

Case No: 2026-0008 Date of visit: 28/01/2026

Additional inspector(s): Main Inspector:

Site No: FS0375 Site Name: Loch Damph

Business No: FB0224 Business Name: Torridon Smolts Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNI 3 VMD 4 5 6

Water Temp (°C): 4.2 Thermometer No: T173 FHI 045 completed N/A

Observations: Region: HI Water type: F CoGP MA:

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/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:**

Morts for the last four weeks, w/b 21st Jan 806 (no % available) w/b 14th Jan 828 (0.3%) w/b 7 Jan 922 (0.4%), w/b 1st Jan 3102 (1.2%), Fungus.

Weekly totals in records recorded from the 1st of the month in seven day blocks, not standard weekly formats.

Peaks in mortality 2024 w/b 1st Sep 10098 (1.3%), w/b 7 Sep 4202 (0.5%) furunculosis treated with florocol, W/b 14 Sep 7200 (0.9%) mainly fungus but tail end of furunculosis. W/b 14th October 3424 (1.4%), w/b 21st October 3477 (1.4%), w/b 28th Oct 3481 (1.4%) post vaccination fungus, w/b 18th November 3202 (1.3%), treatment on the 14th with florocol for furunculosis. W/b 25th Nov 3078 (1.3%), w/b 2nd Dec 2388 (1%), w/b 9th Dec 2474 (1.1%), w/b 16 Dec 2236 (1%), w/b 23 Dec 2391 (1%),

Peaks in mortality 2025, w/b 31 Dec 3006 (1.3%), w/b 7 Jan 2749 (1.2%), w/b 14 Jan 2241 (1%), w/b 21 Jan 2242 (1%), w/b 28 Jan 3228 (1.4%), w/b 4 Feb 2752 (1.3%), w/b 11 Feb 2081 (1%), Furunculosis and florocol. W/b 6th Nov 1717 (0.6%), w/b 13th November 3370 (1.2%), w/b 20 Nov 2112 (0.8%), mort levels have remained elevated due to furunculosis in the background and fungus.

Current cycle was going well from input in June 2025 with low mortalities, second input from Inverkerry Smolt Unit in November resulted in furunculosis with a treatment of florocol administered to the whole site.

Two pens were vaccinated in January with Micro 6 and Clynav & Pasteurella.

Two dead fish observed with fungus.



Case No:  Site No:

Date of Visit:  Main Insp:

**Registration/Authorisation Details**

1. Business/site details summary checked by site representative?

2. Changes made to details?

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

Total No facilities	<input type="text" value="20"/>	Facilities stocked	<input type="text" value="8"/>	No facilities inspected	<input type="text" value="20"/>
Species	<input type="text" value="Atlantic salmon"/>				
Age group	<input type="text" value="2025"/>				
No Fish	<input type="text" value="253,863"/>				
Mean Fish Wt	<input type="text" value="85g"/>				
Next Fallow Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="March 2026"/>	Next Input Date (Site)	<input type="text" value="May/June 2026"/>		
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	<input type="text" value="Y"/>		Any escapes (since last visit)?	<input type="text" value="N"/>	
If yes, detail:	<input type="text" value="Background furunculosis and fungus"/>				

**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?

**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?

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:

6. Any other peaks in mortality during period checked?

If yes, detail:

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

If yes, detail action:

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



Case no:  Site No:  Date of visit/  
 Sampling:

Priority samples: VI  BA  PA  MG  HI

Time sampling starts/ends:   Main Insp:  VMD No.

Environmental conditions: 1  2  3  4  5

Summary samples HIST  BA  MG  VI  PA  Total Samples

Add Fish/Pools - click button

	Pool/Fish No											
	Fish nos	1-20	21-35									
	Pool Group											
Stock Details	Species	SAL	SAL									
	Average weight	60g	60g									
	Sex	N/A	N/A									
	Water Type	FW	FW									
	Stock Origin	Inverkerry Smolt Unit (FS1061)	Mill Burn (Old Mill) (FS0831)									
	Facility No	11	4									



Case Number:	2026-0008	Site No:	FS0375	Main Insp:	
Date of Visit	28/01/2026	No of movements/supp./dest.			Score
<b>Live fish movements</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>&gt;10</b>
Movements on (from out with GB) of susceptible species	Frequency of movements on from British Islands (non-GB).	0	5	10	14
	Frequency of movements on from a third country	0	9	18	26
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10
<b>Exposure via water</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	
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	
<b>Management practices</b>		<b>None</b>	<b>Secure</b>	<b>Unsecure</b>	
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			0
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	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			
	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>	<b>1</b>	<b>2 or 3</b>	<b>≥ 4</b>
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	0
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>18</b> <b>MEDIUM</b>

Case No:

Site No:

**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	Top Nets				
----------------	----------	--	--	--	--

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)



# Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

## Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0224	Date of visit:	28/01/2026
Site no:	FS0375	Site name:	Loch Damph
Case no:	20260008	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.

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

R04

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

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

Signed:



Date: 05/02/2026

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 \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot)

R04