



	Initial	Date
Assessment		
US resolved	n/a	
Further Action	n/a	

Fish Farm Welfare Inspection Report

General details (Refer to Guidance Notes (WF153))

1. Reference number 2. Date of Visit

3. Name and address

4. Location of Fish (if different from above)

5. Category 6. Visit Type

7. Visit sub type (Targeted only) 8. Target date

9. Name and contact details of Private Veterinary Advisers:

10. Have the Veterinary Advisers been contacted before the visit? Yes No

11 & 12. List enterprises which were inspected at this visit and record details of any non-compliance in the appropriate section overleaf.

Enterprise Type	No of fish present	No of fish inspected	No of fish on which action was taken	Overall assessment for enterprise (compliant or non-compliant)
Salmo salar	250,064	250,064	0	0

Non-compliance assessment

High	Medium	Low

Summary information detailing farming type and overall management together with the reason for visit, summary of findings, description of decisions and actions taken with reasons

Detail letters sent, notices served and other action regarding any identified non compliances

Give mark forward date with justification

Use additional pages if necessary to record findings.

Manuscript/Report and additional comments

FINDINGS

At the time of inspection 9/10 cages were stocked with 250,064 Atlantic salmon with an average weight of 2.2kg.

SEA LICE

below the reporting levels. Salmosan was used.

MORTALITY

Week 30 – 0.78% - 3,124

Week 31 – 0.93% - 3,726

Week 32 – 1.37% - 5,400

Week 33 – 27.65% - 107,700

Week 34 – 14.29% - 40,260

The company's staff at the site and the Private Veterinary Surgeon employed (hereafter PVS) have carried out tests of the water and of the fish to understand the possible root cause of this mortality. The PVS attended on multiple occasions between July and August (24th July, 19th and 21st of August) to inspect the records, the fish and to carry out samples to come to a diagnosis. It is noteworthy that this company regularly employ the services of [REDACTED] (hereafter [REDACTED]). A fish specialist vet of Fish Vet Group attends this site almost every month being also the prescribing vets. [REDACTED] carry out routinely random sampling to screen a representative group of the population and also targeted sampling of fish appearing sick. The PVS also analyzes the cycle records to observe trends and advise accordingly. On top of this regular input and due to the large mortality recorded, [REDACTED] attended the site in July and in August (24th July, 19th and 21st of August). The case PVS was also remotely following progress when not physically on site.

Despite lab testing the root cause was difficult to establish with absolute certainty. However, on the grounds of ancillary diagnostics and findings, the PVS considered it very likely that zooplankton blooms, which have been documented by monitoring, have severely damaged the gills of the fish causing mortality and predisposing them to microorganisms affecting the gills including the amoeba *Neoparamoeba perurans*. Pancreatic disease did not appear to have been the cause of deaths to the PVS, moreover the fish were vaccinated against it and laboratory findings seem to have excluded SAV as the causative agent of this large mortality. The PVS also reported seeing some fish damaged by the tentacles of macro-jellyfish.

No specific treatment exist for gill damage due to zooplankton, but hygiene of the cages, nets and removal of morts were the only specific options to manage zooplankton damage. On the day of official inspection operatives were seen actively removing morts from cages and dealing with moribunds.

The amoeba *Neoparamoeba perurans* was treated with low dose peroxide. However, only little difference was observed following this treatment. Thus, due to the complexity and severity of the issue, emergency harvesting had to be carried out. The site was completely depopulated on October the 23rd to prevent further health and welfare issues. The depopulation was prior to what the company had originally planned for this production cycle.

CONCLUSIONS

The site has experienced high levels of mortality of a multifactorial nature. Initial damage of the gills of the salmon by blooms of hydrozoan jellyfish was compounded by secondary factors. The company recruited a fish vet specialist to carry out physical inspections, take diagnostic samples and to treat accordingly. Hygiene of cages and removal of deaths were carried out to manage this incident along with treatments. Despite this, emergency harvesting was carried out and the site fallowed before the expected time to prevent further health and welfare issues; this was due to the complexity of the issue. Grieg Seafood took satisfactory actions in this set of circumstances including: employment of veterinary specialist advice and treatment, emergency harvesting of salmon and depopulation of

the site.

DATA PROTECTION

For information on how we handle personal data please go to www.gov.uk and search Animal and Plant Health Agency Personal Information Charter.

APHA is an Executive Agency of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and also works on behalf of the Scottish Government, Welsh Government and Food Standards Agency to safeguard animal and plant health for the benefit of people, the environment and the economy.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
HM2