

Steps taken by Member States and producer organisations to comply with the landing obligation			
No	Question	Input	Updates
1.	Have you initiated, supported, participated in or implemented any measures and/or studies relating to the avoidance of unwanted catches through spatial or temporal changes to fishing behaviour (for example, studies/pilots on real time closures)? Yes/No Please specify the measures taken or studies	Yes. Closure of nursery areas as per GFCM Recommendation GFCM/40/2016/4 has been observed.	
2.	Which fleet segments/fisheries do these measures and/or studies apply to?	Otter Bottom Trawls	
3.	What has the uptake of these measures and/or studies been in the fleet segments/fisheries to which they are applicable? Please provide the number and proportion of vessels in the segment/fishery.	All Vessels	
4.	Have you initiated any changes to your quota management system to implement the landing obligation? Yes/No Please specify these changes.	Not applicable	
5.	For stocks managed through catch limits, have you conducted a quantitative analysis to identify potential national choke issues? Yes/No Please give details.	Not applicable	
6.	Have you pursued any exemptions to the landing obligation (either for high survival or de minimis) in the development of regional joint recommendations? Yes/No Please give details of each exemption pursued.	Yes. Malta has the possibility of applying exemptions under the 'De Minimis' for the Lampara fishery as per Regulation (EU) 1392/2014. However it should be noted that in this fishery it has been noted that no undersized	

		<p>fish are normally caught and that the primary destination of the products are for feed in tuna farms, i.e., non-human consumption.</p> <p>Malta has also the possibility of applying exemptions under the “De Minimis” for the bottom otter trawl fishery as per Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2017/86 of 20 October 2016 establishing a discard plan for certain demersal fisheries in the Mediterranean Sea.</p>	
7.	What studies or evidence have you collected or produced in order to support such a request.	Evidence has been based on observations and records collected by observers on board.	
8.	What steps have you taken to ensure the amount discarded under granted de minimis exemptions does not exceed the permitted volume in the delegated act?	Monitoring of logbooks and landings made in the presence of inspectors.	
9.	What has been the utilisation of any granted de minimis exemptions in the fleet segment/fishery to which the exemption applies?	No discards were recorded. The majority of the Lampara catches are used as feed for Tuna farms.	
10.	Have any of your vessels utilised the provision to discard fish,	The provision to discard damaged	

	<p>which shows damage caused by predators? Yes/No</p> <p>Please provide the total weight of catch of each species discarded for each fleet Segment/fishery concerned.</p>	<p>fish has not been utilised.</p> <p>Not Applicable</p>	
11.	<p>For stocks managed by catch limits, did you make use of the provisions for inter-annual or inter-species flexibility? Yes/No</p> <p>Please identify which flexibility (or flexibilities) was used, and the corresponding reallocation of fishing opportunities for the stocks concerned.</p>	Not Applicable	
12.	<p>In the development of joint recommendations, has consultation with Advisory Councils and other relevant stakeholders taken place? Yes/No</p> <p>Please outline the process of consultation with Advisory Councils.</p> <p>Please outline the process of consultation with other stakeholders, if relevant.</p>	<p>Yes, Malta has participates in meetings with MEDAC in view of the Landing Obligation and other related issues</p> <p>Meetings with stakeholders were carried out through MEDAC where fishermen were invited to air their views and deliver advice according to their experience at sea.</p>	
13.	<p>Following the adoption of the delegated act for a discard plan, have steps been taken to ensure adequate understanding among stakeholders of their obligations under the provisions of the act? Yes/No</p> <p>Please outline the process of ensuring stakeholders understand the obligations that will apply to them.</p>	<p>YES. A letter explaining the landing obligation was sent to each licence holder authorised for the lampara fishery.</p> <p>The landing obligation has been introduced as a condition in the fishing authorisation of otter bottom trawls.</p>	

14.	<p>Are there any other steps not covered by the questions above that you have carried out to effect compliance with the provisions of the landing obligation? Yes/No</p> <p>Please specify the measures taken.</p>	No	
15.	Which fleet segments/fisheries do these studies/pilots apply to?	Not applicable	
16.	<p>What has the uptake been of these measures in the fleet segments/fisheries to which they are applicable?</p> <p>Please provide the number and proportion of vessels in the segment/fishery.</p>	Not applicable	
Steps taken by Member States regarding control of compliance with the landing obligation			
17.	<p>Has information been provided by Member States administrations and control agencies to fishermen? Yes/no</p> <p>In what format has this information taken:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Initiatives directed to fishermen to improve compliance;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines on the application of the landing obligation, accurate recording of catches, etc.;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>	Fishermen have been advised that landings of the Lampara and Otter Bottom Trawls Fishery have to be carried out in the presence of an Officer from the fisheries competent authority for accurate recording of the catches landed.	
18.	<p>Have guidelines been provided by Member States administrations and control agencies for inspectors? Yes/no</p> <p>In what format has this information taken:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Delivery of guidelines for inspectors on the effective and</p>	<p>Yes –</p> <p>100% of landings and a number of outlets involving the reference species were inspected and the cases were followed up</p>	

	<p>uniform application of the landing obligation;</p> <p>☐ Seminars and trainings organised for presenting the guidelines to inspectors at national and regional level.</p>	<p>accordingly.</p> <p>Landing obligations are outlined regularly during briefing meetings and EFCA workshops</p>	
19.	<p>Have new control and monitoring tools been used by Member States? Yes/no</p> <p>Please supply information on:</p> <p>☐ Control tools used in the context of landing obligation, i.e. REM, traditional systems (aerial surveillance, inspections at sea), reference fleets, etc.;</p> <p>☐ Steps towards implementation of new tools, including electronic monitoring means dedicated to implementation of landing obligation, haul-by-haul recording, etc.</p>	No	
20.	<p>Have the Member state administrations and control authorities monitored below Minimum Conservation Reference Size (MCRS) catches at and after landing (Traceability)? Yes/No</p> <p>Please supply information on:</p> <p>☐ Total number of discards (by fishery, fleet segment) from 2013 to 2018;</p> <p>☐ Initiatives taken to prevent under MCRS catches from reaching the commercial channels (pre-notification of landings of under MCRS catches, etc.);</p> <p>☐ Measures taken to monitor landings at fish markets/auctions adopted.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No catches below the minimum conservation reference size of a species subject to the landing obligation were registered.</p> <p>Landing Inspections</p> <p>Fish market routine inspections</p>	

21.	<p>Has control and monitoring been based on risk assessment? Yes/no</p> <p>Please supply information on the risk assessment tools used and the results obtained, including those implemented by the regional Control Expert Groups in cooperation with EFCA.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>100% inspections of landings from Lampara and Trawlers</p>	
22.	<p>Has the “last observed haul” approach elaborated by EFCA as a tool for monitoring the implementation of the landing obligation and to derive potential targets for inspection been used? Yes/No</p> <p>Please give details of the fisheries covered and the extent of sampling.</p>	<p>No</p>	
Information on the socioeconomic impact of the landing obligation			
23.	<p>. Using the most appropriate indicators defined below, provide information on the socioeconomics impacts on:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The catching sector; <input type="checkbox"/> Upstream businesses; <input type="checkbox"/> Processors; <input type="checkbox"/> Consumption and markets; <input type="checkbox"/> Costs for Member States.</p>	<p>No impacts perceived to date</p>	
24.	<p>Have there been any reported incidents of overloading of vessels causing stability problems? Yes/No</p> <p>Please specify the number and nature of such incidents.</p> <p>Can you quantify these in terms of:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of deaths or serious injuries; <input type="checkbox"/> No of vessels involved as a % of the specific fleet segment.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	

25.	<p>Have there been any reported incidents of overloading of vessels forcing them to return to port early? Yes/No</p> <p>Please specify the number and nature of such incidents.</p>	No	
26.	<p>Have there been any reported incidents or accidents on board vessels that can be attributable to excessive workload? Yes/No</p> <p>Please specify the number and nature of such incidents or accidents.</p>	No	
27.	<p>Has any national legislation relating to safety on board fishing vessels arising from the landing obligation been amended or introduced? Yes/No</p> <p>Please provide details of this legislation.</p>	No	
28.	<p>Have you provided or received any funding under Article 32 (Health and safety) of EMFF or Article 3 (Eligible operations on safety) and Article 6 (Eligible operations on working conditions) of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/531 to mitigate against potential safety issues caused by the landing obligation? Yes/No</p> <p>If yes, please specify the number of projects involved and the nature of the measures taken.</p> <p>If no, have any measures been taken which have not been funded under the EMFF?</p>	No	
Information on the use and outlets of catches below the minimum conservation reference size of a species subject to the landing obligation			
29.	<p>What have been the main reported uses and destinations for catches below MCRS?</p> <p>Can you quantify these catches by species in terms of volumes,</p>	Not applicable	

	price per tonne and associated costs for the different outlets such catches have been sent?		
30.	Have you carried out any studies or pilot projects considering the potential uses for such catches? Yes/No	No	
Information on port infrastructures and of vessels' fitting with regard to the landing obligation for each fishery concerned			
31.	Have you provided funding under Article 38 of the EMFF for modifications on board vessels for the handling of catches on board? Yes/No Please specify the number, nature and total amount invested in such projects.	No	
32.	Have you provide funding under Article 43 of the EMFF for investment in the infrastructure of fishing ports, auction halls and shelters for the handling of unwanted catches? Yes/No Please specify the number, nature and total amount invested in such projects.	<p>Yes – The Project Selection Committee approved the Landing Office project on the 11/05/2017.</p> <p>This project entails the Construction of a Landing Office and a cold room in Marsaxlokk. It shall provide better facilities to the DFA officials in carrying out effective fish landing and inspections. A crawler crane shall also be purchased as part of this project.</p> <p>Name of Project: EMFF1.23.1 The Construction and Finishing of an Office on the Fish Landing Site in the Marsaxlokk Designated Port</p>	

33.	<p>Have you provide funding under Articles 68 and 69 of the EMFF for investment in marketing measures and the processing of fishery and aquaculture products? Yes/No</p> <p>Please specify the number, nature and total amount invested in such projects.</p>	<p>Yes, the Project Selection Committee approved the Nesploraw Flimkien it-Teżori tal-Baħar! (Exploring Together the Treasures of the Sea!) on 23/01/2018.</p> <p>Name of Project: EMFF4.3.1 Nesploraw Flimkien it-Teżori tal-Baħar!</p> <p>The Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture (DFA) in partnership with the National Literacy Agency (NLA) and the Directorate for Learning and Assessment Programmes (DLAP) launched a promotional campaign, holding the title Nesploraw Flimkien it-Teżori tal-Baħar! The main scope of this operation was to communicate the following three (3) principle messages- (i) awareness of the state of the local fish stocks, (ii) sustainable fish consumption and (iii) the role of each individual in assisting conservation efforts.</p> <p>Dissemination of information, specifically the three (3) principle messages was carried out successfully through diverse mediums, namely: TV Spots, 3</p>	
-----	---	---	--

		<p>minute animated video, leaflets, roll-up banners, A4 sticker sheets, bus-wraps, radio adverts, billboards, adverts placed on social media platforms and publication of adverts on online newspapers.</p> <p>Further to this, the project was also promoted during an open weekend activity at the Fish Market in Marsa where different stakeholders were invited to take part in this activity. By means of this activity valuable information was disseminated to visitors in a fun, visual and interesting manner.</p> <p>Funding: EMFF Funds Budget: € 250,000 excl. vat (Public Eligible) Budget Share: 75% EU Funds, 25% National Funds</p>	
Information on the difficulties encountered in the implementation of the landing obligation and recommendations to address them			
34.	<p>Please provide information on the following:</p> <p>Operational difficulties, such as:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Avoidance and/or selectivity insufficient to avoid unwanted catches;</p>	<p>As the amount of discards related to national fisheries has been negligible, there is nothing to report on this issue.</p>	

	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Handling, storage and processing of unwanted catches;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lack of funding to adapt fishing gears, vessels or port infrastructure</p> <p>Difficulties relating to monitoring, control and enforcement, such as:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lack of understanding or awareness of the rules;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Difficulties implementing and monitoring de minimis or high survivability exemptions;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation problems with regard to control/monitoring processes or infrastructure (e.g. adaptation of ERS systems);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Refusal to carry observers.</p> <p>Difficulties in fully utilising fishing opportunities, such as:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Problems re-allocating quota to cover catches previously not landed;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Problems with the timing or availability of quota swaps;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries being forced to close early due to choke problems.</p>		
Questions concerning control and enforcement, added in the questionnaire sent in 2017			
35.	How is the effective control and enforcement of the landing obligation at sea and the accurate documentation of all catches, including quantities discarded, ensured?	As mentioned above, Lampara fisheries do not produce any difficulty in this regard as no fisheries below the minimum size are caught or discarded.	
36.	How many suspected and confirmed infringements, related to the landing obligation, have been detected at sea and at	None	

	<p>landing/marketing?</p> <p>In cases of confirmed infringements please indicate the circumstances of the offence and the sanctions applied, including penalty points.</p>	Not applicable	
--	--	----------------	--