FHI 059, Version 14	Issu	ed by: FHI	Date of issue: 04/04/2025				
Case No: 2025-0383			Date of visit: 09/10/2025				
Additional inspector(s):		Main Inspecto	or:				
Site No: FS1342 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	West Strome Bakkafrost Scotland					
Case Types: 1 UNI 2	REP 3 OTH	4 5	6				
Water Temp (°C): 13	Thermometer No:	T310	FHI 045 completed N/A				
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: S	CoGP MA: M-20				
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?  Y If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.							
Clinical signs of disease observed?  Post mortem signs observed?	l <i>?</i>		res, see additional information/clinical score sheet. res, see additional information/clinical score sheet.				
Diagnostic samples taken?		N N					
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry out intended visit detail reason below:							

#### **Additional Case Information:**

Third party reports received in July and August indicated an unpleasant odour originating from the site and increased boat activity associated with treatments and mortality removal. The business was contacted and confirmed there were no significant health concerns at the time. Appropriate sea lice treatments were being carried out, with sea lice counts and mortality levels reported as required.

As a result, an inspection was not warranted at the time. However, an unannounced inspection was scheduled to coincide with the next routine visit to the area.

Site records reviewed during the inspection were consistent with the information previously provided by the business. The business intends to install an ensiler onsite for future waste processing.

The stock inspected appeared healthy and was shoaling well. Approximately five lethargic fish were observed, some with scale loss likely linked to a recent freshwater treatment completed on 07/10/25.

FHI 059, Versio	on 14			Issued by: Fh	<del> </del>		Date of	issue: 04/04/2025
Case No:	2025-0383	]	Site No:	FS1342				
Date of Visit:		09/10/2025	l		Main Insp:			
Registration/A	uthorisation	Details						
1. Business/site			by site repres	sentative?			Y	
2. Changes ma		•	, ,				N	1
Site Details (ir	nclude cleane	er fish for all	sections)					
Total No faciliti		16	Facilities sto	cked	13	No facilities	inspected	4
0	Atlantic							
Species	salmon							
Age group	2024 Q3							
No Fish	359,913							
Mean Fish Wt								
Next Fallow Da	` ,	Early 2026		Next Input D	_ ` ′	Undecided		
Recent (last 4 v				Y	Any escapes	(since last vi	sit)?	
If yes, detail:	AGD, PGD a	and ERM						
Mayramant Da								
Movement Re		anasiaa bald	availabla fari	ti				$\overline{}$
1. Movement re		species neid	avallable for i	nspection?			40/00/0005	1
2. Date of last i	•		10				12/03/2025	V
3. Are records	•	•						Y
4. Are moveme				aste?				Y
5. Are records	•							Y
<ol><li>Have all intro</li></ol>	oductions and	imports (sinc	e last inspecti	ion) from outw	vith the GB he	alth zone bee	n recorded in	N/A
the movement	records?							
Transport Rec	ords							
1. Are any mov		ed out not usin	a STB (bv (	or on behalf o	of) the busines	s)?		
If yes, is there a						,		
Mortality Reco	rdo.							
1. Mortality reco		<b>ecies</b> held av	ailable for ins	enection?				Y
2. How are mo	-			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Biogas - Bark	rin		•
If other detail:	tanties dispos	cu or:			Diogas - Dairi	пр		
3. Mortality rec	ords complete	and correctly	entered?					Y
,	•	,		artial): 0.18% (	(663 fish), wee	k 40: 0.68%	(2485 fish), w	/eek 39:
4. Recent mort	ality (last 4 wk	(s):			8: 0.51% (192			
5. Evidence of					, -			N
If yes, facility no		• •		cility/reason:				
			·					
<ol><li>Any other pe</li></ol>		, ,	od checked?					Y
	Mortality eve							
7. Have increas	•	ned) mortalitie	s been report	ted to vet or F	HI?			N/A
If yes, detail ac								
8. Have 'mortal	ity events' bee	en reported to	FHI? If no, e	nter details or	n mortality eve	nts sheet.		Y

Treatments and Medicines Records	
1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail: Alphamax	
If other, detail: Optomease Vet (benzocaine)	
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: Optomease Vet (benzocaine)	
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	
Biosecurity Records	
Biosecurity records available for inspection?	
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	
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?	
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 <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> that will be notified to Scottish Ministers?	
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher	
health status, certification if required)?	
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measures implemented between each epidemiological unit to minimise	
transmission of disease been covered (movement of staff, visitors, equipment, live or dead fish etc.)?	
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of	
aquaculture animals held on site?	
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	
If no, detail:	
Results of Surveillance	
_	V
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	I V
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	\ V
3. Any significant results?  If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	'
Third party report 03/10/2025 - Piscirickettsia salmonis (SRS) potentially observed in histology sample. PCR wou	ld bo
required to confirm this.	ld be

FHI 059, Version 14	Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 0	04/04/2025
Case No: 2025-0383	Site No:	FS1342	
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)			
1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years?		N
· · ·	quivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year		
	enced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (inclu vell as access to suitable biological and/or mechar ime?	•	Υ
4. Is there a signed documented farm manage Area (or equivalent)?	ement agreement or statement relevant to the site	and CoGP Farm Management	
5. Are sea lice count records available for ins	pection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)		Υ
6. Do records adequately reflect the required	standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Leg	al SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Υ
7. Are sea lice (L. salmonis) record levels belare inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)	ow the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoG	P during the period that records	N
8. Have weekly average adult female sea lice	counts at or above the intervention level been rep	orted accurately?	Υ
If no, please detail in additional information.			
9. Is <i>C. elongatus</i> infestation at a level which	is considered to cause significant welfare problem	s? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50)	N
	stered or other actions taken when <i>L. salmonis levelongatus</i> is considered to have welfare implication		Υ
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried	applicable)? s taken had a significant impact upon the lice level out in cooperation between participating farms? where fewer populations or part populations are he		N/A Y
15. Is there a site specific written lice manage scenarios during the escalation of a sea lice i	ement procedure with waypoints describing set actions	ons to deal with recognised	
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks	reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail rea	sons.	Υ
	ge due to predators in the current or previous prod he predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	uction cycles?	
If other, detail below:			
		. =	
·	erienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the la	ist FHI inspection?	
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip 4. Have these been reported to Scottish Minis	·		
· ·	orthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17	7	
· ·	d local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)?	<i>'</i>	
		(000)	
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover esc	apees? If yes give detail		
If all nets were deployed was this action as	greed with local wild fish interests and was permiss	sion given by Scottish Ministers?	
(Legal, CoGP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	, mariota, ma non intereste and was permise	given by coolden minioters:	
9. What action was taken to prevent and mini	mise the risk of further escapes? (Not covered in c	ode but could	
be considered under satisfactory measur			
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with re	egards to containment? If no, please detail reason	(s)	

O N	0005 0000			D ( ( )	00/40/0	205		
Case No:	2025-0383	J		Date of VI	sit: 09/10/20	025		
Site No:	FS1342	]		Main In	sp:			
Results Summary	Freq. Date of Notification							
Results Summary	r req.	Database	e Insp	Phone Insp Writing Insp				2 <sup>nd</sup> Ins
						<u> </u>	_	2 1113
	_				_			
	+							
	+							
Report Summary								
Case Type	Date	Insp	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insp					
UNI, REP	21/10/2025							



### Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

### Summary for information of site operator

Business no: FB0169 Date of visit: 09/10/2025
Site no: FS1342 Site name: West Strome

Case no: 20250383 Inspector:

## Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, without prior notification following reports from a third party, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Four 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 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.

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

R10

UKAS Accredited Inspection Body - Type C No. 0269
Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Telephone - 0131 244 3498
Email - ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Fish Health Inspectorate Website



FS numbers of some destination sites were not detailed for some movements. A
reminder to record this was given and the records were updated during the
inspection.

# 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.

### 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).

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory with regards to parasites.

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: 21/10/2025

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)