Case No: 2025-0204 Date of visit: 27/05/2025

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

Site No: FS0575 Site Name: Ormsary Smolt Unit
Business No: FB0061 Business Name: Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd

Case Types: 1 ECI 2 CNA 3 ECS 4 MIX 5 6

Water Temp (°C): 13.4 Thermometer No: Site FHI 045 completed Y

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

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:

Reported escape on 10/03/2025. Escape investigation conducted.

Fish all incinerated on site.

Treatments - Formalin treatments in January, March, April (08/04) and May (02/05 and 07/05) due to Costia. Only specific tanks treated for fungus but whole site treated for Costia.

Pre-transfer checks were done by Mowi but the site does not get access to any reports from that visit. Loch Duart pre-transfer report 20/02/25 - 4 fish tested with no significant findings.

VMD Feedmix - Last feed mix florocol 14/05/2024 23/05/2024 - went to Clachbrech. Mixed slice 19/09/2023 - for use on site.

On the day of inspection, fish were being transferred to one of the new outdoor tanks. Site was clean and tidy. Peaty water on site made it difficult to see deep into the tanks but all fish observed appeared healthy.

Site thermometer used for biosecurity reasons.

Case No: 2025-0204 Site No: FS0575

Date of Visit: 27/05/2025 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	108	Facilities stocked	93	No facilities inspected	108		
Species	Atlantic salmon	Atlantic salmon					
Age group	2025 S0	2026 S1					
No Fish	4,793,754	4,788,719					
Mean Fish Wt	10.76g	0.72g					

Next Fallow Date (Site)	Never fallow	Next Input Date (Site)	Dec 2025/Jan 2026
Recent (last 4 wks) disease problems?	N	Any escapes (since last visit)?	Y
If yes, detail:	See additional info		

Movement Records

1. Movement records for **all species** held available for inspection?	Y
2. Date of last inspection:	05/11/2024
3. Are records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Are movement records available for dead fish and waste?	N/A
5. Are records complete and correctly entered?	N/A
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?	Incinerated - on site
If other detail:	
3. Mortality records complete and correctly entered?	Y
4. Recent mortality (last 4 wks):	S0's - Wk18: 0.11% (6139 fish), Wk19: 0.14% (6857 fish), Wk20: 0.06% (2820 fish), Wk21: 0.07% (3301 fish). S1's - Wk18: 0.69% (33,751 fish), Wk19: 1.21% (58,589 fish), Wk20: 0.65% (31,215 fish), Wk21: 0.31% (14,924 fish).
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?	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.	N/A

Treatments and Medicines Records

1. Recent treatments (see comment)?							Y
If yes, detail:	Formalin						
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)?	Formalin					
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?	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:	05/11/2024 - 27/05/2025

Case Number:	2025-0204		Site No:	FS0575	Main Insp:	
Date of Visit	27/05/2025					

		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	
	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	6

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	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	1
	Sites sharing staff and equipment	0	1	2	1

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	**22**
Rank	**MEDIUM**

Case No: 2025-0204 Site No: FS0575

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?	
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?	Y
If Yes proceed with questions 4 – 9. If No skip to question 10	
4. Have these been reported to Scottish Ministers?	Y
5. Have these been reported to local DSFB forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	Y
6. Have these been reported to the SSPO and local fisheries trusts forthwith (where they exist)? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4.17)	Y
7. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees? If yes give detail	Y
Please see additional info / escape report	
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)	N/A
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)	Retraining of staff
10. Is the site inspected as satisfactory with regards to containment? If no, please detail reason(s)	

Case No: **2025-0204** Site No: FS0575

Date of visit: **27/05/2025** 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 (FRESHWATER)				
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?		Y		
If yes answer 1.2-1.8:				
1.2. Have appropriate reports been made to Scottish Government within 24 hours of discovery?	High	Y	AAAH 31D,E	
1.3. Have these been reported to the SSPO[2] and, where in existence, the local DSFB and fisheries trust?	Medium	Y	CoGP 2.4.31, 3.4.39	
1.4. Were methods (if any) used to recover escapees?		Y		Hypochlorite poured down the channel to kill fish and bodies recovered from the channel itself and the beach.
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	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	Not recapturing as such
1.6. Was permission sought from Marine Scotland prior to recapture?	Medium	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	See above
1.7 Were the gill nets deployed of appropriate mesh size with regard the size of the escaped fish?	Low	N/A	CoGP 2.4.32, 3.4.40	Not applicable
1.8. In light of the escape event, has appropriate action been taken to prevent and minimise the risk of further escapes?	High	Y		See additional info
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	CoGP 2.4.28, 3.4.36 SSI, 2,9	Containment Escape Contingency document seen (dated as reviewed in March 2025) - not site specific as it covers a number of sites but Ormsary Smolt Unit is specifically mentioned within sections for Risk, Prevention and Recovery.
b(i). Inspection of records relating to equipment, facilities and the site				
General records				
2.1 With regard to each facility, net, screen and mooring at each site, a record should be maintained of:-			SSI 2,1	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement		Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
		Facilities	Moorings	Nets	
a) The name of the manufacturer	Low	Y	N/A	N/A	Only tanks on site. PPS Glass Fibre Limited have made tanks
b) Any special adaptations	Low	N/A	N/A	N/A	No special adaptations
c) The name of the supplier	Low	Y	N/A	N/A	
d) The date of purchase	Low	Y	N/A	N/A	
e) Each inspection including					
i) the name of the person conducting the inspection	Low	Y	N/A	N/A	Tanks inspected during fallow period when they are being
ii) the date of each inspection	Medium	Y	N/A	N/A	
iii) the place of each inspection	Low	Y	N/A	N/A	
iv) the outcome of each inspection	High	Y	N/A	N/A	Maintenance and repair log seen
f) the date and result of each repair, equipment test and antifouling treatment carried out	High	Y	N/A	N/A	
2.2. In relation to each net a record of:					
i) The mesh size	Medium	N/A	SSI, 2,2		
ii) The code which appears on the identification tag	Medium	N/A			
iii) The place of use, storage and disposal	Medium	N/A			
iv) The depth of water between the bottom of the net and the seabed as measured at the mean low water spring	Low	N/A			
2.3. In relation to each facility a record of:					
i) The date of construction	Low	Y	SSI, 2,3		Seen in contingency plan
ii) The material used in construction	Low	Y			Most are fiberglass - 11 are steel tanks with concrete bases.
iii) Its dimensions	Low	Y			
2.4. In relation to each mooring a record of-			SSI, 2,4		
i) The date of installation	Low	N/A			N/A as no moorings - land based facility
ii) The design and weight of the anchors	Low	N/A			
iii) The length of the mooring ropes or chains	Low	N/A			
2.5. A record of any navigation markers deployed at each site at which fish are farmed	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,5		
2.6 In respect of sites at which fish are farmed in inland waters[3]			SSI, 2,6		

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
a) The type, method of and date of construction of any flood prevention or flood defence measures in place	Low	N/A		No flood prevention is in place on site as the site has previously never flooded before January 2025
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	Y		24th January 2025
d) The water course height during any such flood incident	Low	N/A		Waterline marks were seen on site in the office and workshop
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	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (a)	No tanks damaged due to the flood due to them being higher up on site
b) Any action taken to rectify any such damage	High	N/A	SSI, 2,11 (b)	
Pen and mooring systems				
2.8 Can the site demonstrate evidence that pens and moorings are designed, manufactured and installed suitable for purpose at the location of the site?	High		CoGP 3.4.11	
2.9 Are pen systems inspected and approved by suitably qualified / experienced person(s)?	High		CoGP 3.4.12	
2.10 Can the site demonstrate evidence that all nets have been designed and manufactured under the control of a Quality Management System to ensure they provide containment for the whole of their working life?	High		CoGP 3.4.13	
2.11 Are all screens inspected daily and relevant action taken? Are records maintained of inspection frequency and the outcomes?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.17, 2.4.18	
2.12 Are screens constructed from a suitably strong and robust material, and therefore fit for purpose?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.19	Aluminium - various sizes
2.13 Can the site demonstrate awareness of the minimum net strengths to be used at all times?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.14	No nets on site
2.14 Does the site have a documented net replacement policy based on meeting the minimum strength requirements?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.15	
2.15 Does the site use nylon nets older than 5 years?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.16	
2.16 Can site managers demonstrate awareness of the minimum fish size supplied where new stock is introduced?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.18	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
2.17 Have nets been treated with UV inhibitor?	Low	N/A	CoGP 3.4.19	
2.18 Are nets stored away from direct sunlight and vermin when not in use?	Low	N/A	CoGP 3.4.20, 3.4.21	
2.19 Can the site demonstrate evidence of nets being inspected and strength tested after each cycle by a competent person?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.22	
2.20 Is net inspection/testing in accordance with a detailed procedure based on manufacturer's advise and using a documented quality control system?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.22	
2.21 Do the net inspections include representative sections from:			CoGP 3.4.23	
a) net base	High	N/A		
b) side wall	High	N/A		
c) above the waterline	High	N/A		
2.22 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.24	
2.23 Are additional net inspections undertaken following adverse weather where required?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.25	
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	
3.2 Are all staff fully aware of the importance of containment and best practice?	High	Y	CoGP 7.4.7	
3.3 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working in the site in relation to any helicopter operations?	High	N/A	CoGP 2.4.27, 3.4.33	No helicopter operations used on site
3.4 Is there a satisfactory record of all training and qualifications for each person working at the site in relation to any boat operations?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.35 SSI 2,6,a	No boat operations carried out on site
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 ; CoGP 2.4.29, 3.4.37	Training records seen and well as refresher training
b(iii). Inspection of records relating to procedures and risk assessments				

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
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 2.4.6, 3.4.8, 2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.2 Before procedures are conducted on site, are the following in place:			CoGP 2.4.23, 3.4.27 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 Is the integrity of all handling equipment checked, including pipelines, pumps, transport tanks, graders, counters and vaccination stations, before fish are handled?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.24, 3.4.28	
4.4 Do these checks include the suitability of the above equipment for use during adverse weather conditions where appropriate?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.25, 3.4.29	
4.5 Are mitigation measures such as safety nets, security devices, or bunding used at potential risk points, such as pipe connections?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.26, 3.4.30	Recovery channel is there as a mitigation measure
4.6 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	N/A	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	
4.7 Does the site suffer from regular or heavy predation?		N		Land based, enclosed facility
4.8 Are there records of site specific risk assessments ascertaining the risk and impact of predator attack?	Medium	Y	CoGP 2.4.7, 3.4.9	
4.10 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	N/A		
- The use of lethal means by any person involved in operations on the site	Low	N/A	SSI, 2,8,b	

Point of compliance	Risk level	Satisfactory? Y/ N/ N/A	Requirement	Comments and advice given or action taken if necessary
4.11 Where predator nets are deployed is this done in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of access by predators? For example, see requirements of Annex 7.	Low	N/A	CoGP 3.5.34-37 2.5.34-37	
c. Inspection of site and site equipment				
5.1 Are there any obvious containment issues on the site?	High	N		
5.2 Can the site demonstrate evidence that the site is not located within an area likely to be affected by flood, or suitable flood defences are in place?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.9, 2.4.10, 2.4.11	Site flooded on 24/01/25. Floodwater in buildings was due to build up of debris in the recovery channel. Containment of fish was not affected by floodwater as tanks are located on higher land within the site.
5.3 Does the site have effective measures in place to prevent fish from jumping out of holding facilities into surface waters or natural water courses?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.12	
5.4 Is the site inflow system designed to prevent any upstream escape of farm stock?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.14	
5.5 Are the screen sizes capable of containing the entire range of fish sizes within the unit in every instance?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.15	Various sizes of screens used
5.6 In the case of a land-based aquaculture system, are there two screens incorporated into the outflow system of a suitable size to prevent the passage of fish in all potential water conditions?	High	Y	CoGP 2.4.20	Tank screen plus recovery channel screen
5.7 Does the net mesh size contain the entire range of fish sizes in every instance of the species involved?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.17	
5.8 Are boat operations conducted in a manner which avoids damage to nets and pens?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.34	
d. Inspection of site specific procedures				
6.1 Are nets visually inspected on a daily basis including prior to and during the stocking, moving or crowding of fish?	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.24	
6.2 If helicopter transfer of fish is conducted are receiving pen(s) properly prepared:-				
a) pens should be marked with buoys clearly visible from the	High	N/A	CoGP 3.4.31	
b) 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 3.4.32	

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 significant risk of an escape of fish.
[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

Case No: 2025-0204 Date of visit: 27/05/2025

Site No: FS0575 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
MIX	05/06/2025		
ECI	05/06/2025		
CNA / ESC	22/04/2026		
ESC (R27)	17/04/2026		

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO	FB0061	**DATE OF VISIT**	27/05/2025
SITE NO	FS0575	**SITE NAME**	Ormsary Smolt Unit
CASE NO	20250204	**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 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.

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.

UKAS Accredited Inspection Body - Type C No. 0269
Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/

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 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

An enhanced containment 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: 04/06/2025

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
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0061
SITE NO FS0575
CASE NO 20250204

DATE OF VISIT 27/05/2025
SITE NAME Ormsary Smolt Unit
INSPECTOR [redacted]

Escape Investigation

The site was inspected following notification of an escape of approximately 18,174 Atlantic salmon on 10/03/2025 with a mean weight of 120g (Escape incident number MSe100325SAL1). During the investigation this figure was revised to 4455 escaped fish with an additional 13,700 fish were recovered after being euthanised.

An enhanced containment inspection was conducted during the inspection and a report will be issued separately.

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

Signed: [redacted]
Fish Health Inspector

Date: 16/04/2026

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)

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - https://www.gov.scot/policies/fish-health-inspectorate/

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO	FB0061	**DATE OF VISIT**	27/05/2025
SITE NO	FS0575	**SITE NAME**	Ormsary Smolt Unit
CASE NO	20250204	**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

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice an issue resulted in a breach of containment reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate on 10th March 2025. A recommendation would have been made to ensure appropriate training was provided to staff in relation to any revised procedures or risk assessments put in place following this incident. However, evidence of staff retraining was provided on 27th May 2025, and revised standard operating procedures were provided on 6th March 2026. Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd are advised to continue to provide appropriate training in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture (CoGP) Chapter 2, point 1.2.3 and Chapter 7, points 1.8 & 1.9. Also to maintain appropriate records in accordance with schedule 2, section 7 of the Fish Farming Businesses (Record Keeping) (Scotland) 2008.

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

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice an issue resulted in a breach of containment reported to the Fish Health inspectorate on 10th March 2025. A recommendation would have been made to undertake a documented review of standard operating procedures for conducting fish transfers in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture, Chapter 2 points 4.16.1, 4.16.3 and 4.16.4. This should have identified improvements and considered the use of safety nets, secondary pipe joint devices or bunding at pipe connections and a record system for the removal of screens to ensure staff are aware of the

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Fax – 0131 244 0944 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science

status of the containment systems prior to any transfer procedures being undertaken. Evidence that this had been undertaken and that standard operating procedure (SOP) documents on site specify interceptor screens of the correct size should be in place prior to any destocking of tanks was provided to the FHI on 6th March 2026. The APB has also confirmed with the FHI on 27th May 2025 that new equipment (clips) have been deployed on transfer pipe connections.

Landcatch Natural Selection Ltd. are advised to consider implementing a record system for the removal of screens to ensure staff are aware of the status of the containment systems prior to any transfer procedures being undertaken.

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

Although the site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice, during the breach of containment reported 10th March 2025 the method used to euthanise fish in the effluent channels was not detailed in the sites standard operating procedures. A recommendation would have been made to undertake a documented review of standard operating procedures for containment in the event of an escape to ensure that recovery methods are undertaken in accordance with A Code of Good Practice for Scottish Finfish Aquaculture, Chapter 2 point 4.19.1. The use of appropriate recovery methods including anaesthetics for humane recovery or euthanasia for fish that have escaped into effluent channels should be considered. Evidence that this had been undertaken was provided to the FHI on 6th March 2026.

Further Action

The site meets the requirement of current Scottish industry best practice following the improvements which have been implemented subsequent to the breach in containment reported on 10th March 2025. These improvements and the supporting evidence presented were in accordance with the suggested recommendations detailed in this report.

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: 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)

Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Road, Aberdeen, AB11 9DB
Tel – 0131 244 3498 Fax – 0131 244 0944 Email – ms.fishhealth@gov.scot
Website - www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/science