	FS0537	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)				
•	nced sea lice problems in the p	revious 4 years?			
·	Nanagement Area (or equivalen	·	n a single ye	ear class basis?	
azamethiphos and em	access to a range of licenced in amectin benzoate) as well as a I in a reasonable period of time	ccess to suitable biological			
4. Is there a signed do Management Area (or	cumented farm management agequivalent)?	greement or statement releva	ant to the si	te and CoGP Farm	
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for inspection?	(Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6))		
	ely reflect the required standard	•		egal SSI, CoGP Anr	nex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	nonis) record levels below the seconds? (CoGP Annex 6)	suggested criteria for treatme	ent in the Co	oGP during the perio	od that
-	female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) r 0/6/19) during the period that re	•	evel of 3 or a	above (prior to w/b 1	0/6/19) or
If yes, have these been	n reported to the Fish Health In	spectorate? If no, FHI see co	omment.		
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is consi	dered to cause significant we	elfare proble	ems? (CoGP 4.3.81,	5.3.50)
	reatments been administered o reatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i>				
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where applicabl	e)?			
12. Have therapeutic to	reatments or the actions taken	nad a significant impact upor	n the lice lev	vels recorded?	
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried out in co	ooperation between participa	ating farms?	•	
14. Is there a harvestir sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, where for	ewer populations or part populations	ulations are	held without treatme	ent for
	sific written lice management pr scalation of a sea lice infestatio		cribing set a	ctions to deal with re	ecognised
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks reflect s	ea lice count data? If no ple	ase detail re	easons.	
Containment Inspect	ion				
•	nced equipment damage due to	predators in the current or	previous pro	oduction cycles?	N
•	ce to mitigate against the preda	•	•	•	Y
Bird netting, pest cor		(,	
If other, detail below					
•	ents or events been experience estions 4 – 9. If No skip to ques	•	site since the	e last FHI inspection	? N
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip to quest ported to Scottish Ministers?	SHOTE TO			
	ported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP -	443754	17)	
	ported to the SSPO and local fi	* / `		•	5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover escapees?	If yes give detail			
8 If all note were deal	oyed was this action agreed wi	th local wild fish interests on	d was norm	ission diven by Soot	tich
Ministers? (Legal, Co	SP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)		·		and i
	ken to prevent and minimise the		ot covered in	n code but could	
	r satisfactory measures of the das satisfactory with regards to		detail reaso	on(s)	Υ

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Site No: FS0537

Case No: 2023-0548

Nature of non-compliance:

Action taken (FHI):

Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology

Case No:	2023-0548	J		Date of vi	isit: 20/12/20	023		
Site No:	FS0537	7		Inspec	tor:			
		4						
Results Summary	Freq.				Date of Noti		•	
		Databas	e Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Ins
D				_				
Report Summary	Doto	lnor	ond .	-				
Case Type	Date 20/01/2024	Insp	2 nd Insp					
MIX ECI, CNI, VMD	30/01/2024 23/02/2023	3						
LOI, OIVI, VIVID	23/02/2023							

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NOFB0007DATE OF VISIT18/12/2023SITE NOFS0537SITE NAMEInvicta TroutCASE NO20230548INSPECTOR

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.

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.

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

R04



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)

Date: 23/02/2024

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI		Date of issue:	12/05/2020
Case No: 2023-0549				Date of visit: 04/12/2	2023
Time spent on site:	hours	\neg	Main Inspector	r:	
Site No: FS0102 Business No: FB0067	Site Name: Business Name:	Moffat Water Selcoth Fisheries	s Ltd		
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 MIX	4	5	6	
Water Temp (°C): 7	Thermometer No:	Site	\supset	FHI 045 completed	N/A
Observations:	Region: DG	Water type:	F	CoGP MA:	
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	N If yes, see a	additional inforn	nation/clinical score she nation/clinical score she nation/clinical score she	eet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit deta	il reason below:			

Additional Case Information:

Site is very well maintained, with good biosecurity procedures.

Site temperature used as inspector's thermometer unavailable.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issue	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2023-0549		Site No:	FS0102]			
Date of Visit:		04/12/2023	ş		Inspector(s):			
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta	•	checked by s	ite representa	ative?			Y	
2. Changes made to	details?						N]
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fisi		_ ′					
Total No facilities		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilitie	es inspected	10
Species	RTR							
Age group	Sep-22							
No Fish	116,984							
Mean Fish Wt	314g							
Next Fallow Date (Si	′	No plans		Next Input Da	_ ` ′	Unknown		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease proble	ems?		N	Any escapes	(since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:								
 3. Are records comp 4. Are movement rec 5. Are records comp 6. Are health certification Transport Records 1. Are any movement If yes, is there a system 	cords available lete and corre ates for introd the carried out	le for dead fis ectly entered? ductions (outwork)	sh and waste? ? vith GB) availa half) of the bu	able? usiness (not usi	-			N/A N/A N/A Y
Mortality Records								V
1. Mortality records a		•			In since start			Ť
2. How are mortalities If other detail:	s disposed of	r?			Incinerated -	on site		
	a manulata and		o v o d O					Y
3. Mortality records of	•	correctly ente		050()	40 (0 040()	40.04./0.05	(0/)	
4. Recent mortality (t micel mortal		.05%) wk48 - 4	16 (U.U4%) WK	49 61 (0.05	%) WK5U - 24	(0.02%) N
5. Evidence of recen		* *		dragger:				IV
If yes, facility nos/no	mortality per	racility/no sto	ck per racility/	reason.				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	ring period ch	necked?					Y
If yes, detail:		• .		4/25 13,389 (1.	8%) 10923 (1	49%) Fish	20g post tran	sfer
7. Have increased (u					1070) 10020 (1	11070/11011	zog poor trans	N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	? If no, enter	details on mort	ality events sh	neet.		N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: Florocol, TMS	
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)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y
Biosecurity Records	
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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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)?	
	V
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	ī
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	1
aquaculture animals held on site?	V
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site? If no, detail:	1
ii iio, detaii.	
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?	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems). RTFS, PKD - No clinical signs	
Records checked between: 02/03/2022 - 20/12/2023	

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date of	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2023-0549		Site No:	FS0102		Insp:	
Date of Visit	04/12/2023		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS	0	5	10	14	
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone or		0	40	200	0
Species .	Number of supp	ncluding third country	0		18 10	26 14	5
Manager							10
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
Exposure via water	Trambor or door	Site contacts			6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	Farm is protect disinfection or b	ed (secure water supply through porehole)	0				
susceptible to same diseases)		or in a coastal zone with category In or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		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	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				
	Processing fish	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	1			0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
·	Feeding unpas	•	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing st	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 with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total Rank		34 HIGH

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2
Case No: 2023-0549	Site No:	FS0102
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only	v)	
Has the site experienced sea lice problem		
·	r equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single	year class basis?
	licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (in as well as access to suitable biological and/or me iod of time?	
4. Is there a signed documented farm mana Management Area (or equivalent)?	agement agreement or statement relevant to the	site and CoGP Farm
5. Are sea lice count records available for in	nspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	
6. Do records adequately reflect the require	ed standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels be records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	pelow the suggested criteria for treatment in the C	CoGP during the period that
8. Have average adult female sea lice ($\it L. s$ 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the pe	almonis) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or eriod that records are inspected?	above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or
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	ch is considered to cause significant welfare prob	olems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
	inistered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis c. elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication	
11. Has any other action been taken (where		
	ons taken had a significant impact upon the lice l	
	ed out in cooperation between participating farms	
sea lice?	e, where fewer populations or part populations ar	e neid without treatment for
15. Is there a site specific written lice mana scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice	gement procedure with waypoints describing set e infestation?	actions to deal with recognised
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stoc	ks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail	reasons.
Containment Inspection		
•	nage due to predators in the current or previous p	production cycles?
	st the predation experienced on site? (Detail below	
Bird scarer, top/side netting, local pest		
If other, detail below:		
	experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the	he last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No s		
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Mil		4.47\
The state of the s	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.	
o. have these been reported to the SSPO a	and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exi	st)? (COGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover e	scapees? If yes give detail	
8. If gill nets were deployed was this action Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	agreed with local wild fish interests and was perr	mission given by Scottish
· ·	inimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered	in code but could
be considered under satisfactory meas	sures of the Act)	
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with	n regards to containment? If no, please detail reas	son(s) Y

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

Case No:	2023-0549			Date of visit	: 04/12/202	3				
Site No:	FS0102	7								
	F30102	,		Inspector						
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp		
	-									
							_			
	-									
	_									
Report Summary										
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp							
MIX ECI, CNI	23/01/2024									
ECI, CNI	23/01/2024									
	1									

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NOFB0067DATE OF VISIT18/12/2023SITE NOFS0102SITE NAMEMoffat WaterCASE NO20230549INSPECTOR

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 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

R04

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.



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 (www.gov.scot)</u>

Date: 23/02/2024