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Electronic reporting (ERS) - Development

- 1993 – Pilotproject ERS
- 1997 – Pilotproject ERS
- 2000 – VMS required for all vessels 24 meter and above
- 2004 – ERS and manual reporting in NAFO. ERS required in CCAMLR for Norwegian vessels
- 2005 – ERS of the same standing as manual reporting in Norwegian waters (and other waters later)
- 2007 – Pilotproject Electronic logbook (Fdir / Fisknett)
- 2008 – VMS required for all vessels 21 meter and above.
- 2010: Agreement between Norway and the European Union on Electronic Exchange of catch and activity data
  VMS – 15 meter and above from 1. juli 2010
  1. October 2010: ERS / Electronic required for all vessels 21 meter and above
  1. februar 2011: ERS/ Electronic logbook required for EU vessels 24 meter and above.
ERS / Electronic logbook – Status 1. May 2011 (Norwegian vessels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periode</th>
<th>No. Unique vessels</th>
<th>Number of reports</th>
<th>Of which RS=NAK</th>
<th>Share (%) with RS=NAK</th>
<th>No. Of DCA reports corrected</th>
<th>No. Of reports cancelled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Oct. 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>10421</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>10550</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2010*</td>
<td></td>
<td>8417</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2010 **</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>3292</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>14385</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2011 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>15203</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>14532</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.2011</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>9529</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>86329</td>
<td>4423</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>3638</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Control of timelimits for DCA reports set in production from 22.11.2010

**) Vessels 15 m and above from 1. January 2011

***) Control of DA_TI / PD_PT /ZD_ZT in DEP / POR reports set in production from 7. February 2011
ERS / electronic lobook: Vessel fishing in NEZ and EU waters.
ERS / Electronic logbook: Coastal vessel fishing only in NEZ
Implementation issues. Step by step implementation

A step by step implementation of electronic logbook, allowing the fishermen a period of trial and error is a fruitful way forward.

A step by step implementation of automatic control of the various requirements in the regulation could be beneficial both for the fishermen, the service providers and for the FMCs.
Implementation issues. Return Error Codes (RE)

• Return messages must be created and returned to the fishermen indicating whether the report sent fulfills the requirements or not. If the final recipient is a foreign FMC it is also important that a return message issued by this FMC, which is the final recipient, is returned to the original senders (fishermen).

• Electronic logbook calls for new and more detailed return error codes. The meaning of the various codes must be available for the fishermen on the website of the relevant fisheries authorities.

• How to treat the various reports exchanged between parties must be agreed upon. There is also a need to establish a common understanding how to react in various situations, and to agree on common return error codes.
Implementation issues. Correction and Cancellation

• A possibility to correct catch information is important to secure that the best estimates of the catch is actually sent by the fishermen. Some reports, such as DEP or Catch on Entry (COE), are merely a signal of an intended or planned activity in the future. The intention may very well be changed and it is therefore also important to allow the fishermen to cancel such reports when the plans are altered.

• The important point is that corrections accepted by the FMC when ordinary time limits are exceeded must be marked in a way that clearly indicates that personnel in the flag state FMC have assessed and accepted the correction. Such a way of handling correction must also be a part of the bilateral agreements.
Implementation issues. The FMC

• A 24 hour / 7 days staffed FMC is important for a successful implementation of a system like electronic logbook. That is, both a role as “helpdesk” or guidance for the skippers, as well as a more active role towards the fisherman when the systems in the FMC indicate that the skipper has problem or does not report as required.

• The staff at the FMC must have an understanding and knowledge about the various components of the information chain and clear instructions must be developed to secure that problems can be handled instantaneously. The instructions must also be continuously updated if new situations occur.

• The FMC must be equipped with software that makes the personnel able to register and send required reports on behalf of the fisherman.

• All communication between the personnel in the FMC and the fishermen must be logged.
Implementation issues. Users and training

• It is important to have a plan for access to logbook information and that resources are available for training of relevant personnel in the use of the information.