Case No: 2025-0313 Date of visit: 29/08/2025

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

Site No: FS0413 Site Name: Camas Glas
Business No: FB0119 Business Name: Mowi Scotland Ltd

Case Types: 1 REG 2 CNA 3 4 5 6

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

Observations: Region: HI Water type: S CoGP MA: M-34

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

Temperature too high for EC inspection.

Additional Case Information:

Stock on site was moved on from Glenfinnan in Nov 24, followed by a 2nd input from Loch Damph in Dec 24. Fish were treated with Salmosan shortly after input and have only received FW and FLS since. HSMI has recently been diagnosed but mortality on the site remains very low.

Wrasse stocked on site were imported from NI. Lumpfish came on from Ocean Matters. Site is moving away from stocking lumpfish and will only be stocking wrasse for future production cycles.

Wrasse mortality last 4 weeks: Wk32: 719 (1.29%), Wk31: 1,677 (2.89%), WK30: 786 (1.51%), Wk29: 420 (0.98%)
Lumpfish mortality last 4 weeks: Wk32: 277 (0.86%), WK31: 633 (1.94%), Wk30: 653 (1.96%), Wk29: 637 (1.88%)

Site paperwork was inspected remotely on 20/08/25, however, site was unable to be inspected under the 2009 Regs for disease control purposes due to the temperature being >14 degrees. Movement records were collected. Paperwork for enhanced containment inspection were reviewed remotely, the physical inspection will be completed when the EC inspection is scheduled later in the year when the water temperature is <14 degrees.

UPDATE: Physical site inspection and EC inspection were completed by [redacted] on 08/10/25. Relevant sections of the case sheet have now been updated with information collected from this inspection (reference case: 2025-0366).

Case No: 2025-0313 Site No: FS0413

Date of Visit: 29/08/2025 Main Insp: [redacted]

Registration/Authorisation Details

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

Site Details (include cleaner fish for all sections)

Total No facilities	12		Facilities stocked		12	No facilities inspected		0
Species	Atlantic salmon	Wrasse	Lumpsucker					
Age group	24 Q4	2024	2024					
No Fish	731,910	114,694	62,404					
Mean Fish Wt	1.7kg	110g	100g					
Next Fallow Date (Site)	Jun 26		Next Input Date (Site)			Nov 26		
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:	22/02/2023
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 the movement records?	Y

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?	Ensiled - on site
If other detail:	Ensiled waste taken to Pelagia for further processing.
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	Wk34: 2,010 (0.27%), Wk33: 1,149 (0.16%), Wk32: 535 (0.07%), Wk31: 1,613 (0.22%).
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:	Wk4 2025: 1.58% - treatment losses; wk10 2024: 1.21% - treatment losses; wk28 2023:1.03%, wk30-wk43 2023: >1% - poor gill health, HSMI, bacterial infection.
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:	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)?	T.M.S.
If other, detail:	
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?	N/A
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: 22/02/23 - 29/08/25

Case Number:	2025-0313		Site No:	FS0413	Main Insp:	
Date of Visit	29/08/2025					

		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	5
	Frequency of movements on from a third country	0	9	18	26	0
	Number of suppliers	0	5	10	14	5
Movements off	Frequency of movements off	0	3	6	10	0
	Number of destinations	0	3	6	10	0
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		1
	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		1
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm processing	0				
	Processing own fish (re-cycling risk)	1				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				
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		0
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	**13**
Rank	**LOW**

Case No: 2025-0313 Site No: FS0413

Date of Visit: 29/08/2025 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?	Nov-24

Case No: 2025-0313 Site No: FS0413

Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only)

1. Has the site experienced sea lice problems in the previous 4 years?	N
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?	Y
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?	Y
4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent)?	Y
5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)	Y
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)	N
8. Have weekly average adult female sea lice counts at or above the intervention level been reported accurately?	Y
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)	N
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)	Y
11. Has any other action been taken (where applicable)?	Y
12. Have therapeutic treatments or the actions taken had a significant impact upon the lice levels recorded?	Y
13. Are treatments, where conducted, carried out in cooperation between participating farms?	Y
14. Is there a harvesting strategy for the site, where fewer populations or part populations are held without treatment for sea lice?	Y
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?	Y
16. Do the sea lice levels observed on stocks reflect sea lice count data? If no please detail reasons.	N/A

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)	
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)	

Case No: 2025-0313 Site No: FS0413

Date of visit: 29/08/2025 Main Insp: [redacted]

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION (SEAWATER)				
a. Enquiry relating to i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures				
1.1. Have escape incidents or events[1] been experienced on or in the vicinity of the site since the last MSS inspection?		N		
If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High		AAAH Regs[4] 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.37, 5.4.17	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees?				
If yes give detail				
1.5 Was the decision to attempt to recapture and the method employed agreed with the local DSFB and FT?	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed in accordance with the permission issued by Marine Scotland?	Low		CoGP 4.4.38, 5.4.18	
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High			
1.9. Is there a site specific contingency plan in response to failures in containment, aimed at preventing escapes and recovering escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI, 2,9	Site-specific contingency plan in the event of fish escape SOP available.
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site				
General records			CoGP: 4.4.9, 4.4.14,	
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			SSI 2,1	
		Facilities	Moorings / Nets	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement		Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	Y	Y	Gael Force Marine and Moreknot supply the mooring equipment and are industry leaders.Mallaig Marine Limited are contracted to undertake all moorings work and a specialist aquaculture mmoorings installation and maintanence company. Net, moorings and facility policy available for inspection. AKVA, Fusion Marine, KJ and Aqualine group supply the pens and employ a chartered engineer to review and specify all documentation. Equipment certification was available. Nets are supplied by Morenot and exceed the minimum net strengths and are of appropriate mesh size.
b) Any special adaptations	Low	Y	Y	Y	
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	Y	Y	Net and Mooring Policy.
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	Y	Y	Invoices available.
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	Y	Y	Morenot service sheet available for net inspections and repairs.
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y	Y	Y	Moorings inspection report 2024 available.
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Y	Y	Y	Daily check sheet available for cages.
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Y	Y	Y	
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	Y	Y	Y	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,2		Morenot Aquaculture service card available.
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	Y			Site plan identifies the ID of each net and its location on the site.
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	Y			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	Y			Pen layout and seabed depth map available.
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y		
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y		
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4	
i) The date of installation	Low	Y		
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	Y		
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	Y		
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	Y	SSI, 2,5	Pen layout and seabed depth map available.
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters[3]			SSI, 2,6	
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A		
b) The date of and results of any tests conducted on any such measures	Low	N/A		
c) The date of any incident where the site was flood	Low	N/A		
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A		
2.7 A record of-			SSI, 2,7	
a) The date of any severe weather event which caused damage to any facility, net or mooring	Medium	Y	SSI, 2,11 (a)	These events would be recorded in the site diary and any remedial repairs would also be recorded here.
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	Y	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				
2.8 Are there documented procedures maintained regarding the selection and installation of pens and moorings?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.8, 4.4.13	Net, mooring and facility policy available for inspection.
2.9 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the design specification of pens and moorings are suitable for purpose and correctly installed?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.9, 4.4.14	Manufacturer attestation satisfies the requirements for strength and safety of pens and moorings according to NS9415.
2.10 Do pen systems meet the manufacturers guidelines?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.10	
2.11 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.11	
2.12 Is there evidence of the competence of personnel involved in the design, installation and maintenance of pen and mooring systems?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.12, 4.4.15	Equipment design, installation and maintanence is undertaken by Mallaig Marine who are industry experts.

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.13 Are pen and mooring components inspected with a) a documented SOP b) a documented inspection plan based on a risk assessment	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.16	Pens, nets and moorings are inspected prior to each cycle at sheltered farm locations and once per annum at more high energy sites. Reports available.
2.14 Do all nets used on site meet industry standards?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.17	Nets meet or exceed NS 9415 industry standards.
2.15 Can the site demonstrate an awareness of the minimum fish size in relation to net size?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.19	
2.16 Does the net design, quality and standard of manufacture take into account the conditions that are likely to be experienced on site and include adequate safety margins?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.20	Prior to deploying equipment on sites, environmental surveys are conducted to establish the conditions that will be experienced at that location in accordance with the Technical Standard for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture order and the Norwegian Standard 9415.
2.17 Are nets treated with a UV inhibitor?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.21	
2.18 Are nets tested at a pre-determined frequency?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	Net, mooring and facility policy details testing frequencies.
2.19 Is the method of test procedure based upon the manufacturers advice?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.22	
2.20 Are frequent net inspections conducted to look for damage?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	Above surface inspections are carried out during daily checks. Sub-surface inspections occur ???
2.21 Are net inspection records maintained?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.23	Recorded on Aquacom.
2.22 Is the system by which nets are attached to the pen and weighted inspected frequently?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.24	Pens, nets and moorings are inspected prior to each cycle at sheltered farm locations and once per annum at more high energy sites. Reports available.
2.23 Where damage to nets and/or associated fittings has occurred, or the potential for damage exists, has remedial action been taken?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.25	Any repairs are completed at the time of inspection or as required.
b(ii). Inspection of records relating to training				
3.1 Are training programmes and plans relevant to the various onsite activities documented?	High	Y	CoGP 7.1.8	Company academy provides in-house training in site-specific operations and include fish handling, crowding, harvests, treatments etc.
3.2 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations? (This excludes well boat operations)	High	Y	SSI 2,6,a	Training record for all site staff made available and details who is certified to participate in site specific operational activities.

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
3.5 With respect to any transfer of or handling of fish is there a record of all training of each person working on site in relation to containment and prevention of escape of fish, and recovery of escaped fish?	High	Y	SSI 2,7,a	All staff are trained in escape prevention.
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments				
4.1 Are procedures which could increase the risk of fish escaping considered to be carefully planned and supervised to minimise risk?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.29, 5.4.12	Each site-specific activity has an accompanying SOP and RA available. These identify breach risks and the containment measures that have been implemented to mitigate these risks.
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 4.4.30, 5.4.13 SSI 2,7, b , SSI 2, 8, c	
a) a documented risk assessments	High	Y		
b) standard operating procedures	High	Y		
c) contingency plan	High	Y		
4.3 In relation to any boat operations at each site at which fish are farmed is there a record of:				
-The type and size of each boat used for operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI 2,6,b	
- The type and size of any propeller guard fitted to each boat used on the site	Low	N/A	SSI 2,6,c	None of the workboats are fitted with prop guards.
4.4 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		
4.5 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	Predator control plan details these risks and mitigation measures that can be deployed on site.
4.6 Are there risk assessments undertaken on a pre-determined frequency?	Low	Y	CoGP 4.4.26	Reviewed prior to each production cycle.
4.7 A record of any anti-predator measures undertaken at each site at which fish are farmed including:			SSI, 2,8,a	
The type and location of each net, fence and scarer deployed	Medium	Y		Site plan identifies the ID of each net and its location on the site.
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	Y	SSI, 2,8,b	PCP details specifies that the dispatch of seals as a predator mitigation action is not permitted.
4.8 Where predator nets are deployed is the advice of Annex 7 considered?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.27	No predator nets used on this site.
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		Physical site inspection completed on 08/10/25 (case 2025-0366)
5.2 Is the net mesh size considered to be capable of containing all fish sizes present on site?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.18	
5.3 Do nets carry numbered ID tags?	Low	Y	SSI 2,2 ii	
Look at a percentage of nets on site - Does the net location meet the inventory?	Low	Y		
5.4 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight?	Low	N/A	CoGP 4.4.21	Nets are not stored on site. They are removed for service/repairs at the end of each cycle and then replaced.
5.6 Are appropriate measures in place to mitigate predation on site? (Provide detail if necessary)		Y		Sealpro nets, tensioned and bird nets.
5.7 Are boat operations conducted in such a manner which prevents damage to nets and pens?	High	Y	CoGP 4.4.28	
5.8 Is there a requirement for navigation markers to be deployed?	Low	Y	MSA[5] 2010 P4, S21	
5.9 If yes, has this been done in accordance with the necessary requirements?	Low	Y	MS Marine licence	
5.10 If Yes to 5.8 is there a record of any navigation markers deployed?	Low	Y	SSI 2,5	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are pen nets examined for holes, tears or damage prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.31	No handling procedures were observed during the physical site inspection (2025-0366).
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-			CoGP 4.4.32	
a) nets should be secure	High	N/A		
b) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the air	High	N/A		
c) radio contact between farm staff and helicopter crew should be maintained or where this is not possible, pens receiving fish should be manned	High	N/A	CoGP 4.4.33	
Consideration should be given to all other site procedures being undertaken during the visit with respect to containment and the risk of fish farm escapes				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
Additional actions	**Powers**			**Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary**
e) 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 5 (3) (a)			
h) 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 An ‘escape event’ can be defined as any circumstances on or in the vicinity of a fish farm which are believed to have caused an escape, or which may have given rise to a
2 FHI interpretation – Informing the SSPO is only a requirement where the site belongs to an Authorised Production Business which is signed up to the CoGP.
3 being waters which do not form part of the sea or any creek, bay or estuary or of any river as far as far as the tide flows
4 The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 (as amended)
5 The Marine Scotland Act 2010

Case No: 2025-0313 Date of visit: 29/08/2025

Site No: FS0413 Main Insp:

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

Report Summary			
Case Type	Date	Insp	2nd Insp
REG	10/09/2025		
CNA	13/10/2025		

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Buisiness no:	FB0119	Date of visit:	29/08/2025
Site no:	FS0413	Site name:	Camas Glas
Case no:	20250313	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.

On this occasion, the site inspection could not be conducted as the water temperature was too high. An inspection will be rescheduled for later in the year.

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 three years. 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.

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 Scotland were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

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

Records were inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007, as amended, with respect to section 3 regarding parasites (sea lice) and section 4A regarding fish farm management agreements and statements and were found to be adequately maintained.

Containment records were also inspected as part of an enhanced containment inspection. The enhanced containment inspection will be completed after a physical inspection to be scheduled for later in the year. A separate report will be issued detailing the results of this inspection.

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

Signed: [redacted] Date: 12/09/2025

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)

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

Fish Health Inspectorate visit report

Summary for information of site operator

Business no:	FB0119	Date of visit:	29/08/2025
Site no:	FS0413	Site name:	Camas Glas
Case no:	20250313	Inspector:	[redacted]

ENHANCED CONTAINMENT INSPECTION

An enhanced inspection to ascertain the risk of escape from the fish farm was conducted in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007.

The visit consisted of an inspection of facilities, records and the provision of advice.

a) Inspection of i) escape incidents and ii) contingency procedures

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

b)i) Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site

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

b)ii) Inspection of records relating to training

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

b)iii) Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments

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

c) Inspection of site and site equipment

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

d) Inspection of site specific procedures

No site-specific procedures were observed during the 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

Further Action

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

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

Signed: [redacted] Date: 13/10/2025

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)

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