Case No: 2025-0154 Date of visit: 29/04/2025

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

Site No: FS0946 Site Name: North Voe
Business No: FB0125 Business Name: Scottish Sea Farms Ltd

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

Water Temp (°C): 9.5 Thermometer No: T306 FHI 045 completed N/A

Observations: Region: SH Water type: S CoGP MA: S-5

Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present?	N	If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.
Clinical signs of disease observed?	N	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 from Loch Shin

Increased mortality in week 52 2024 - 0.55% (1017 fish) mortalities were attributed to seal damage. No damage to equipment, seals were grabbing fish through meshes.

Mortalities are ensiled and sent to SSF Lerwick using company's own transport.

CMS reported in heath surveillance, exacerbated by the large size of fish, however there has been very little increase in mortality.

Case No: 2025-0154 Site No: FS0946

Date of Visit: 29/04/2025 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	7	Facilities stocked	6	No facilities inspected	7		
Species	Atlantic salmon						
Age group	2023 S0						
No Fish	88,502						
Mean Fish Wt	7.8kg						
Next Fallow Date (Site)	June 2025	Next Input Date (Site)	June 2026				
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	Y	Any escapes (since last visit)?	N				
If yes, detail:	CMS						

Movement Records

1. Movement records for **all species** held available for inspection?	Y
2. Date of last inspection:	08/03/2022
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)?	Y
If yes, is there a system in place for maintenance of transportation records?	Y

Mortality Records

1. Mortality records for **all species** held available for inspection?	Y
2. How are mortalities disposed of?	Ensiled - on site
If other detail:	
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	WK17 - 0.48% (427) WK16 - 0.35% (367) , WK15 - 0.31% (333) WK 14 - 0.33% (415)
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?	Y
If yes, detail:	See additional information
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.	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?	Y
If yes, detail:	
If other, detail:	Optomease
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
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?	Y

Biosecurity Records

1. Biosecurity records available for inspection?	Y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality removal, recording and safe disposal been considered?	Y
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?	Y
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?	Y
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals being stocked on the farm site been covered (equal or higher health status, certification if required)?	Y
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.)?	Y
7. Is documentation available regarding the measures in place to maintain the physical containment of aquaculture animals held on site?	Y
8. Have the biosecurity procedures been adequately implemented on site?	Y
If no, detail:	

Results of Surveillance

1. Has any animal health surveillance been carried out by, or on behalf of, the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	Y
3. Any significant results?	N
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent disease problems).	

Records checked between:	08/03/2022 - 29/04/2025

Case Number:	2025-0154		Site No:	FS0946	Main Insp:	
Date of Visit	29/04/2025					

		No of movements/supp./dest.				Score
Live fish movements		**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	
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	10
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	3

Exposure via water	**Site contacts**	**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	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	

Management practices		None	Secure	Unsecure	
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	
	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	

Biosecurity	**Number of sites**	**1**	**2 or 3**	**≥ 4**	
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating from single shorebase	0	1	2	0
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	

Disinfection of equipment between sites, use of footbaths etc	Yes	0	0
	No	1	
CoGP/Regulator			
Practices in accordance with regulator or industry code of practice	Yes	0	0
	No	3	
Platform access to cages	Yes	0	0
	No	2	

Total	**18**
Rank	**MEDIUM**

Case No: 2025-0154 Site No: FS0946

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) fallowed 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?	N
2. Are measures in place to mitigate against the predation experienced on site? (Detail below)	Y

Predator Nets	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?	N
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)	Y

Case No: 2025-0154 Site No: FS0946

Date of Visit: 29/04/2025 Main Insp: [redacted]

Point of Compliance

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

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?	Y
3. Is the current FMAg/S available for inspection?	Y
4. Does the FMAg/S identify the relevant farm management area?	Y
5. Does the FMAg/S identify the fish farm site(s) to which it applies?	Y
6. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of commencement of the agreement or statement?	Y
7. Does the FMAg/S identify the date of review?	Y

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?	Y
9. Does the FMAg/S identify the vaccination requirements for stocks held in the area or farm?	Y
10. Does the FMAg/S identify the species of fish which may be stocked into the area or farm?	Y
11. Does the FMAg/S identify the maximum stocking density of any pen on any farm in the area or the individual farm?	Y
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?	Y

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?	Y
14. Does the FMAg/S identify the availability and the use of medicines on farms covered by the agreement of statement?	Y
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?	Y
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?	Y
17. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for synchronous treatments on farms within the area?	Y

Live Fish Movements

18. Does the FMAg/S identify the circumstances when live fish may be introduced or removed from the area or farm?	Y
19. Does the FMAg/S identify the arrangements for the movement of live fish on and off sites in the area or individual farms?	Y

Harvesting

20. Does the FMAg/S identify acceptable harvest practices on farms in the area or individual farms?	Y

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?	Y
22. Does the FMAg/S identify whether one or more year classes may be stocked onto sites covered by the agreement or statement?	Y
23. Does the FMAg/S identify whether broodstock or potential broodstock are to be kept on any site covered by the agreement or statement?	Y

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?	N/A

Management and operation

25. Is the fish farm being managed and operated in accordance with the agreement or statement?	Y
26. What is the version no/date of issue of the FMAg/S?	09/09/2024 - 09/09/2025

Case No: 2025-0154 Site No: FS0946

Date of visit: 29/04/2025 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		Sea lice counts are conducted weekly. Every pen sampled.
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)	WK52 24, WK1 25 - Two counts missed. This was due to bad weather and staff shortages.
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	Sea lice numbers have been reasonably good during cycle. Numbers began to rise mid February. Dropped below 2 AF in last two weeks. Site currently harvesting, plan to be fallow end of May
b) C. elongatus infestation is at a level considered to cause significant welfare problems	High	Y	CoGP 4.3.81, 5.3.50	

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	Low numbers of lice throughout cycle. Salmosan treatment 13/08/2024. Site currently harvesting to fallow and veterinary advice not to treat.
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		Salmosan treatment 13/08/2024
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		FW treatments following transfer from Gletness.
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	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
name of the product;	High	Y		
batch number;	High	Y		
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	N/A	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		

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
coordinated monitoring and treatment;		Y		
co-operation between participating farms.		Y		
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	Weekly fish health meetings
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	
3.13 Are significant changes to FMS notified to other companies within the FMA?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 4.3.89, 5.3.58	No other operators in management 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	
4.2 Are training records available for relevant staff in relation to:			CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 SSI, 1,1	
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? N.B. there is no legal requirement to maintain a record of this.	High	Y	CoGP 4.1.6, 5.1.6 CoGP 4.3.84, 5.3.53	
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		
f. Inspection of farm count procedures				
6.1 Are pens and fish sampled at random?	Low	Y	CoGP Annex 6,	Generally all pens are sampled. Site is currently harvesting and fish are difficlut to handle at the size they're at. Some pens are only part stocked and during inspection workboats were onsite. 3/6 pens sampled.
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	
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		
g. Inspection of treatment administration procedures				
7.1 Are treatments considered to be administered in an appropriate competent manner?	High	N/A		Administration of treatments not inspected.
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	Y	CoGP 4.3.131, 5.3.85	

Point for consideration	Risk level	Satisfac-	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
7.3 Are the fish under consideration being given any other medication, or are they in a withdrawal period for any other medication?		N		
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	Y	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)**	
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)**	
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)**	

[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

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

[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: 2025-0154 Date of visit: 29/04/2025

Site No: FS0946 Main Insp: [redacted]

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

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2nd Insp
ECI, CNI	20/04/2026		
SLA	31/07/2026		

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0125	Date of visit:	29/04/2025
Site no:	FS0946	Site name:	North Voe
Case no:	20250154	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. There were no recommendations made and no further action is required.

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

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. 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. No recommendations made or further action required.

e) Inspection of site and site stock

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No recommendations made or further action required.

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

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

An inspection of treatment administration procedures was carried out. The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No further recommendations made, or further action required.

Further Action

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice. No further recommendations are made, or further action required.

Please do not hesitate to contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: [redacted] Date: 30/07/2026

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)

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

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0125	Date of visit:	29/04/2025
Site no:	FS0946	Site name:	North Voe
Case no:	20250154	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 surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as low. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every third 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.

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

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), 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 fish farm management agreements and statements and containment and escapes.

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: Date: 20/04/2026

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)

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