

Case No:	2025-0172	Date of visit:	20/05/2025			
Additional inspector(s):		Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0245	Site Name:	Ardintoul			
Business No:	FB0119	Business Name:	Mowi Scotland Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 SLI	4 VMD	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	11.1	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed	N/A	
Observations:	Region:	HI	Water type:	S	CoGP MA	M-21
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.				
Post mortem signs 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:

Salmon mortalities for the last four weeks: wk 20 462 (0.06%), wk 19 503 (0.06%), wk 18 1667 (0.14%), wk 17 1667 (0.20%) mix of physical damage, seal predation, runts and without diagnosis.

Peak salmon mortality 2025 wk 10 19342 (2.20%) post transfer losses, (issues with the wellboat input causing some physical damage but cause could not be identified.). Peaks in mortality 2024 wk 25 1996 (2.01%), wk 24 2670 (1.75%), wk 23 3948 (1.97%), wk 22 3879 (1.15%), gill infections, site was fallow end of wk 25. Peaks in sal mortality 2023 wk 38 13360 (1.36%) gill infection, wk 45 25589 (2.70%), wk 46 14683 (1.59%), wk 47 48095 (5.30%) treatment losses AGD and gill infection, wk 48 31206 (3.63%) gill infection, wk 49 17351 (2.63%), wk 50 7721 (1.20%) post FW losses and gill infection.

Lumpfish mortalities last four weeks: wk 20 431 (0.67%), wk 19 848 (1.29%), wk 18 1120 (1.68%), wk 17 2171 (3.15%) recorded as pseudomonas. No plans to treat currently. No wrasse on site.

Peaks in lumpfish mortality 2025 :wk 11 1190 (1.55%), wk 12 1401 (1.85%), wk 13 1533 (2.07%), wk 14 1195 (1.64%), wk 15 1115 (1.56%), wk 16 1419 (2.02%), all pseudomonas. 2024 wk 7 1329 (4.70%), wk 08 1328 (2.32%), wk 9 1227 (2.20%) handling and pseudomonas. Wk 13 1082 (2.02%), wk 14 1442 (2.74%), wk 15 1942 (3.80%), wk 16 1706 (3.47%) handling and pseudomonas. 2023 wk 29 2995 (1.86%)pseudomonas, wk 30 6864 (4.34%)handling and pseudomonas, wk 31 2161 (1.43%), wk 32 1740 (1.17%), wk 33 6357 (4.32%), wk 34 2161 (1.53%), wk 35 2500 (1.80%), wk 36 2211 (1.62%), wk 38 1751 (1.31%), wk 39 2350 (1.79%), wk 40 2008 (1.55%), wk 43 1432 (1.13%), wk 44 1260 (1.01%), wk 45 1495 (1.20%) all handling.

Lumpfish will no longer be used by Mowi following this cycle.

Case No: 2025-0172

Site No: FS0245

Date of Visit: 20/05/2025

Main Insp:

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Y

N

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	12	Facilities stocked	6	No facilities inspected	12
Species	Atlantic salmon	Lumpsucker			
Age group	2025 Q1	2025			
No Fish	838,153	63,714			
Mean Fish Wt	381g	n/a			
Next Fallow Date (Site)	July 2026	Next Input Date (Site)	Jan 2027		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:	Pseudomonas in the lumpfish (confirmed by PCR)				

Movement Records

1. Movement records for **all species** held available for inspection?
2. Date of last inspection:
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?
5. Are records complete and correctly entered?
6. Have all introductions and imports (since last inspection) from outwith the GB health zone been recorded the movement records?

Y

20/07/2023

Y

Y

Y

N/A

Transport Records

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

Y

Y

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records for **all species** held available for inspection?
2. How are mortalities disposed of?
- If other detail:
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?
- If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

Y

Biogas - Barkip

Taken to Barkip and Dundas

Y

see additional information

Y

in the lumpfish, see additional information

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

Y

If yes, detail: see additional information

7. Have increased (unexplained) mortalities been reported to vet or FHI?

N/A

If yes, detail action:

8. Have 'mortality events' been reported to FHI? If no, enter details on mortality events sheet.

Y

Case no:

2025-0172

Site No:

FS0245

Date of visit/
Sampling:

20/05/2025

20/05/2025

Priority samples:

VI

BA

PA

MG

HI

Time sampling
starts/ends:

13:00:00

13:30:00

Main Insp:

VMD No.

5

Environmental conditions:

1

Dry

2

Cloudy

3

Windy

4

5

Summary samples

HIST

BA

MG

VI

PA

Total Samples

Add Fish/ Pools - click button

Stock Details	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4								
	Pool Group												
	Species												
	Average weight	400g	400g	350g	350g								
	Sex	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A								
	Water Type	SW	SW	SW	SW								
		Lochailort FS1269	Lochailort FS1269	Lochailort FS1269	Lochailort FS1269								
	Stock Origin												
	Facility No	5	5	5	5								

--	--

0

[illegible]

Case Number:	2025-0172	Site No:	FS0245	Main Insp:		
Date of Visit	20/05/2025	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 British Islands (non-GB).	0	5	10	14	0
	Frequency of movements on from a third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	0
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		2
	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				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				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				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		2
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2		0
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					21	MEDIUM

Case No: 2025-0172

Site No: FS0245

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

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?
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 adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)
7. Are sea lice (*L. salmonis*) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)
8. Have weekly average adult female sea lice counts at or above the intervention level been reported accurately?
If no, please detail in additional information.
9. Is *C. elongatus* infestation at a level which is considered to cause significant welfare problems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other actions taken when *L. salmonis* levels have exceeded the suggested criteria for treatment or where *C. elongatus* is considered to have welfare implications? (CoGP 4.3.82, 5.3.51)
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?
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 specific written lice management procedure with waypoints describing set actions to deal with recognised scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.

Containment Inspection

1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to predators in the current or previous production cycles?
 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)
- | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Top Nets | Seal Blinds | Tensioned Nets | | | |
|----------|-------------|----------------|--|--|--|
- If other, detail below:
- Wildlife diary kept.
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last FHI inspection?
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10
 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?
 5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
 6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)
 7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail
 8. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with local wild fish interests and was permission given by Scottish Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)
 9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in code but could be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act)
 10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)

Case No: 2025-0172

Site No: FS0245

Date of Visit: 20/05/2025

Main Insp: [REDACTED]

Point of Compliance

1. Is the farm under inspection located within a farm management area?

Y

If N, no further questions require completion.

Points of Compliance for Both Farm Management Agreements and Statements

2. Has a current farm management agreement or statement (FMAg/S) been prepared?

Y

3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?

Y

4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?

Y

5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?

Y

6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?

Y

7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?

Y

Arrangements for Fish Health Management

8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum health standards for the stocks to be introduced to the area or farm?

Y

9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?

Y

10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?

Y

11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?

Y

12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the storage and disposal of any dead fish from any fish farm in the area or the individual farm?

Y

Arrangements for The Management of Sea Lice

13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangements for the sharing of data on sea lice numbers and treatments?

Y

14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?

Y

15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirements for the sensitivity testing of available treatments for sea lice on farms in the area or individual farms?

Y

16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances under which biological controls and cleaner fish are to be used on farms in the area or individual farms?

Y

17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?

Y

Live Fish Movements

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?

Y

19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?

Y

Harvesting

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?

Fallowing

21. Does the FMAg/S identify the dates by which the area or individual farm will be fallow and the earliest date when a farm or area may be restocked?

22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?

23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?

Point of Compliance for Farm Management Agreements Only

24. Does the farm management agreement include arrangements for persons to become, or cease to be, parties to the agreement?

Management and operation

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?

26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?

Main Insp: [REDACTED]

[illegible]



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS No	FB0119	DATE OF VISIT	20/05/2025
SITE No	FS0245	SITE NAME	Ardintoul
CASE No	20250172	INSPECTOR	[REDACTED]

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 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.

R25



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, 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: 13/06/2025

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 \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/)