FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020						
Case No: 2025-0094			Date of visit: 09/04/2025						
Time spent on site:	hrs	Main	Inspector:						
Site No: FS0057 Business No: FB0119	Site Name: Business Name:	Corry Farm Mowi Scotland Ltd							
Case Types: 1 ECI	2 CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6						
Water Temp (°C): 8.78	Thermometer No:	T304	FHI 045 completed N/A						
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA M-12						
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. N N									
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:									

Additional Case Information:

Inspection lead by _____, supervised by _____. Remote inspection of registration/authorisation details, farm management statement, transport, treatment, biosecurity and containment records on 03/04/2025; movement, waste, mortality and sea lice records inspected onsite on 09/04/2025. Fish sampled for VMD by _____.

Business transferred to Mowi Scotland Ltd (FB0119) 06/01/2025 but trades as Wester Ross Fisheries Ltd.

Current stock was transferred in October 2024 and is a mixture of Jubilee Loch Shin (FS0890) and Loch Lochy (FS0150). Freshwater (FW) treatment 13/02/2025 due to the presence of amoebic gill disease (AGD). Internal health report from 17/03/2025 stated AGD score 1; the site manager is anticipating another FW treatment in 4-6 weeks. The site is used as a nursery site as it experiences low oxygen in the later summer months. Stock is predicted to be transferred in July 2025. Seal predation is routinely experienced at the site. No equipment damage has been reported and the Enviro nets are inspected every two weeks during changing.

Third party PCR results 14/03/25; piscine orthoreovirus - 2/2 positive, Moritella viscosa - 2/2 positive, Tenacibaculum - 2/2 positive. Third party PCR results 17/03/2025; Tenacibaculum - 2/2 positive. Approximately 5-10 fish present per pen were showing signs of winter ulcers and/or seal predation damage.

No medicated treatments since last inspection (tricaine used during sea lice counts).

Ensiler has been ordered to use on site during the next cycle.

FHI 059, Version 13			Issued by: F	HI	Da	ate of issue: 12/05/2020
Case No: 2025-00	94	Site No:	FS005	7		
Date of Visit:	09/04/2025	5		Inspector(s):	
Registration/Authorisa	tion Details					
1. Business/site details s	summary checked	d by site repre	sentative?		Υ	
2. Changes made to det	•				Y	
Site Details (include cl	eaner fish for all	sections)				
Total No facilities	14	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilities inspecte	ed 14
Species SAL						
Age group Q4 2024						
No Fish 734,291						
Mean Fish Wt 741 g						
Next Fallow Date (Site)	July 2025		Next Input I	Date (Site)	October 2025	
Recent (last 4 wks) dise	ase problems?			Any escape	es (since last visit)?	N
If yes, detail: Moritella	viscosa and tena	acibaculum				
Movement Records						
Movement records av	ailable for inched	tion?				Y
Date of last inspection	•	uorr:			29/05/	2023
3. Are records complete		ered?			29/03/	2023 N
Are movement record			acte?			Y
5. Are records complete			asic:			N
6. Are health certificates	•		available?			N/A
o. Are neallineer lineales	ioi introductions	(Outwith GB)	avaliable:			14/74
Transport Records						
1. Are any movements of	arried out by (or	on behalf) of t	he business	(not using a S	STB)?	Y
If yes, is there a system	•	•			,	Y
Mortality Records						
Mortality records avail	lable for inspectio	n?				Y
2. How are mortalities di				Other (deta	il)	
	•	Cockles Ltd -	waste is col	•	s stored at Ardmair (FS	60056) shorebase.
Mortality records com	nlete and correct	v entered?				Y
5. Mortality records com	piete and correct		% (1 023 fiek	1): w/k 11 0 1	14% (1,034 fish); wk 12	0 0 28% (2 085
4. Recent mortality (last	4 wks).		* *	**	- 0.17% (1,034 lish), wk 12	2 - 0.20% (2,005
5. Evidence of recent inc			0.2370 (1,007	11511), WK 14	- 0.17 /0 (1,233 11311)	Y
If yes, facility nos/no mo	• •		acility/reason			
Pens 9 and 10 are expe			•			
6. Any other peaks in mo				car predation		N
If yes, detail:						
7. Have increased (unex	(plained) mortaliti	es been repor	ted to vet or	FHI?		N/A
If yes, detail action:	,					
8. Have 'mortality events	s' been reported to	o FHI? If no	enter details o	on mortality e	vents sheet	N
2. Hard Mortality events			dotails	ortality C		, ,

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: Tricaine	
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 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	V
minimise transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish	Y
etc.)?	V
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	1
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	
ii no, actail.	
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).	
See additional information	
Records checked between: 25/04/2022-09/04/2025	

г	-HI 059, Version 13				Issued by: FHI								
	Case no:	2025-00	094	Site No:		FS0057			Date of Samplin		09/0	04/2025	09/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		g. HI			
ı	Time sampling starts/ends: Environmental conditions:		0:00	13:3	0:00] al	Inspecto	or:		5	VMD No	D.	7
	Environmental conditions.	'		4		٥		4		3			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-3	4-5										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight		0.7410										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Loch Lochy (FS0150)	Jubilee Loch Shin (FS0890)										
Ů.	raciiity No	6	3										

04/2025 Additional Sample Information:													
	Fish dispatched by an overdose of anaesthetic and percussive blow to the head.												
0	0 Total Tests assigned 0												

FHI 059, Version 13		Issued by: FHI			Date o	Date of issue: 12/05/202		
Case Number:	2025-0094		Site No:	FS0057		Insp:		
Date of Visit	09/04/2025		No of m	ovements/s	supp./dest.		Score	
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10		
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	ovements on from equivalent MS	С	5	10	14	0	
with GB) of susceptible species		ovements on from equivalent zone or	,		10	26	0	
oposioo	Number of supp	cluding third country	C			26 14	0	
Movements off	Frequency of m Number of dest		C			10 10	3	
Exposure via water	Ivaniber of desi	Site contacts						
Water contacts with other		ed (secure water supply through		Π				
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or b	orehole) or in a coastal zone with category I	C)				
diseases)		or within 1 tidal excursion	1	2	4		1	
	Farm is on-line	or in a coastal zone with category III or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6			
		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	С	1	2		0	
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	C]			0	
the rules of the directive	Processing own	n fish (re-cycling risk)	1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status	2					
	Processing fish equivalent statu	from zone or compartment of	4					
	Processing fish	from Category III farm	8	3				
	Processing fish	from Category V farm	10)				
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own wast	e only processed.	С	1				
products	Common proce	sses with other farms	3	3			3	
	Collection point	for waste from other farms	5	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed		- 1			0	
·	Feeding unpast	eurised feed	5	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥4			
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase	С	1	2		0	
	Sites sharing st	aff and equipment	С	1	2		1	
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		C]			0	
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		1					
CoGP/Regulator				_				
Practices in accordance	Yes		С				0	
with regulator or industry code of practice	No		3					
Platform access to cages	Yes			1			0	
20000 10 00000	No		2				3	
				1				
					Total Rank		LOW 11	

Case No:	2025-0094		Site No:	FS0057				
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only							
•	•	s in the previous 4 years?			N			
•	•	equivalent) fallowed synchronously o	n a single yea	ar class basis?	Y			
	•	cenced in-feed and bath sea lice med			Y			
	amectin benzoate) as	well as access to suitable biological						
4. Is there a signed do Area (or equivalent)?	cumented farm manaç	gement agreement or statement relev	ant to the site	e and CoGP Farm Manageme	nt Y			
5. Are sea lice count re	ecords available for ins	spection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		Υ			
6. Do records adequat	ely reflect the required	d standard specified in the SSI and th	e CoGP? (Le	gal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ			
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. saln</i> records are inspected?	•	elow the suggested criteria for treatm	ent in the Co	GP during the period that	Υ			
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?								
If yes, have these bee	n reported to the Fish	Health Inspectorate? If no, FHI see c	omment.		N/A			
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which	h is considered to cause significant w	elfare probler	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N			
•		nistered or other actions taken when a elongatus is considered to have welf			N/A			
11. Has any other action				(,,	N/A			
•	· ·	ns taken had a significant impact upo	n the lice leve	els recorded?	N/A			
				5.0 1000ra0a .	N/A			
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?								
15. Is there a site spec scenarios during the e		ement procedure with waypoints des	cribing set ac	tions to deal with recognised	Y			
_		s reflect sea lice count data? If no ple	ase detail res	acone	V			
10. Do the sea lice lev	eis observed on stock	s reflect sea fice count data: If no pie	sase detail let	230113.	'			
Containment Inspect	ion							
1. Has the site experie	nced equipment dama	age due to predators in the current or	previous prod	duction cycles?	N			
2. Are measures in pla	ice to mitigate against	the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)		Υ			
Top nets, pest contr								
If other, detail below								
2			-:4:	lant Fill immention	The state of the s			
		perienced on or in the vicinity of the	site since the	last rmi inspection?	N			
If Yes proceed with qu								
4. Have these been re			4427 544	17)				
	•	forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP -						
b. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO ar	nd local fisheries trusts forthwith (whe	ere they exist)	? (COGP = 4.4.37, 5.4.17)				
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover es	capees? If yes give detail						
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Coo		agreed with local wild fish interests an	nd was permis	ssion given by Scottish				
		nimise the risk of further escapes? (N	ot covered in	code but could				
	r satisfactory measu							
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with	regards to containment? If no, please	e detail reasor	n(s)	Υ			

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 12/05/2020

FHI 059, Version 13

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
	ite No: FS0057	Date 01 133ue. 12/03/2020
Date of Visit: 09/04/2025	Inspector:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located with	· ·	Υ
If N, no further questions require completion	on.	
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Ma	anagement Agreements and Statement	s
2. Has a current farm management agree		ed?
Is the current FMAg/S available for inspDoes the FMAg/S identify the relevant fa		Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	•	Ÿ
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of co		nent?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of re	view?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Managen		
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum	health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
farm? 9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccinatio	on requirements for stocks held in the are	a or farm?
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species	•	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximule individual farm?	m stocking density of any pen on any farn	n in the area or the
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger		dead fish from any
fish farm in the area or the individual farm	1?	
Arrangements for The Management of S	Sea Lice	
13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangemen	nts for the sharing of data on sea lice num	bers and treatments?
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availabili	lity and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement
of statement?	ments for the consitiuity testing of available	o trootmente for occ
 Does the FMAg/S identify any requirent lice on farms in the area or individual farm 		e treatments for sea
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumst		d cleaner fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual far		
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger	ments for synchronous treatments on farn	ris within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumst area or farm?	tances when live fish may be introduced o	or removed from the
area or farm? 19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger	ments for the movement of live fish on an	d off sites in the area
or individual farms?		

FHI 059, Version 13	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 12/05/2020
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or in	dividual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restocked 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	y which the area or individual farm will be fa ed? e or more year classes may be stocked onto odstock or potential broodstock are to be k	o sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ment Agreements Only nt include arrangements for persons to bec	come, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and op 26. What is the version no/date of issue o	perated in accordance with the agreement of the FMAg/S? 10/03/2024	or statement?

Case No: 2025-0094 Site No: FS0057 Date of visit: 09/04/2025

Start date:	End date: (if applicable)	Size of fish:	Average weight of affected	Species:	Yearclass (SW SAL only):	Timescale	Mortality rate recorded(%):	Explained/ unexplained:	If explained, select reason(s):
26/06/23	02/07/2023		population:	SAL	,,	Weekly	2.40	Explained	
	02/01/2020			O, 1 <u>-</u>					

If unexplained, select observations:	Total mortality during event (if available):	Additional information (e.g. action taken by company):	Action taken by FHI (include case no where applicable):	Yearclass Year
			Historic data, collected during site inspection. The site was owned and operated by another APB at this date so further information cannot easily be obtained for this time period. FHR (2025-0094) includes a reminder to the business of the agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.	

Case No:	2025-0094			Date of visit:	09/04/2025						
Site No:	FS0057	1		Inspector:		1					
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
,		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
						_					
5 (5											
Report Summary											
Case Type ECI, CNI, SLID, VMD	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLID, VMD	14/04/2025										



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

 Business No
 FB0119
 Date of Visit
 09/04/2025

 Site No
 FS0057
 Site Name
 Corry Fish Farm

 Case No
 20250094
 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 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 found to be inadequately 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.

Mortality levels had exceeded the reporting criteria since the last inspection and had not been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. I would like to remind you of the industry agreement in relation to mortality reporting as detailed in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture.

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.

The following points were raised with the site representative during the inspection: R25



- FS number of a source site was not detailed for some movements. A reminder to record this
 was given and the records were updated during the inspection.
- Some historic waste transfer notes detailed Loch Broom as the waste pick up point. A
 reminder to ensure that the waste pick up point is site specific was given.
- The site was operated by another APB when the historic mortality event that exceeded the reporting criteria occurred, no further action required.

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 assistance or clarification in implementing any requirement or recommendation detailed in this report.



Signed:

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)

Date: 14/04/2025