Case No: 2025-0401 Date of visit: 22/10/2025

Additional inspector(s): [redacted] Main Inspector: [redacted]

Site No: FS0068 Site Name: Calva Bay (Calbha Beag)
Business No: FB0398 Business Name: Loch Duart Plc

Case Types: 1 SLA 2 REP 3 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): Thermometer No: FHI 045 completed N/A

Observations: Region: HI Water type: S CoGP MA M-5

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Y 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:

Input Oct/Nov 2024 from Badcall Bay (FS0067).

Salmosan treatment weeks 42/43.

Recent mortalities:
SAL Week 42: 1.34%; Week 41: 0.87%; Week 40: 0.33%; Week 39: 0.62%
WRA Week 42: 0.02%; Week 41: 0.05%; Week 40: 0.02%; Week 39: 0.02%

Cleanerfish stocked week 36/37. Cleanerfish delivery was supposed to be earlier, however other Loch Duart Plc sites were prioritised instead as sea lice numbers were higher elsewhere at the time. Sea lice numbers became elevated on site in week 37 (4.67 adult females/fish), by then the cleanerfish delivery had been completed and the company decided to allow 2 weeks for the cleanerfish to have an effect on the lice load. By week 39 the sea lice counts had risen to 7.52 so a Salmosan treatment was planned for week 40. This could not be completed due to weather, and was therefore postponed to week 42 (other sites in the area are also currently affected by high lice loads and therefore treatments need to be prioritised among farms).

Ongoing strategy for the prevention, control and reduction of lice:
Salmosan, freshwater and FLS treatments will be ongoing to establish and maintain control over lice numbers on site. Cleaner fish stocking strategies will also be maintained. The Kvaloy is now chartered full time to Loch Duart Plc and an adjustable grader is to be fitted to facilitate the easier removal of cleaner fish from pens (so cleaner fish and FW treatments can be used simultaneously). Currently only fish above an average size of 2.8kg can be removed. The Aqua Viking will also be available full time for treatments from the 28/10/25. Tarp treatments will also be available but as a last resort dependent on weather and tidal conditions.

The main population appeared in good condition, shoaling deep in the water column and with a good feeding response. A small number of lethargic fish were observed and 2 dead fish were seen on site. The lethargic fish appeared to be mostly runts. Skin abrasions along the flanks and head damage could be observed on these fish and on a small amount of the main population. No fish with red heads observed. Some of the fish removed for the sea lice counts had evidence of skin damage, especially between the anal and pelvic fin, however there was evidence of treatment/cleanerfish clearance as most of these areas were clear of parasites.

Case No: 2025-0401 Site No: FS0068

Date of Visit: 22/10/2025 Main Insp: [redacted]

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities 12 Facilities stocked 11 No facilities inspected 12

Species	Atlantic salmon	Wrasse					
Age group	25S0	Wild					
No Fish	647,873	6,112					
Mean Fish Wt	2.9kg	Mix					

Next Fallow Date (Site) May/June 2026 Next Input Date (Site) May 2027

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? Y
2. Date of last inspection: 07/02/2024
3. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste? Y
5. Are records complete and correctly entered? Y
6. Have all introductions and imports (since last inspection) from outwith the GB health zone been recorded in the movement records? 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?

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records for **all species** held available for inspection? Y
2. How are mortalities disposed of? Other (detail)

If other detail: Transported in sealed bins to Badcall shorebase, skipped and uplifted by DK Waste Services. Taken to Greys Composting, Banff.

3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered? Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks): See additional info.
5. Evidence of recent increased/atypical mortalities? Y

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

See additional info. Latest week mortality increase attributed to backlog due to mortalities not being fully removed in week 41 due to weather.

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

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)? Y

If yes, detail: Salmosan T.M.S.

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)? Salmosan T.M.S.

If other, detail:

6. Are medicines stored appropriately? Y

Biosecurity Records

1. 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 *how* and *when* 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

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?

If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).

Records checked between: 07/02/2024 - 22/10/2025

Case No: 2025-0401 Site No: FS0068

Date of visit: 22/10/2025 Main Insp: [redacted]

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION CHECKLIST				
a. Inspection of sea lice records				
1.1 Are sea lice count records available for inspection?	Medium	Y	CoGP 1.2.1, 1.2.2, Annex 6 SSI 1,2,	
1.2 Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI[1] and the CoGP[2]? Counts should be:		Y		
weekly;	Low	Y		
record the person making the count;	Low	Y		
date of the count;	Low	Y		
number of fish sampled (should be 25);	Low	Y		
pen or facility number recorded;	Low	Y		
water temperature3;	Low	Y		
number of parasites observed and correct stages recorded4.	Medium	Y		
1.3 Where weekly counts are not conducted is the reason for not conducting the count stated?	Low	Y	SSI 1,2(g)	
1.4 Is that reason considered acceptable by the Inspector? Give detail.	Low	Y		
1.5 Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?		N	Detail if necessary:	
1.6 Have weekly average adult female sea lice counts at or above the intervention level been reported accurately? If no, please detail in additional information.		Y		
b. Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice				
2.1 Has appropriate action been taken where:				
a) L. salmonis record levels have been above the suggested criteria for treatment?	High	Y	CoGP Annex 6	Treatments have been initiated as quickly as the current business strategy allows.
b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	These have been delayed due to weather and boat availability. Also, only Salmosan treatment available due to fish size and cleanerfish welfare (see additional info).

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.2 Is therapeutic treatment initiated ASAP where required?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.130, 5.3.84	
2.3 Where medicines have been administered there should be a record of :			VMD[12] 19 SSI 1,3	
the name / identity of the product;	High	Y		
the date of administration;	High	Y		
the quantity (concentration and amount) administered;	High	Y		
the method of administration of the product;	High	Y		
the identification of the fish / facilities treated;	High	Y		
name of the person administering the treatment;	Low	Y		
the withdrawal period.	Medium	Y		
2.4 If the medicine is administered by a veterinary surgeon:			VMD 18	
the name of the veterinary surgeon;	High	Y		
name of the product;	High	Y		
batch number;	High	Y		
the date of administration;	High	Y		
amount administered;	High	Y		
identification of fish treated;	High	Y		
withdrawal period.	Medium	Y		
2.5 Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	High	Y		
Inspect records to confirm. Significant impact - ≥50% reduction in site average L.salmonis numbers (all stages)				
2.6 If other methods are employed on site to control sea lice and their impact is there a record of:			SSI, 1,4	
the nature and date of the method employed;	Low	Y		
the identification number of all facilities subjected to the method;	Low	Y		
the name of the person employing the method.	Low	Y		
2.7 Where medicines have been acquired is there a record of:			VMD 19	
proof of purchase of the medicine concerned;	Medium	Y	VMD 17	
name of the product;	High	Y		
batch number;	High	Y		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
the date of purchase;	Medium	Y		
the quantity purchased;	High	Y		
the name and address of the supplier.	Medium	Y		
2.8 Where medicines have been disposed is there a record of:			VMD 19	
the date of disposal;	Medium	N/A		
the quantity of product involved;	Medium	N/A		
how and where it was disposed of.	Medium	N/A		
2.9 Are veterinary health plans available which detail bio-security protocols, preventative measures and treatments in relation to sea lice?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.129, 5.3.83	
Consider the following points over a percentage of treatments conducted on site.				
2.10 Has the recommended course of treatments been completed?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.134, 5.3.88	
2.11 If not, is there a recorded acceptable reason for not completing treatment?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.12 Was advice taken from the Veterinary surgeon in such circumstances?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.135, 5.3.89	
2.13 Are there clear written instructions regarding medicine use, available to those responsible for treatment administration?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	
2.14 Does the site have treatment discharge consents relevant to sea lice?		Y	Detail if necessary:	
c. Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and farm management agreements or statements				
3.1 Is there a nominated farmer acting as coordinator and point of contact for this farm or area inclusive of this farm?	Low	Y	SSI 1,5,b CoGP 4.3.75, 5.3.44	
3.2 Is there a written undertaking that the farm will observe the provisions of the NTS[6]?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.76, 5.3.45	
3.3 Has an area group been formed within the area containing the site?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46	
3.4 Does the remit of the area group have appropriate veterinary involvement? Consider:	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.77, 5.3.46 SSI 1,5, c	
agreed basis for monitoring sea lice;		Y		
coordinated monitoring and treatment;		Y		
co-operation between participating farms.		Y		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
This may require follow up investigation conducted off site to determine.				
3.5 Are records available of any decisions made by the FMG in relation to the prevention, control and reduction of parasites?	Low	Y	SSI 1, 5, c	
3.6 Where treatments have been administered is this done in accordance with principles to maximise the effectiveness of treatments, promote the minimal use of medicines consistent with the maintenance of high standards of fish welfare and help preserve their efficacy?	Medium	Y	4.3.82, 5.3.51	
For example, the principles of ISLM include: Resistance monitoring – reporting suspected adverse drug event (SADE) to the VMD. The steps to determine if resistance is considered a reason for a suspected lack of efficacy (e.g. Bio-assay tests and results, seeking veterinary advice). Appropriate discharge consent in place. Use of authorized medicines with veterinary instruction and advice as necessary. Monitoring lice numbers. Using an array of treatments where possible. Treating all stocks on site at the same time. Avoiding the simultaneous use of different active ingredients. Avoiding consecutive treatments of the same active ingredient, and certainly not on the same cohort of lice. Routine removal of moribund fish and regular removal of mortalities.				
3.7 Are weekly monitoring results communicated to other farmers within the defined area?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.78, 5.3.47	
3.8 Is this done 'as soon as reasonably possible where lice numbers exceed the suggested criteria for treatment'?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.79, 5.3.48	
3.9 Is sea lice data and other information relevant to the management of sea lice provided to the SSPO?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.3.80, 5.3.49	
3.10 Are annual review meetings held by FMA groups to evaluate site performance against set criteria?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.83, 5.3.52	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.11 Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or farm management statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?		Y	AFSA[13] 4A Detail if necessary:	
3.12 Are up to date copies of FMS available from other APB operating within the same FMA?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.88, 5.3.57	Jun-25
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	Loch Duart Plc is the only company in the area.
3.14 Is there co-operation between APB's operating within the FMA in the development and implementation of FMAg?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.90, 5.3.59	
3.15 Are copies of FMS or FMAg available for inspection?	Medium	Y	AFSA 4B	
3.16 Does the FMS or FMAg take into account the relevant aspects regarding a sea lice control strategy?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.3.91, 5.3.60	
3.17 If the FMA has been redefined , is there documented evidence to demonstrate that the risks to health within and outwith the area is not increased by the proposal?	High[10]	N/A	CoGP 4.3.92, 5.3.61	
3.18 Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.100	
3.19 If answered no to 3.18, then is there a documented risk assessment which meets the requirements of CoGP point 4.3.101?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.101	
d. Inspection of records relating to training and procedures				
4.1 Is there a training programme or plan in place relevant to sea lice control for the site?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Husbandry staff: welfare section on induction. Fish welfare officer course (FWO) within 1 year (Pharmaq/Stim).
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1	At least one FWO present at all handling operations. Biologist conducts counts on all site.
parasite identification;	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.84-86,	
counting parasites (procedures for);	High	Y	5.3.53-55	
recording counts;	High	Y		
biology and life cycle of parasites;	Low	Y		
symptoms of parasite infection in fish.	Low	Y		
4.3 Have staff been trained in the administration of treatments?	High	Y	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	In house training.
N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this.				
e. Inspection of site and site stock				
5.1 Are medicines used, stored and disposed of safely?	Medium	Y	VMD schedule 5	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.2 Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data?	High	Y		
Refer to section e) of guidance notes				
5.3 Does the site appear satisfactory in terms of fish welfare relating to sea lice infestation?	High	Y		During the inspection head damage (white heads) could be observed on a small amount of the general population. This is due to the logistical delays that were outside of Loch Duart Plc's control. The company is continuing to take action and treatments are now taking place to reduce the number of sea lice on site. Any moribund or damaged fish is promptly removed by staff during husbandry operations. The fish removed for sea lice counts also had evidence of skin abrasions, however these areas were clean of parasites and appeared to be healing. Counts have decreased significantly post treatment (both adult and pre-adult stages). The current situation has been passed to APHA for awareness.
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Y	CoGP Annex 6,	
6.2 Have the personnel conducting counts had appropriate training in lice recognition and recording?	High	Y	4.3.84-86, 5.3.53-55	
(Cross reference to training records – Section d)				
6.3 Can such personnel demonstrate post training competence?	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.85, 5.3.54	
6.4 Do the sample sizes and methods of sampling match the CoGP suggested protocol (detailed iii – vii)?	Medium	Y	Annex 6	10 fish from every pen on site each week.
N.B. Other strategies are acceptable if considered adequate in the control and reduction of sea lice				
6.5 Is identification and recording of sea lice count information including species and stages observed to be correct?	High	Y	Annex 6	
Minimum recording requirements within the CoGP and NTS are:				
for Caligus elongatus all identifiable stages and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis chalimus, mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)[11]				
6.6 Is the transfer of data from field counts to records observed to be satisfactory?	Medium	Y		Week 43 counts: 3
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner?	High	N/A		
Consider appropriate use of tarpaulins; completion of medication per prescription, correct concentrations, mixing and administrations, appropriate product used				
7.2 Is accurate information provided to the attending veterinary surgeon for dosage calculation?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	
7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?		N/A		
7.4 If so, has the prescribing veterinary surgeon been informed of this?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.132, 5.3.86	
7.5 Are clear instructions for medication, dosage and administration communicated to the staff responsible for treatment?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.3.133, 5.3.87	

Additional actions	Powers	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
h. FHI sea lice counts If necessary conduct a sea lice count in accordance with the protocol of the CoGP. Indicate where this procedure has been done and make a record of results within the comments box	**Power granted under the Act – section 3 (2) (a)**	N/A
i. Collection of samples If necessary collect samples. Indicate if samples have been taken and detail what those samples are and the purpose of their collection	**Power granted under the Act – section 3 (3) (a)**	N/A
j. Enforcement Notice. If an enforcement notice has been issued then maintain a copy / duplicate and record detail Guidance on completing the Enforcement Notice	**Power granted under the Act – Section 6 (2)**	N/A

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary

[1] Scottish Statutory Instrument – The Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008

[2] A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture

[3] Water temperature to be measured at the half way point of the depth of the facility containing the fish, or as close to as possible. For SW cage sites one reading per count may be su

[4] Recording requirements:- for C. elongatus – all identifiable stages and for L. salmonis - mobiles and adult females (with or without egg strings)

[5] Area refers to management area as specified within Part 3 of the industry CoGP or as redefined appropriately

[6] For reference Annex 6 of the CoGP provides the detail of the NTS

[7] FMA = Farm Management Area

[8] FMS = Farm Management Statement

[9] FMAg = Farm Management Agreement

[10] No further action may be required when answering no to this point and yes to 3.18

[11] Legal recording requirements within the SSI stipulate – for Caligus elongatus: mobiles; and for Lepeophtheirus salmonis: non-gravid mobiles and gravid females.

[12] VMD - The Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2013 (SI 2013 No 2033)

[13] AFSA - Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)

Case No: 2025-0401 Date of visit: 22/10/2025

Site No: FS0068 Main Insp: [redacted]

Results Summary	Freq.	Date of Notification						
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2nd Insp
			[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	[redacted]

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2nd Insp
REP	30/10/2025	[redacted]	[redacted]
SLA	07/11/2025		
Case Completion	21/04/2026		

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0398	Date of visit:	22/10/2025
Site no:	FS0068	Site name:	Calva Bay (Calbha Beag)
Case no:	20250401	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 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.

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.

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.

R25

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

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

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). An enhanced sea lice inspection was conducted. A separate report will be issued in due course.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: [redacted] Date: 30/10/2025

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)

R25

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

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0398	Date of visit:	22/10/2025
Site no:	FS0068	Site name:	Calva Bay (Calbha Beag)
Case no:	20250401	Inspector:	[redacted]

ENHANCED SEA LICE INSPECTION

An enhanced sea lice inspection to ascertain the levels of sea lice and for assessing the measures in place for the prevention, control and reduction of sea lice was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of records with regards to sea lice, the stock on site, site procedures with regards to sea lice and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of sea lice records

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

b) Inspection of records relating to treatment and control of sea lice

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice, however, the sea lice levels on site were above the suggested criteria for treatment as stated in A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP). Therapeutic treatments and other management actions were undertaken, subject to logistical timeframes, when the suggested criteria for treatment was reached, without the sea lice numbers being reduced below the criteria suggested in Annex 6 of the CoGP.

It is recommended that a documented review is undertaken of the sea lice control strategy, taking into account veterinary advice, where necessary, which is required as part of the Veterinary Health Plan in accordance with Chapter 4, point 3.129 of the CoGP. This should identify any improvements which are required to logistical timeframes, treatment practices and protocols or availability of medicinal treatments to ensure an effective strategy is being implemented that will meet the standards associated with A National Treatment Strategy for the Control of Sea Lice on Scottish Salmon Farms, as described in Annex 6 of the CoGP.

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

c) Inspection of records relating to farm management groups and area management agreements.

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

d) Inspection of records relating to training and procedures

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

e) Inspection of site and site stock

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

f) Inspection of farm count procedures

An inspection of site staff conducting and recording a sea lice count was carried out. This met the requirements of The Fish Farming Business (Record Keeping) (Scotland) Order 2008 and CoGP. No further recommendations or further action required.

g) Inspection of treatment administration procedures

No treatments were being administered at the time of inspection therefore, an appropriate assessment could not be made on administration procedures.

The recommendation in this report should be implemented by the 11th of May 2026. Documentation should be provided as evidence that the recommendation has been implemented. Enforcement action may result if the recommendation is not implemented in the necessary time frame. Records should be sent to the Marine Directorate's Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI) (contact details are provided below).

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: [redacted] Date: 07/11/2025

Fish Health Inspector

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

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

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)

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

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0398	Date of visit:	22/10/2025
Site no:	FS0068	Site name:	Calva Bay (Calbha Beag)
Case no:	20250401	Inspector:	[redacted]

Case completion report

Recommendations in relation to the above case were made for implementation by the 11th of May 2026. Following submission of the required documentation, evidence has now been provided to the Fish Health Inspectorate to demonstrate that the recommendations have been implemented.

This case will now be closed. This site may be subject to further audit and recommendations in the future.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: [redacted] Date: 21/04/2026

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)

R23

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