

Case No: 2019-0281 Date of visit: 03/06/2019

Time spent on site: 3.5 hours Main Inspector:

Site No: FS0423 Site Name: Lamlash
Business No: FB0169 Business Name: The Scottish Salmon Company

Case Types: 1 REP 2 SLA 3 REG 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): Thermometer No: FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: ST Water type: S CoGP MA M-48

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? N 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:

Current issues with amoeba and anaemia - Lamlash is currently going through tests to find the cause of the anemia to see if it is linked to PD - Site tested positive for SAV1 (only picked up in one sample) in January - 29.6 CT value - blood samples and heart.

Mortality event in WK20 attributed to anaemia and PD. There was also a freshwater treatment and increased handling may have exacerbated the issue. Mortality levels have since returned to below 1%

WRA mortality - 2387 - 13.4% since input

Lump Mortality - 900 - 9.4% since input

Case No: **2019-0281** Site No: **FS0423**
 Date of Visit: **03/06/2019** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

- 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **Y**
- 2. Changes made to details? **Y**

Site Details

Total No facilities	14	Facilities stocked	14	No facilities inspected	14
Species	SAL	WRA	LUM		
Age group	18 S1	MIX	MIX		
No Fish	292,034	17,774	9,657		
Mean Fish Wt	3.274 Kg	MIX	MIX		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	August 19		Next Input Date (Site)	March 20	

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **Y** Any escapes (since last visit)? **N**
 If yes, detail: **See additional comments**

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **13/06/2017**
- 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? **[REDACTED]**

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **Y**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **Whole fish - Dundas Chemicals**
- If other detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **Y**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **wk 22 - 1343 (0.46%) WK 21 - 1584 (0.54%) WK 20 - 6725 (2.28%) WK 19 - 2081 (0.69%)**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **Y**
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**

See additional comments

- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **N**
- If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **N/A**
- If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **Y**

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail:	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
2. Medicines records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	T.M.S.	
If other, detail:		
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> mortality at the site been included?	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	<input type="checkbox"/>
If no, detail:	

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
3. Any significant results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	See additional comments	

Records checked between: 13/06/2017 - 03/06/2019

Case Number:	2019-0281	Site No:	FS0423	Insp:		
Date of Visit	03/06/2019	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	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	
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				
	Farm is on-line or in a coastal zone with category I farms upstream or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1
	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				0
	Common processes with other farms	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		0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	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					14	LOW

Case No: 2019-0281 Site No: FS0423

Date of visit: 03/06/2019 Inspector(s):

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
-------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

a. Inspection of sea lice records

1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium	Y	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2, Annex 6 SSI 1,2, SSI 1,2(g)	Counts were not conducted in week 20, due to grading and freshwater treatment. Lice counts were below CoGP rec treatment level at counts immediately before and after week 20.
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI ¹ and the CoGP ² ? (Counts should be weekly, record the person making the count, date of the count, number of fish sampled (should be 25), pen or facility number recorded, water temperature ³ , number of parasites observed and correct stages recorded ⁴)	Low & Medium	Y		
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated?	Low	Y		
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail.	Low	Y		
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?		N	Detail if necessary:	

b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where: a) <i>L. salmonis</i> record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment? b) <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High	N/A	CoGP Annex 6	
	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of: the name / identity of the product the date of administration the quantity (concentration and amount) administered the method of administration of the product the identification of the fish / facilities treated name of the person administering the treatment the withdrawal period	High	Y	VMD ¹² 19 SSI 1,3	
	High	Y		
	High	Y		
	High	Y		
	High	Y		
	Low	Y		
	Medium	Y		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon: the name of the veterinary surgeon name of the product	High	N/A	VMD 18	
	High	N/A		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
batch number	High	N/A		
the date of administration	High	N/A		
amount administered	High	N/A		
identification of fish treated	High	N/A		
withdrawal period	Medium	N/A		
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	High	Y		Lice numbers were already low before treatment - 2 pens treated.
Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site average <i>L.salmonis</i> numbers (all stages)				
2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their impact is there a record of:	Low	Y	SSI, 1,4	Hydrolicer on site during inspection.
the nature and date of the method employed; the identification number of all facilities subjected to the method; the name of the person employing the method				
2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:			VMD 19	
proof of purchase of the medicine concerned	Medium	Y	VMD 17	
name of the product	High	Y		
batch number	High	Y		
the date of purchase	Medium	Y		
the quantity purchased	High	Y		
the name and address of the supplier	Medium	Y		
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19	
the date of disposal	Medium	N/A		
the quantity of product involved	Medium	N/A		
how and where it was disposed of	Medium	N/A		
2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83	
Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments conducted on site				
2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	
2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use, available to those responsible for treatment administration?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?		Y	Detail if necessary:	
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and farm management agreements or statements				
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?	Low	Y	SSI 1,5,b CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	Only site in management area
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the provisions of the NTS ⁶ ?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider: -agreed basis for monitoring sea lice -coordinated monitoring and treatment -co-operation between participating farms This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?	Low	N/A	SSI 1, 5, c	
3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy? For example, the principles of ISLM include: Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD. The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice) Appropriate discharge consent in place Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary Monitoring lice numbers Using an array of treatments where possible Treating all stocks on site at the same time Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and certainly not on the same cohort of lice Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities.	Medium	Y	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	Only site in management area
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?		Y	AFSA ¹³ 4A	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium	N/A	Detail if necessary: CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium	Y	AFSA 4B	
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined , is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?	High ¹⁰	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.100	
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.101	
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures				
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1	
parasite identification	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for)	High	Y	5.3.53-55	
recording counts	High	Y		
biology and life cycle of parasites	Low	Y		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish	Low	Y		
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	Y	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this Where records exist regarding SOPs and site procedures these should be inspected to confirm suitability				
e. Inspection of site and site stock				
5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?	Medium	Y	VMD schedule 5	Only medicine stored on site is TMS, which is kept under lock and key
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High	Y		
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating to sea lice infestation?	High	Y		
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Y	CoGP Annex 6, 4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	Sea lice count by company biologist witnessed
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording? (Cross reference to training records – Section d)	High	Y		
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54	
6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)? N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice	Medium	Y	Annex 6	
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct? Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are: for Caligus elongatus all identifiable stages and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings) ¹¹	High	Y	Annex 6	
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?	Medium	Y		
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner? Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations, appropriate product used	High	N/A		
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?		Y		In withdrawal for TMS
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
h. FHI sea lice counts If necessary conduct a sea lice count in accordance with the protocol of the CoGP. Indicate where this procedure has been done and make a record of results within the comments box	Power granted under the Act – section 3 (2) (a)	
i. Collection of samples If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection	Power granted under the Act – section 3 (3) (a)	
j. Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)	

[1] Scottish Statutory Instrument – The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008
 [2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture
 [3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be s
 [4] Recording requirements:- for C. elongatus – all identifiable stages and for L. salmonis - mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)
 [5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately
 [6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS
 [7] FMA = Farm Management Area
 [8] FMS = Farm Management Statement
 [9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement
 [10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18
 [11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate – for Caligus elongatus: mobiles; and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis: non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.
 [12] VMD - The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfactory?	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
[13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)				

[REDACTED]
The Scottish Salmon Company
1 Smithy Lane
Lochgilphead
Argyll
PA31 8TA
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	03/06/2019
SITE No	FS0423	SITE NAME	Lamlash
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20190281

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION

An enhanced sea lice inspection to ascertain the levels of sea lice and for assessing the measures in place for the prevention, control and reduction of sea lice was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of records with regards to sea lice, the stock on site, site procedures with regards to sea lice and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of sea lice records

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

b) Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

c) Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and area management agreements.

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

d) Inspection of records relating to training and procedures

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

e) Inspection of site and site stock

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

f) Inspection of farm count procedures

An inspection of site staff conducting and recording a sea lice count was carried out. The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

g) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

Procedures were not inspected as a treatment was not taking place at the time of inspection. However, discussions on procedures with the company correspondent would suggest that the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice.

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



Signed:

Date: 29/08/2019

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

[REDACTED]
The Scottish Salmon Company
1 Smithy Lane
Lochgilphead
Argyll
PA31 8TA
[REDACTED]

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0169	DATE OF VISIT	03/06/2019
SITE No	FS0423	SITE NAME	Lamlash
INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]	CASE No	20190281

The above site was inspected following the report of a mortality event by The Scottish Salmon Company.

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.

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third 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 Scotland were available for inspection.

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice). An enhanced sea lice inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

R10

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

Signed:



Date: 11/06/2019

Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter

Case No: 2019-0296 Date of visit: 07/06/2019

Time spent on site: N/A Main Inspector:

Site No: FS1245 Site Name: Tayside

Business No: FB0544 Business Name: Scotland

Case Types: 1 DIA 2 3 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): N/A Thermometer No: FHI 045 completed

Observations: Region: TA Water type: B CoGP MA

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.

Clinical signs of disease observed? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.

Gross pathology observed? N/A If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.

Diagnostic samples taken? N/A

UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:

Additional Case Information:

Fish was found on the edge of the River Garry on the 6/6/19 at around 1200. The fish was reported to have clear eyes indicating that it had not been dead for too long.

The fish was transported to the lab the same day and arrived in a cool box approximately 6pm. It was kept in the cool room over night and was sampled first thing the next morning. (7/6/19)

Fish externally was in quite poor condition. Lesions on both sides and haemorrhaging on the underside. Some damage to one side of the head had occurred, Likely from a bird when the fish was dying. Internally the fish looked relatively healthy given the clinical signs of disease. Numerous anasakis were present on both the liver and the spleen.

Diagnostic lab was consulted on what samples to take considering the condition of the fish. They recommended that we only take samples for PCR testing as organ tissue would be too far degraded in order to conduct histology or virology.

Internal and external photos taken during the diagnostic sampling. Can be found in "photos" tab of case sheet.

Case No: **2019-0296** Site No: **FS1245**
 Date of Visit: **07/06/2019** Inspector(s): **[REDACTED]**

Registration/Authorisation Details

- 1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative? **N/A**
- 2. Changes made to details? **N/A**

Site Details

Total No facilities	N/A	Facilities stocked		No facilities inspected	
Species					
Age group					
No Fish					
Mean Fish Wt					
Next Fallow Date (Site)		Next Input Date (Site)			

Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems? **N/A** Any escapes (since last visit)? **[REDACTED]**
 If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**

Movement Records

- 1. Movement records available for inspection? **N/A**
- 2. Date of last inspection: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Are records complete and correctly entered? **[REDACTED]**
- 4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? **[REDACTED]**
- 5. Are records complete and correctly entered? **[REDACTED]**
- 6. Are health certificates for introductions (outwith GB) available? **[REDACTED]**

Transport Records

- 1. Are any movements carried out by (or on behalf) of the business (not using a STB)? **[REDACTED]**
- If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records? **[REDACTED]**

Mortality Records

- 1. Mortality records available for inspection? **N/A**
- 2. How are mortalities disposed of? **[REDACTED]**
- If other detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? **N/A**
- 4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): **[REDACTED]**
- 5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? **[REDACTED]**
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason: **[REDACTED]**
- 6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked? **[REDACTED]**
- If yes, detail: **[REDACTED]**
- 7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI? **[REDACTED]**
- If yes, detail action: **[REDACTED]**
- 8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, add MRT case and enter on mortality events sheet. **[REDACTED]**

1. Recent treatments (last 4 wks)?	
If yes, detail:	
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)?	
If other, detail:	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will notify Scottish Ministers or veterinary professional of any <i>increased (unexplained)</i> 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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> 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)?	
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:	

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	N/A
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	
3. Any significant results?	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between: N/A

Case no: Site No: Date of visit/
Sampling:

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI

Time sampling starts/ends: Inspector: VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1 2 3 4 5

Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click

Pool/Fish No	F1	P1										
Fish nos	1	1										
Pool Group	P1	P1										
Species	SAL											
Average weight	3.5000											
Sex	Female											
Water Type	FW											
Stock Origin	Wild River Garry											
Facility No	N/A											

Case no: 2019-0296

Site No: FS1245

Method of killing:

Date of visit: 07/06/2019

Inspector(s):

Sheet Relevant: Y

S for strong presence: M for medium presence: W for weak presence

Fish Number									
Time sampled after death (if > 45 minutes)									
External Signs									
Behaviour	Moribund								
	Lethargic								
	Hanging vertical								
	Spiralling								
	Flashing								
	Loss of equilibrium								
Body	Dark								
	Distended abdomen								
	Anorexic								
	Scale Oedema								
Opercula	Shortened								
	Flared								
Haemorrhaging	Throat	S							
	Ventrum	S							
	Base of fins	S							
	Elsewhere	S							
Eyes	Exophthalmic								
	Enophthalmic (sunken)								
	Cataract								
	Haemorrhagic								
Gills	Pale								
	Zoned								
	Necrotic								
Lesions	Flank	S							
	Elsewhere	S							
Vent	Inflamed								
	Trailing faeces								
Lice Load	Estimate numbers	0							
Internal Signs									
Ascites	Clear								
	Bloody								
Oedema	In tissues								
Heart	Pale/anaemic	W							
	Granulomas								
	Deformed								
Liver	Petechial haem								
	Gross haem								
	Tissue breakdown								
	Enlarged								
	Colour number(s)								
Pyloric caeca	Granulomas								
	Lesions								
	Petechial haem								
Spleen	Tubules mauve								
	Lack of fat	S							
	Enlarged	S							
Gut	Granulomas								
	No food present	S							
	Yellow pseudo-faeces	S							
	External haem								
Body wall	Internal haem								
	Haemorrhaging								
	Swim bladder								
Kidney	Haemorrhaging								
	Fluid filled								
	Swollen								
General	Grey								
	Granular								
	Liquefied								
	Parasites present	S							
Anaemia									

Additional comments:

Fish was found dead, sampling took place 24 hour after it was found. Person that found the fish stated that the eyes were still clear

Anasakis present on the liver and spleen

Site 6
Cromwellpark
Almondbank
Perth
PH1 3LW

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0544	DATE OF VISIT	07/06/2019
SITE No	FS1245	SITE NAME	Tayside – River Garry
INSPECTOR		CASE No	20190296

Section 1: Summary

A call was received from a biologist at the freshwater laboratory in Pitlochry on the 6^h of June 2019. He had found a freshly dead 2 sea winter Atlantic salmon near the bank of the River Garry. The fish was collected, chilled and transported to the Marine laboratory in Aberdeen for diagnostic sampling. The fish was displaying lesions/ulcers across approximately 20% of its body and was approximately 4.5 kg in weight. The fish did not arrive until late in the evening so the fish was not sampled until the following morning on the 7th June 2019.

The fish had been dead longer than 24 hours therefore only samples for molecular genetic analysis and parasitology were viable.

Parasitology examination showed a heavy infestation of *Anisakis simplex* within the vent tissue sampled. A number of *Anisakis* were also observed on the liver and spleen during the internal examination of the fish.

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

Section 2: Case Detail

Observations

The fish was collected for sampling as it was displaying similar clinical signs of disease that had been reported in other rivers across Scotland. The fish was transported to the Marine Laboratory for diagnostic sampling.

R09

External haemorrhaging and lesions were observed on the throat, ventrum, base of fins and flank of the fish. Some post mortem damage to the head and eyes was also observed, this was most likely caused by predators or scavengers whilst the fish was in the shallows of the river.

Internally, the heart appeared anaemic, there was also a distinct lack of fat on the pyloric caeca and the spleen was enlarged. There was no food present in the gut, however there was yellow pseudo faeces present in the lower gut. A number of *Anisakis simplex* were attached to the liver and spleen.

Samples

Samples were collected from 1 fish according to the table below:

Fish number	Pool number	Species	Stage	Origin
F1	P1	Atlantic Salmon	4.5 kg	River Garry

Results

Virology: Tissue samples were tested for segments of nucleic acid indicative of the presence of the pathogens specified below using real-time PCR (QPCR).

The samples tested negative for infectious haematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), infectious salmon anaemia virus (ISAV), salmonid alphavirus (SAV), viral haemorrhagic septicaemia virus (VHSV), salmon gill poxvirus (SGPV), piscine reovirus (PRV) and piscine myocarditis virus (PMCV).

Parasitology: Fins tissue collected was degraded and presence of *Gyrodactylus salaris* could not be determined.

Vent sample showed heavy infestation of *Anisakis simplex*.

Signed: 

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 13/08/2019

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter





