FHI 059, Version 13	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2025-0089			Date of visit: 19/03/2025
Time spent on site:	hours	Main Inspecto	or:
Site No: FS1330 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Sconser Quarry Mowi Scotland Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 8.3	Thermometer No:	T172	FHI 045 completed
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-28
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving Clinical signs of disease observed Gross pathology 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 detail rea	son below:	

Additional Case Information:

Wild wrasse from around the shores of Skye.

Lumpfish stocked at 20g in Spring 2024. Unsure of the average weight at the date of the inspection

Erisort fish to be input this year in May already part grown.

Unlikely to use LUM in the next cycle.

Site almost completely harvested, just two cages remaining. The entire site will be fallow by the week after the inspection.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issu	ued by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 12/05/2020
Case No:	2025-0089]	Site No:	FS1330	<u> </u>			
Date of Visit:		19/03/202	:5		Inspector(s):	:		
Registration/Autho	risation Deta	ails						
1. Business/site deta			site represent	ative?			Y	1
2. Changes made to	•						Υ	1
Site Details (includ	e cleaner fis	h for all sec						
Total No facilities		7	Facilities sto	ocked	2	No facilitie	es inspected	7
Species	SAL	WRS	LUM					
Age group	2023 Q4	wild	2023					
No Fish	64,000	3,500	8,000					
Mean Fish Wt	6kg	wild	20g+					
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	April 2025		Next Input Da	ate (Site)	May 2025	,	
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		Y	Y Any escapes	s (since last	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	Yersinia, CM	IS and HSM	l.					
Movement Records	5							
1. Movement record		r inspection	?					Y
2. Date of last inspec							14/02/2023	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	1?					Y
4. Are movement red		•		?				Y
5. Are records comp								Y
6. Are health certification		•		able?				Y
Transport Records								
1. Are any movemen		t by (or on b	ehalf) of the b	usiness (not us	sing a STB)?			N
If yes, is there a syst								
Mortality Records								
Mortality records a	available for i	nenection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Other (detail	il)		
	Duranta Ene				Cirici (dotail	1)		
3. Mortality records of								Y
3. Willtanty records	Jumpieto ana	Correctly of		1: 0.33%, wk 10	0 0 62% wk	0. 0.5% wk	2: 0.42% WR	Crude 11
				1: 0.33%, wk 10 10: 0%, wk 9: 0				
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):			10: 0%, wk 9: 0 1%, wk 8: 1.38%		.37 %. LUIVI	- WK 11. 0.707	%, WK 10.
5. Evidence of recen	`	typical morts		70, WK 0. 1.007	/0.			l N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		y/reason:				
Il yes, lacinty 1105/115	mortality po.	Tability/110 C.	OUR PUT TUE	//16030/1.				
6. Any other peaks in	n mortality du	rina period (checked?					Y
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				36% in wk 7 of 2	2024 due to S	Salmosan tre	eatment, Treat	ment
		_	•	oted by site sta				
If yes, detail:				d level (0.21%)				0.55
7. Have increased (u								Y
If yes, detail action:	• •		•	the event. Alterr	native treatme	ent organise	ed.	
8. Have 'mortality ev							ŭ.	Y

If yes, detail:	Tricaine		
If other, detail:			
2. Medicines records	s available for inspection?		Y
3. Are records comp	lete and correctly entered?		Y
4. Are fish in a withd	rawal period?		N
5. If yes, what treatm	ient(s)?		
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines sto	red appropriately?		Y
Biosecurity Record			
•	s available for inspection?		Y
	nd frequency of mortality removal, recording	•	Y
	•	tish Ministers or veterinary professional of any	
,	ned) mortality at the site been included?		Y
	·	ce or suspicion of the presence of a listed disease	
	luded and how and when that will be notified		Y
		on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	Y
health status, certific	ation ir required)?		
6 Have the husband	dry and hipsecurity measures implemented	between each epidemiological unit to minimise	
	ase been covered (movement of staff, visite		<u> </u>
	available regarding the measures in place	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Y
aquaculture animals		to maintain the physical containment of	
	rity procedures been adequately implement	ted on site?	Y
If no, detail:	I Procedures acom adequately imprement		
Results of Surveilla	ance		
1. Has any animal he	ealth surveillance been carried out by, or or	n behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results	available for inspection?		Y
3. Any significant res	sults?		Y
		Results back from Patogen confirmed	
		presence of CMS, HSMI and Yersinia	at low levels
If yes, detail (if not de	etailed under recent disease problems).	Confirmed via PCR	
	Pecards checked between:	1/02/23 - 10/03/2025	

Records checked between:

Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI HI	-	HI 059, Version 13							ISS	ued by:	FHI			
Priority samples: VI BA PA MG HI Time sampling starts/ends: 15:30:00 16:00:00 Inspector: VMD No. 13 Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Pool/Fish No Pool Fish nos 1 Pool Fish No		Case no:	2025-00	89	Site No:		FS1330					19/	03/2025	19/0
Summary samples HIST BA MG VI PA Total Samples Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos Pool Group Species Species SAL Average weight Average weight Sex Water Type SPECIAL SEX Water Type ARREST SEX SPECIAL SEX Water Type ARREST SEX SPECIAL SEX Water Type ARREST SEX SPECIAL SEX SPE		Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG					
Add Fish/Pools - click Pool/Fish No Fish nos 1 Pool Group Species Average weight Average weight Sex Water Type SM Pool Group Sex Water Type Average SW			15:3	0:00	16:0	0:00		Inspecto	or:			VMD No	o. [13
Pool/Fish No		Environmental conditions:	1	Dry	2	Sunny	3	Calm	4		5			
Pool/Fish No		Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	mples
Fish nos	A													
Pool Group Species SAL Average weight Sex Water Type SW Sex Substitute of the property of th		Pool/Fish No												
Species SAL Average weight 7.0000 Sex Water Type SW		Fish nos	1											
Average weight 7.0000 Sex Water Type SW	Г	Pool Group												
Sex Water Type SW		Species	SAL											
Sex Water Type SW		Average weight	7.0000											
Details rulaig Bay		Sex												
Ock Origin Facility No Georgia Bay		Water Type	SW											

1111 000, 101010							.00	aca by.		
03/2025 Addition		ple Infor	mation:							
0	Total T	ests ass	igned	0	1					
	_									

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	of issue	: 12/05/2020
Case Number:	2025-0089		Site No:	FS1330		Insp:	
Date of Visit	19/03/2025		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	5
with GB) of susceptible	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent zone or					
species		ncluding third country	0			26	
	Number of sup	pliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of m		0			10	10
	Number of des		0		-	10	3
Exposure via water		Site contacts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	ed (secure water supply through	o				
susceptible to same		or in a coastal zone with category I					
diseases)	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		2
		or in a coastal zone with category III	1	,	6		
		or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category V		3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category v	1	4	8		
			N.				
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent waters	O	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro		0				
	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				1
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2				
	Processing fish equivalent state	from zone or compartment of	4				
		from Category III farm	8				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.	0	Ī			
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	0	i			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	O	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	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	Yes		O				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		31
					Rank		HIGH

Case No:	2025-0089	Site No: FS1330									
Sea Lies Increation (Soowator Sitos Only)										
Sea Lice Inspection (N								
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years? 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis? Y											
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin,											
azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?											
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?											
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)											
6. Do records adequate	ely reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ								
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salm</i> records are inspected?		low the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that	N								
<u>~</u>	· ·	<i>monis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or od that records are inspected?	Υ								
If yes, have these been	reported to the Fish I	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see comment.	Υ								
9. Is C. elongatus infes	station at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N								
		istered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levels</i> have exceeded the <i>elongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)	Υ								
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where	applicable)?	Υ								
•		ns taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Υ								
		d out in cooperation between participating farms?	Υ								
14. Is there a harvestin sea lice?	g strategy for the site,	where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for	Y								
15. Is there a site spec recognised scenarios of		ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with f a sea lice infestation?	Υ								
16. Do the sea lice leve	els observed on stocks	s reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	Υ								
Containment Inspecti	on										
•	• •	ge due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?	N								
		the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Υ								
If other, detail below:		nets at water level), double layer to net at mort sock, tensioned nets, S	aphire								
·		perienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?	N								
If Yes proceed with que											
4. Have these been rep		orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)									
•		d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)									
7. Were methods (if an	y) used to recover esc	capees? If yes give detail									
8. If gill nets were depload Ministers? (Legal, CoG		greed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish									
, -	•	imise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could									
be considered under	•										
10. Is the site inspected	d as satisfactory with r	regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	Υ								

Issued by: FHI

FHI 059, Version 13

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2025-0089	Site No: FS1330	
Date of Visit: 19/03/2025	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance 1. Is the farm under inspection located w		Y
f N, no further questions require comple	tion.	
 Has a current farm management agreed. Is the current FMAg/S available for instance. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm. 	farm management area? n site(s) to which it applies? commencement of the agreement or staten	ed? Y Y Y Y
farm? 3. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccinate to the FMAg/S identify the species to the FMAg/S identify the maximal to the farm?	ement m health standards for the stocks to be intro tion requirements for stocks held in the area s of fish which may be stocked into the area um stocking density of any pen on any farm ements for the storage and disposal of any	a or farm? a or farm? n in the area or the
Arrangements for The Management of 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangement	f Sea Lice ents for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availab	oility and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement Y
ice on farms in the area or individual farm		
Does the FMAg/S identify the circum used on farms in the area or individual fa	stances under which biological controls and arms?	
	ements for synchronous treatments on farn	ns within the area?
area or farm?	stances when live fish may be introduced o	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangor or individual farms?	ements for the movement of live fish on and	d off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	e harvest practices on farms in the area or indiv	idual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restoc 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether o agreement or statement?	ne or more year classes may be stocked onto s proodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept	ites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manage 24. Does the farm management agreem parties to the agreement?	ement Agreements Only nent include arrangements for persons to becom	ne, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and 26. What is the version no/date of issue	operated in accordance with the agreement or so of the FMAg/S? 27/05/2024	statement? Y

Case No:	2025-0089			Date of visit:	19/03/2025]					
Site No:	FS1330	l		Inspector:							
Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification									
Nesults Summary	i ieq.	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
			'		'		'	2 11100			
			-								
			-								
Report Summary	1		I	1							
	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp	1							
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	24/03/2025		2 11100								
	1										



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

Business NoFB0119Date of Visit19/03/2025Site NoFS1330Site NameSconser QuarryCase No20250089Inspector

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.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate as required.

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business and/or Marine Directorate were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.



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

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, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice), section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites, fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

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

Signed: Date: 24/03/2025

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)