

Case No:	2025-0200	Date of visit:	28/05/2025			
Additional inspector(s):		Main Inspector:				
Site No:	FS0629	Site Name:	Poll Na Gille			
Business No:	FB0119	Business Name:	Mowi Scotland Ltd			
Case Types:	1 ECI	2 CNI	3 SLI	4 VMD	5	6
Water Temp (°C):	11.3	Thermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed	N/A	
Observations:	Region:	ST	Water type:	S	CoGP MA:	M-40
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Clinical signs of disease observed?	Y	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Post mortem signs 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:**

Fish came on from Loch Arkaig and have been performing well since the last inspection, with harvests brought forward due to the fish reaching harvestable size quicker than expected. No mortality events since the last inspection and mortality at the site has been low. Sealice counts at the site have also been low for both average adult female leps and caligus. No medicinal treatments have been done since the last inspection for sealice. FW and FLS were last on site in April followed by a thermolicer at the beginning of the month with good clearance recorded for both.

There have been no imports since the last inspection.

Cleanerfish mortalities for the last 4 weeks:

Lumpfish - Wk19: 918 (1.81%), Wk18: 1,877 (2.36%), Wk17: 2,501 (3.05%), Wk16: 1,787 (2.36%)

Wrasse - Wk19: 359 (4.27%), Wk18: 1,489 (15.04%), Wk17: 2,538 (20.41%), Wk16: 1,792 (12.59%)

Site is currently doing deadhaul harvests to Blar Mor. Cleanerfish are being removed and culled with no re-use planned.

FMA is not fallowed synchronously, however a RA is in place. As a mitigation strategy against sealice transfer between the APB and the other operator in the FMA, the APB make their thermolicer available to the other operator prior to any introductions of salmon smolts.

Fish are vaccinated against Furunculosis, IPN, Moritella, Vibriosis, Pastuerella and Yersinia.

Fish on site were sitting slightly deeper in the water but water clarity enabled observation. The population on site appear to be in good physical condition and were active in the cages. No moribunds were observed in any of the cages. One darker fish was observed but due to it being the only one across the site, in combination with no other clinical signs observed, this was not sampled for diagnostics. One other fish was observed with seal damage. The fish sampled for VMD was in good condition

Site paperwork and inspection completed by ■■■■, accompanied by ■■■■ for audit.

Case No: 2025-0200

Site No: FS0629

Date of Visit: 28/05/2025

Main Insp: [REDACTED]

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

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

Y  
Y

**Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)**

Total No facilities	12	Facilities stocked	9	No facilities inspected	12
Species	Atlantic salmon	Lumpsucker	Wrasse		
Age group	24Q2	2024	2024		
No Fish	295 572	72 122	7 022		
Mean Fish Wt	3.8kg	85g	65g		
Next Fallow Date (Site)	June 2025	Next Input Date (Site)	March 2026		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?		N	Any escapes (since last visit)?		N
If yes, detail:					

**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  
08/10/2024  
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?

N  
Y

**Mortality Records**

1. Mortality records for **all species** held available for inspection?  
2. How are mortalities disposed of?

Biogas - Barkip

If other detail: Whole fish transferred directly from site in sealed mort bins to Kames Pier for uplift by lorry before being taken to Barkip.

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?

Y

4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): Wk19: 299 (0.1%), Wk18: 1,303 (0.37%), Wk17: 473 (0.1%), Wk16: 658 (0.14%)

5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities?

N

If yes, facility nos/no mortality per facility/no stock per facility/reason:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

N

If yes, detail:

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 Number:	2025-0200	Site No:	FS0629	Main Insp:		
Date of Visit	28/05/2025	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score	
<b>Live fish movements</b>		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
<b>Exposure via water</b>	<b>Site contacts</b>	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		4
	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		
<b>Management practices</b>		None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing plant discharging into adjacent waters	0	1	2		2
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				
	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				
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>	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		2
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0				0
	No	1				
<b>CoGP/Regulator</b>						
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0				0
	No	3				
Platform access to cages	Yes	0				0
	No	2				
<b>Total Rank</b>					<b>27</b>	<b>HIGH</b>

Case No: 2025-0200

Site No: FS0629

**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) followed 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)
- |                |             |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| Tensioned Nets | Seal Blinds |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
- If other, detail below:
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: 2025-0200

Site No: FS0629

Date of Visit: 28/05/2025

Main Insp:

**Point of Compliance**

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

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?

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

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

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

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

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

**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?

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

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

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

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?

**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?

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

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?

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?

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

**Live Fish Movements**

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

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

**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?



Case no:

2025-0200

Site No:

FS0629

Date of visit/  
Sampling:

28/05/2025

28/05/2025

Priority samples:

VI

BA

PA

MG

HI

Time sampling  
starts/ends:

12:00:00

12:15:00

Main Insp:

VMD No.

7

Environmental conditions:

1

Indoors

2

3

4

5

Summary samples

HIST

BA

MG

VI

PA

Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click button

	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	F1											
	Pool Group												
Stock Details	Species	SAL											
	Average weight	3.8kg											
	Sex	Female											
	Water Type	SW											
		Loch Arkaig FS0649											
	Stock Origin												
	Facility No	6											


### Additional Sample Information:

Fish dispatched by percussive blow.

0

[illegible]

Site No: FS0629
Case No: 2025-0200
Nature of non-compliance:
Action taken (FHI):
Non-compliance relevant to (delete): VirologyMolGen/Bacteriology/Histology/Parasitology



Case No: 2025-0200

Date of visit: 28/05/2025

Site No: **FS0629**

Main Insp: [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]



# FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

## SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

<b>BUSINESS No</b>	FB0119	<b>DATE OF VISIT</b>	28/05/2025
<b>SITE No</b>	FS0629	<b>SITE NAME</b>	Poll Na Gille
<b>CASE No</b>	20250200	<b>INSPECTOR</b>	

### 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.

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.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

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: 28/05/2025

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/)