FHI 059, Version 14	I	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 04/04/2025
Case No: 2025-0244			Date of visit: 07/07/2025
Additional inspector(s):		Main Insp	ector:
Site No: FS1027 Business No: FB0125	Site Name: Business Name:	Linga (Setterness) Scottish Sea Farms Ltd	
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	CNI 3 SLI	4 VMD 5	6
Water Temp (°C): 12.18	Thermometer No:	T307	FHI 045 completed N/A
Observations:	Region: SH	Water type: S	CoGP MA: S-4
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving to Clinical signs of disease observed Post mortem signs observed? Diagnostic samples taken?	•	Y If yes, see additional i	nformation/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet. information/clinical score sheet.
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detail	reason below:	

Additional Case Information:

An escape had occurred since last inspection and had been reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate. The escape (MSe090424SAL1) occurred April 2024 due to hole in the net which was immediately fixed and divers inspected the pen. No fish escaped. There was an increased seal presence at the time of the escape. The predator control plan was reviewed following the escape and a predator secondary netting was installed on all net pen enclosures during transferring fish out of pens for well boat treatment.

Mortality, Sea lice, Treatment record and Sea lice strategy and FMS were inspected remotely on 02/07/2025. BMP, movement records (including waste transfer records) and health surveillance records were inspected remotely on 03/07/2025.

Whilst inspecting sealice records it was noted that in the previous cycle sealice counts were over the threshold and had been reported to the the FHI accurately. In the current cycle sealice counts have been below the threshold.

Wrasse are wild caught and are sourced locally to Shetland. Wrasse first input was week 25 (16/06/2025). Wrasse mortalities from the last 4 weeks - wk27 - 34 (increase of mortalities were attributed to poor weather), wk26- 7, wk25 - 1,

At the time of inspection sea lice counts were observed. Sea counts are reflective of what has been reported and were found to be satisfactory.

Fish were observed on site and via feed cameras, they were shoaling and swimming well deep in the water column. The fish had a good feed and stimuli response. Some fish were observed to have abrasions/ lesions but were healing well, Site stated that the lesions were attributed to physical damage. 1 lethargic fish was removed at time of inspection. 1 fish with spinal deformity was observed across site. No gross pathology was observed so no samples were collected. It was observed that there were a high number of jellyfish (Species - comb and gooseberry jellyfish) across site.

4 fish were sampled for VMD and were observed to be in good condition externally and internally.

FHI 059, Version 14			Issued by: FHI			Date	Date of issue: 04/04/2025		
Case No:	2025-0244		Site No:	FS1027]				
Date of Visit:		07/07/2025]		Main Insp:				
Registration/	Authorisation	n Details							
1. Business/sit	te details sum	mary checked	by site repre	sentative?			Υ		
2. Changes ma		•	,				Υ		
Site Details (i	nclude clean	er fish for all	sections)						
Total No facilit		10	Facilities sto	cked	10	No facilities	inspected	10	
	Atlantic	Wrasse							
Species	salmon								
Age group	2025 S1	Wildcaught							
No Fish	483,914	12,469							
	693.7g	70g							
Mean Fish Wt						= 1/1 1/2			
Next Fallow Da	, ,	August 2026		Next Input D	_ ` ′	Feb/ April 2			
Recent (last 4		•		IN	Any escapes	s (since last v	isit)?	Y	
If yes, detail:	For escape	see additional	information.						
3. Are records4. Are movement5. Are records6. Have all introduced6. the movement	ent records av complete and oductions and	ailable for de correctly ent	ad fish and wa		twith the GB h	nealth zone be	een recorded	Y Y Y N/A	
Transport Re									
1. Are any mor If yes, is there			•	•	•	ess)?		Y	
Mortality Rec	ords								
1. Mortality red			vailable for ins	spection?				Y	
2. How are mo					Other (detail				
If other detail:	Whole fish c	collected into t	ubs on site ar	nd sent SSF	processing pla	ant to be ensi	led		
Mortality red	cords complete	e and correctl						Y	
4. Recent mor	tality (last 4 w	ks):	wk27 - 0.08% (666)	%(377), wk26	i- 0.07%(319)	, wk25 - 0.09 ⁶	% (444), wk2	24 - 0.14%	
5. Evidence of								N	
If yes, facility n		• •		acility/reason	:				
6. Any other pe	eaks in mortal	lity during peri	od checked?					N	
If yes, detail:	- III Mortal	,							
7. Have increa		ned) mortaliti	es been repor	ted to vet or	FHI?			N/A	
If yes, detail a			- ELIIO II					V	
8. Have 'morta	ality events' be	en reported to	o FHI? It no, e	enter details d	on mortality ev	vents sheet.		Y	

Treatments and Medicines Records									
Recent treatments (see comment)?					Y				
If yes, detail: T.M.S.									
If other, detail:									
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)?	T.M.S.								
If other, detail:					· ·				
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?					Y				
Discounity December									
Biosecurity Records					V				
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	l recording on	d aafa dianaaa	l boon consid	darad?	Y				
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality remova	_				1				
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB will n increased (unexplained) mortality at the site been inc	•	imisters or vet	ermary profes	ssional of any	V				
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event that the		augnician of th	o processo o	of a liated					
disease is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i>	•	•	•		\vee				
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being					·				
higher health status, certification if required)?	Stocked off the	e laitii sile bee	iii covered (e	quai oi	'				
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures imp minimise transmission of disease been covered (mov etc.)?		•	•		У				
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures aquaculture animals held on site?	in place to ma	aintain the phys	sical containr	ment of	Y				
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately i	mplemented or	n site?			Y				
If no, detail:									
Results of Surveillance									
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?									
•	2. If yes, are results available for inspection?								
3. Any significant results?					N				
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease prob	olems).								
	105/07/0000	07/07/0005							
Records checked between:	25/07/2023 -	07/07/2025							

•	ni 059, version 14						1	ssued b	y. [111				
	Case no:	2025-02	244	Site No		FS1027			Date of		07/	07/2025	07/0
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG	Samplin	g: HI			
	Time sampling starts/ends:	16:0	00:00	16:3	0:00		Main Ins	sp:			VMD No	o. [8
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		ВА		MG		VI		РА		Total Sa	mples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click button												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1-2	3-4										
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL										
	Average weight	693.7g	693.7g										
	Sex	N/A	N/A										
	Water Type	SW	SW										
Stock Details		Girlsta Hatchery (FS0504)	Barcaldine smolt unit (FS1328)										

O Total Tests assigned O												J.			
VMD fish dispatched via TMS.	07/2025	Addition	nal Sam	ple Infor	mation:										
Total Tests assigned 0		VMD fish dispatched via TMS.													
	0	0 Total Tests assigned 0													

FHI 059, Version 14		Issued by: FHI			Date	of issu	e: 04/04/202
Case Number:	2025-0244		Site No:	FS1027	Main Ins	p:	
Date of Visit	07/07/2025		No of me	ovements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements			0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible	Frequency of m (non-GB).	novements on from British Islands	0	5	10	14	0
species	Frequency of m	novements on from a third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of sup	pliers	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		0		6	10 10	10
Exposure via water	INGINIDE OF GES	Site contacts	_		6-10		<u> </u>
Water contacts with other	Farm is protect	ed (secure water supply through	I				
farms (holding species susceptible to same	disinfection or l	porehole)	0				
diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion or in a coastal zone with category III	1	2	4		4
	farms upstream	n or within 1 tidal excursion	1	3	6		
		or in a coastal zone with category V or within 1 tidal excursion	1	4	8		
Management practices			None	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing waters	plant discharging into adjacent	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro	cessing	0				0
and raise of the amount		n fish (re-cycling risk)	1				
		from MS of equivalent status	2				
	equivalent statu		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				0
products	Common proce	esses with other farms	3				
	Collection point	t for waste from other farms	5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	npasteurised feed	0	1			0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed	5				
Biosecurity		Number of sites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites		from single shorebase	0	1	2		1
		taff and equipment	0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of	Yes		0				0
footbaths etc	No		1				
CoGP/Regulator				1			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry	Yes		0				0
code of practice	No		3				
Platform access to cages	Yes		0				0
	No		2				
					Total		19
					Rank		MEDIUM

FHI 059, Version 14	Issued by: FHI	Date of issu	ue: 04/04/2025
Case No: 2025-0244	Site N	lo: FS1027	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) 1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previou 2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallo 3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed a azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time?	wed synchronously on a singland bath sea lice medications	(including deltamethrin,	N Y Y
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreem Management Area (or equivalent)?	ent or statement relevant to th	ne site and CoGP Farm	Y
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Lega 6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard speci		?? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y Y
7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels below the suggesteeords are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ted criteria for treatment in the	e CoGP during the period that	N
3. Have weekly average adult female sea lice counts at or a	bove the intervention level be	en reported accurately?	Υ
f no, please detail in additional information.		, ,	
9. Is C. elongatus infestation at a level which is considered	to cause significant welfare p	roblems? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N
10. Have therapeutic treatments been administered or other suggested criteria for treatment or where <i>C. elongatus</i> is co			Υ
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)? 12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a second state of the second stat	ition between participating far	ms?	Y Y Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice management procedures scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice infestation?	re with waypoints describing s	set actions to deal with recognised	Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice	e count data? If no please det	ail reasons.	Y
Containment Inspection 1. Has the site experienced equipment damage due to preda 2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation e Electric Fence Top Nets Predator N		elow)	N Y
f other, detail below:	ets (above Fredator Nets (i	Delow	
Double netted nylon FISA nets, electric fence on walk ways,	bird nets, pest control for sho	ore base	
3. Have escape incidents or events been experienced on or	·	e the last FHI inspection?	Υ
f Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 104. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?	J		V
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where	they exist)? (CoGP $= 4.4.37$	5 4 17)	N/A
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries			N/A
·	` `	, ,	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes o	give detail		N/A
3. If gill nets were deployed was this action agreed with loca	l wild fish interests and was p	permission given by Scottish	
Ministers? (Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	66.4		N/A
9. What action was taken to prevent and minimise the risk o			
be considered under satisfactory measures of the Act			V
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to conta	animent <i>:</i> ii no, piease detail r	GasUII(S)	1

TIII 050 Maraina 44	Local Loc Elli	D. 1 1
FHI 059, Version 14	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 04/04/2025
Case No: 2025-0244 S	Site No: FS1027	
Date of Visit: 07/07/2025	Main Insp:	
Point of Compliance		
1. Is the farm under inspection located wit	thin a farm management area?	Y
If N, no further questions require completion		
Points of Compliance for Both Farm Ma	anagement Agreements and Statement	to
2. Has a current farm management agree		
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for insp		Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant f	arm management area?	Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of co	•	ment?
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of re	eview?	Y
Arrangements for Fish Health Managen	nent	
8. Does the FMAg/S identify the minimum farm?	health standards for the stocks to be intro	oduced to the area or Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination	•	
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species	•	
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximu individual farm?		
12. Does the FMAg/S identify the arranger fish farm in the area or the individual farm	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	dead fish from any
Arrangements for The Management of a 13. Does the FMAg/S identify arrangemen		where and treatments?
13. Does the Fiving/3 identity arrangemen	its for the sharing of data on sea lice fluin	ibers and deadners:
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availabil of statement?	lity and the use of medicines on farms cov	vered by the agreement Y
15. Does the FMAg/S identify any requirer	ments for the sensitivity testing of availabl	e treatments for sea
lice on farms in the area or individual farm	is?	
16. Does the FMAg/S identify the circums		d cleaner fish are to be
used on farms in the area or individual far		
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrange	ments for synchronous treatments on farr	ms within the area?
Live Fish Movements		
18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circums area or farm?	tances when live fish may be introduced of	
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangeror individual farms?	ments for the movement of live fish on an	nd off sites in the area

FHI 059, Version 14	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 04/04/2025
Harvesting 20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable	harvest practices on farms in the area or indi	vidual farms?
date when a farm or area may be restock 22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one agreement or statement?	y which the area or individual farm will be fallo ed? e or more year classes may be stocked onto a podstock or potential broodstock are to be kep	sites covered by the
Point of Compliance for Farm Manager 24. Does the farm management agreeme parties to the agreement?	ment Agreements Only ont include arrangements for persons to become	me, or cease to be, N/A
Management and operation 25. Is the fish farm being managed and operation 26. What is the version no/date of issue o	perated in accordance with the agreement or f the FMAg/S? 30/01/2025	statement? Y

Case No:	2025-0244			Date of visit:	07/07/2025						
Site No:	FS1027	l		Main Insp:		1					
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification							
·	·	Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp			
Report Summary											
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp								
ECI, CNI, SLI, VMD	16/07/2025		z IIISP								



FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0125 **DATE OF VISIT** 07/07/2025

SITE NO FS1027 SITE NAME Linga (Setterness)

CASE NO 20250244 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 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.



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

 The APB was not authorised to stock Wrasse at this site. An amendment authorisation application was requested to be submitted. Amendment authorisation application was received from the business contact on 07/07/2025. The outcome of the application will be issued separately. 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 further information or have any queries regarding this report.



Signed:

Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/07/2025

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)