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PREFACE

I take great pleasure in submitting the report from the EUROSAI Working Group on Environmental Auditing (WGEA) seminar Sustainable Fisheries and Forests Management. The seminar was organised 15–16 May 2012, in Oslo, Norway.

Based on the evaluations from seminar participants, the seminar was successfully delivered. The main reason for the meeting's success was the willingness of participating SAIs to share their knowledge and experiences in the field of auditing fisheries and forests. I am very grateful that EUROSAI WGEA members took the time to participate in the seminar.

I would like to commend the presentations made by Mr Dominique Reeb, UNECE, Mr Arne I. Sletnes, Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food, and Mr Jesper Raakjær, University of Aalborg. I would also like to thank all participants for presenting their national audits and for actively taking part in seminar discussions with their valuable input.

The seminar presentations of audits in the areas of fisheries and forest showed that several audits have had significant impacts on management practices. I believe this illustrates the role of Supreme Audit Institutions, and how we can contribute to a better and sustainable management of such resources.

Oslo, August 2012

Jørgen Kosmo
Auditor General of Norway
Chair of EUROSAI WGEA
SUMMARY

The EUROSAI WGEA Seminar *Sustainable Fisheries and Forest Management* addressed key issues in the sustainable management of fish and forest resources in the European region, including main challenges in auditing fisheries and forests management.

As compared to other regions of the world, European forests are in a good state and the prospects for a sustainable management of forest resources are positive. In order to achieve a sustainable development of forest, however, current threats and challenges to forests need to be taken seriously. Maintaining a sustainable forest management while dealing with climate change mitigation and adaptation, as well as reconciling biodiversity goals with more intense management, are some of the complex challenges Europe is facing. These challenges call for a consistent European policy on the sustainable management of forests.

Auditing sustainable forest management represents a challenge to SAIs as well. For example, the increased fragmentation of forest ownership and the lack of reliable and valid data were mentioned as some of the key challenges facing auditors today. Presentations of forest audits did, however, demonstrate the potential impacts audits can have on the sustainable management of forests.

In the fisheries sector, the general picture is much more severe as compared to the forest sector. Overcapacity of the fishing fleets in relation to the fish stocks represents the overarching problem, and current policy measures have not been effective nor efficient in meeting the problems faced by the fisheries sector. One important issue addressed was the achievements of the European Union's Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), which overall is assessed to be negative. It was also discussed how SAIs may address the increased involvement of private stakeholders and the civil society in fisheries management, and how to reconcile environmental, economic and social goals when auditing sustainable fisheries management.

This report is thematically structured. The first section considers the plenary and workshop presentations on forests. The second section considers the fisheries presentations made. At the end of each of these two sections, main points are summarised. The third section accounts for presentations held on INTOSAI WGEA activities.
SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Forests are one of the most important sources of renewable energy in Europe. During the seminar’s plenary session 15 May 2012, Mr Dominique Reeb from the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) spoke about the current state and future prospects of Europe’s forests, based on two publications from the UNECE concerning the current state and the future prospects for the European forest sector. Following Mr Reeb, Mr Arne Ivar Sletnes from Forest Europe and the Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food talked about policies for the sustainable management of forests in Europe.

THE STATE OF EUROPE’S FORESTS

Europe is the richest region in the world in terms of forests. When including the Russian Federation, the forest covers 45% of Europe, whereof 83% is accessible for use. Forests in Europe are growing by 8 million hectares per year, and only 40% of the increment in forests is used. Compared to other regions in the world, were forests are decreasing, the current state and future prospects for forests in the European region are generally positive. The general positive state of Europe’s forests heightens the possibilities for a future sustainable management of European forests. Most forests have a management plan, and the area of protected forests is expanding. Also, forest management practices increasingly promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Still, however, there are some important threats to the sustainable management of forests in the region. Mr Reeb mentioned the excessive nitrogen depositions putting forest soils at risk, that the area burnt by forest fires is not falling, and that the workforce is shrinking, old, and accident prone. The fragmentation of the forest landscape is also increasing. Mr Reeb underlined that these are not only questions about climate, but also management, and that managing the fragmented ownership of forests is becoming more and more difficult.

There are also some important regional differences with regards to forest and forest management. In a few countries, the net revenue of forest enterprises is negative. Also, in a very small number of countries, the forest area itself is falling due to external pressures and fellings being higher than the increment. Northern Europe is the most advanced when it comes to the existence and development of national forest programs, policy legislations, and action and management plans. In South-West and
South-East Europe, information problems and problems with obtaining reliable data are especially prevalent, compared to the rest of the region.

Turning to policy challenges, Mr Reeb mentioned four complex challenges related to the sustainable management of forests in Europe. *First, there is a need to find the right path in climate change mitigation and adaptation and maintain sustainable forest management. Wood can replace non-renewable materials and energy when sustainably produced, and thus helps mitigate climate change. At the same time, the forest is itself vulnerable to climate change and will need to adapt to a changed climate in the future.*

*Second, it is of high importance that enough wood energy is mobilised. Forests and wood must play a major role in meeting future energy needs - wood is today the largest renewable energy source in Europe. In order to achieve a rapid structural change, the forest management should be majorly intensified and far-reaching measures to mobilise wood should be created, based on political will and with significant public and private investments.*

*Third, there is a need to reconcile biodiversity goals with more intensive management. Asking about which consequences an intensified management necessary to mobilise wood for energy has for biodiversity, Mr Reeb underlined the current need to manage the trade-offs between biodiversity and traditional wood using industries. And *fourth, how to use the potential of the forest sector to foster a green economy is an important challenge in the region. In conclusion, Mr Reeb pointed out that the forest sector already is a "green" sector. Notwithstanding, the current challenges and threats to sustainable forest management should be taken seriously in order to ensure the future sustainability of forests.*

**Policies for Sustainable Forest Management in Europe**

The second keynote speaker on sustainable forest management, Mr Arne Ivar Sletnes, accounted for the role of Forest Europe in working towards a European consensus on policies for sustainable forest management. Forest Europe comprises of 46 European countries and the EU as signatories, and 48
observers (countries and organisations) with a common goal of a future sustainable forest management in Europe.

From a sustainability perspective, the management of forests is not too bad in the European region. There are, however, potential for improvements, which makes policy important. Forest Europe's member countries have reached a regional consensus on the definition of sustainable forest management. The definition highlights the maintaining of forests' biodiversity, productivity, regeneration capacity and vitality, as well as their potential to fulfil relevant ecological, economic and social functions at all society levels, globally and nationally.

By sustainable forest management, Forest Europe means the maintenance and enhancement of

(i) forest resources and contribution to a global carbon cycle
(ii) health and vitality
(iii) productive functions
(iv) biological diversity
(v) protective functions
(vi) socio-economic functions

All Forest Europe signatory countries have agreed to maintain and enhance these areas, and common approach towards national forest programmes in Europe does exist today, based on a global consensus. Most European states report that they have put in operation national forest programs or equivalent. Mr Sletnes recommended that the indicators of sustainable forest management developed by Forest Europe should be used by countries to develop their national policy on forest management.

At the FOREST EUROPE Ministerial Conference in 2011, two decisions were adopted by the ministers. First, the European Forest 2020 decision that concerns a strategic policy framework for the future was adopted, and it was discussed which targets should be reached by 2020. Second, the Oslo Ministerial Mandate for Negotiating a Legally Binding Agreement on Forests in Europe aims at further reinforcing and strengthening the implementation of sustainable forest management in the region, in order to better face challenges towards forests related to climate change, floods, fires, and pests.

The goal is to achieve a legally binding agreement on forests in Europe, in order to ensure that all forests in Europe are sustainably managed and raise awareness about the importance of forests. Forest
Europe has decided to develop a holistic legally binding framework agreement for forests in Europe, to be completed before 30 June 2013.

WORKSHOP I AUDITING FORESTS

At the workshop on forests, six presentations of forestry audits were held, and the workshop participants discussed common challenges to auditing forests. The audits presented covered a wide array of questions related to sustainable forest management. Below, the presentations are summarised, followed by a summary of the workshop discussions of main challenges to auditing forests, as well as common experiences.

MANAGEMENT OF THE STATE FOREST IN THE STATE FOREST MANAGEMENT CENTRE

In Estonia, the state is the biggest forest owner, with ownership of more than 40% of all Estonian forests. State forests are managed by the State Forest Management Centre (SFMC), a profit-making state agency governed by the Ministry of the Environment. Revenue from the state forest management is paid to the state budget from the profit earned by SFMC. The amount of the revenue depends significantly on whether all the felled timber reaches the purchaser, and on whether the journey of timber from the felling to the purchaser is controlled. The NAO of Estonia therefore looked into the transparency and control of the journey of timber from it was felled until it reached the purchaser.

Due to a change of the forest management structure in the SFMC, the audit compared two time periods; one before the structural change (2006–2008) and one after the structural change (2009). The structural change separated the planning, organisation of felling, and distribution of timber to the purchasers into different management units.

The audit found indications of that the new organisation of work had improved the transparency and control of the processes of accounting for volumes of timber felled from the state forests.

The relative volume of timber obtained from clear cuts (m3 per ha) increased with an average of 17% after the structural change. Possible reasons for this change might be that part of the timber felled from the state forest was previously not delivered to the purchaser, i.e. that it was stolen on the way from the forest to the purchaser. Another reason might be that the volume of accepted timber by the purchaser was previously reported as smaller than the volume of timber actually sent, i.e. that the
purchaser systematically underreported the received volume of timber. The NAO concluded that the internal control system of SFMC improved as a result of the structural reform.

The NAO of Estonia found that although there were improvement in the transparency and control of processes, it is still not sufficient. In several cases, the NAO found it very difficult to explain losses of timber, which indicates that the traceability of processes should be improved.

Some major challenges encountered when conducting the audit were highlighted by Mr Mägi. For one, the accounting of the volumes of timber assortments and the assortment production process is a complicated system for "beginners," which indicates that increased competency building and/or use of external experts is important. Secondly, the NAO found it challenging to audit IT-systems, as they were perceived as easily manipulated. Third, the reliability and comparability of data remains a highly challenging issue.

The NAO of Estonia recommended that the Ministry of the Environment ascertained the reasons for previous losses of timber, in order to minimise the risk of timber loss in the current organisation of work of SFMC. It was also recommended that the State Forest Management Centre should (i) improve the internal control systems in order to analyse the logging data of controlled harvesters, (ii) compare systematically the data of growing and felled forest, and (iii) develop the e-conveyance document system, which enables better to follow the volumes of timber assortments from storage spaces to the purchaser.

**THE EU RURAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF FORESTS**

The ECA audit concerns The European Agriculture Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), which is one of the two instruments financing the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The audit is a performance audit of EAFRD measure number 122, which deals with the improvement of the economic value of forests. The main audit question is whether the Rural Development support for the improvement of the economic value of forest is efficiently and effectively managed.

Audit criteria are derived from the regulatory requirements and objectives set out in the relevant EU legislation. Because the drafting of preliminary observations is currently taking place, Mr Costantzer could not indicate what the main audit findings are. However, Mr Costantzer noted that, on the particular measure audited, there were few requirements at the EU level. The EU should be more precise regarding objectives and what it wants to achieve and more thinking needs to be done around the outcome and potential achievements of this type of EU measure.
AUDIT OF THE MANAGEMENT OF PRIVATE FORESTS

In Poland, the majority of forests are public. According to the NIK, there are no great problems in the sustainable management of public forest. When it comes to private forests, however, risk analyses indicated high possibilities for irregularities in supervision and management, increasing the risk of unsustainable development of privately owned forests. 18.5% of the forest in Poland is private. As the current state forest policy aims at increasing the forest cover, giving financial incentives to those that turn land into forest, it is estimated that the percentage of privately owned forests in the country will increase.

Based on this, the NIK performed an audit of the management of privately owned forests in Poland. As threats to the sustainable development of forests (such as pests and diseases) do not respect the ownership, auditing private forests is important. A challenge, however, was that the audit of private property was beyond the NIK's mandate and competences. The solution to this was to audit supervision authorities and other authorities involved in the management of private forests.

As private forests in each district are supervised by the district governors, the Polish audit looked into how the district governors performed their tasks related to the management of private forests. The audit also covered general administrative proceedings, the carrying out of tasks specified in agreements with the State Forests Holding, as well as the health and sanitary state of private forests.

The Polish audit revealed a range of deficiencies in the supervision of privately owned forests, which might have consequences for their sustainable development. Some of the main findings of the audit were

- Incomplete and inconsistent documentation of the forest management in 64% of the districts audited
- Lack of management plans in 57% of private forests
- 71% of administrative decisions were incorrect or issued in the breach of the law
- A failure of district governors to inform law-enforcement authorities about illegal or destructive logging by forest owners
- All district governors failed to carry out proper supervision
- Properly completion of tasks by the national forest holding offices entrusted by district governors
- Good health conditions of the forests investigated

One topic for discussion was how the NIK had managed to measure the health and sanitary conditions of forests, which were assessed to be good. The forests' health conditions were measured by 20
independent experts on forest health, hired by the NIK. The health and sanitary state of the Polish forests was assessed by making samples of private forests in different regions. Recognizing the impossibility of investigating the conditions in all private forests, they were able to cover a total of 900 hectares, which constitutes 3% of the total private forest area in the district.

At a general level of conclusion, the NIK negatively assessed the district governors' performance in managing private forests. District governors are, among other things, required to develop management plans and oversee that tasks are correctly implemented. The worrying scale of irregularities found in the Polish audit suggested serious problems in the sustainable management, and hence the sustainable development, of private forests in the country.

The audit resulted in a total of 127 recommendations, where one obligated the district governors to inform law-enforcement authorities about any instance of illegal or destructive logging of forests. Of the 127 recommendations, 102 have been implemented and 25 are under implementation, demonstrating the possible impact of audits on state policy.

**SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NORWEGIAN FOREST RESOURCES**

Sustainable management is, according to central Norwegian regulations, the basis for all activity in the Norwegian forest sector. The overall responsibility for administering forest resources and activities lies with the Ministry for Agriculture and Food. Responsibility is delegated to central, regional and local levels, as well as private agreements. In this, also private forest owners have a judicial responsibility to manage forest resources in a sustainable manner.

The Norwegian audit considers

- the state and development of Norwegian forest resources
- the degree to which the policy instruments administered by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food contribute to the objective of sustainable management and development of the forest sector, enabling increased activity in the sector
- the degree to which the Ministry fulfils its managerial responsibilities of forestry through objectives and performance management

Of the total forest acreage, 80% is privately owned. Thus, private forest owners play an important role in the sustainable management of forests. In order to gain information on private forest owners' attitudes towards their own estate and resources, as well as their knowledge about public policy instruments, the OAG of Norway conducted a representative survey of private forest owners. Stratified according to national geographical and estate size allocations, a random sample was drawn from the
official register of agricultural land owners. Because the audit is yet to be published, no findings can be presented at this stage. In addition to the survey of private forest owners, the audit sheds light on the audit questions through quantitative analyses of forest activity, analyses of reports and relevant documents, a survey of the Norwegian municipalities' forestry administration manager, as well as individual and group interviews.

One of the challenges faced when auditing whether increased activity had taken place in the sector, was that the market to a large degree dictates the activity level. This, in turn, limits the Ministry's scope of action, and therefore also their responsibility.

The OAG of Norway also encountered some challenges when trying to measure the development of the ecological development of the forest, as there are different scientific approaches to what methodology and data indicators actually will give a precise enough depiction of the development on environmental values.

The audit will be published autumn 2012.

EFFICIENCY OF MANAGING FORESTS IN SLOVENIA

The Slovenian audit of forest management concerned the general efficiency of forest management in Slovenia, with a relatively broad scope looking into legal regulation and strategic framework, planning and implementation of measures, as well as control mechanisms. The audit had several major findings with important implications.

First, the lack of strategy and action plans that would have contained objectives according to the "SMART" principle, made it difficult to know whether or when the actual state forestry policy could change. The audit found that it was not possible to monitor the progress of the state and state companies in achieving the set objectives.

Second, there was no information system in place to provide accurate and up-to-date databases on types of forests and investments made regarding reforestation. Neither could reliable data on felling of trees due to different diseases and pests be found. These problems have important consequence in that
they aggravate the planning of efficient measures to improve forest conditions and monitor their performance.

At a general level, the audit assessed the management of the state owned forests to be generally inefficient. There was no proper monitoring of concessionary contracts, and unfinished contracts of forest maintenance increase the risk of long-term deterioration of health conditions of Slovenian forests. Also, the maintenance cost of state forests is higher as compared to private forests, as wood from state forests with equal quality to wood from private forests is sold at a lower price.

The Court of Audit of Slovenia have proposed amendments to the current law on forests regarding planning and performance measures to improve health conditions of forests. A new information system has been developed and introduced to support timely recording of felling, reforestation and registration of various diseases and pest invasions. Also, new obligatory procedures to auctioneering wood from state forests have been introduced.

THE STATE-OWNED FOREST ENTERPRISE SVEASKOG: CONTRADICTORY TARGETS AND OPERATIONS

The overall objective of the audit was to examine whether the state-owned company Sveaskog, Sweden's largest forest owner, fulfilled its mission and whether the Government managed the company in accordance with the parliament's decisions and intentions. The background was the special missions Sveaskog had been given by the government in different areas, among them the environmental field. In principle, Sveaskog was supposed to be a role model in the environmental field, but what this meant in practice was not very clear. Neither was it clear to what extent the environmental missions were allowed to affect the company's attainment of its financial targets.

The audit's general findings were that Sveaskog had not fulfilled all its special missions and tasks, and that the Swedish government had not managed the company in accordance with the set goals.

A main problem identified in the audit was the company's difficulties in balancing its different targets and missions. Some targets and missions were in fact contradictory, in particular when it came to the financial versus environmental targets and missions. Ms Gjerde exemplified this with a case when Sveaskog struck a deal with the Swedish environmental protection agency to preserve 60,000 hectares of productive land, without any type of compensation. This did not comply with the Companies Act or with Sveaskog's financial targets. However, it led to environmental goals being met and to the fulfilment of the company's task of being a role model in the environmental field.
Balancing the company's different targets and missions during the audit process resulted to be a challenge also for the SNAO. Ms Gjerde pointed out that combining performance audits and corporate control was difficult as it was challenging to establish the relative importance of the company's special missions versus its financial targets. Another challenge mentioned was the lack of openness in the company. All documents had to be read at the company, which made the data collection process very time consuming. Furthermore, a time consuming pre-study phase (9-10 months) gave the Swedish government time to propose to remove many of the company's special missions, simplify its operations and special targets, and make the forest policy goals less pronounced before the audit report was published.

In turn, when published, some of the audit's conclusions fell flat due to the changes the government had already proposed to Sveaskog's missions and targets. Thus, the audit did have an impact, it only occurred during the auditing process rather than after the publication.

Ms Gjerde concluded that the audit scope was too narrow, and that an overall performance audit on the effectiveness of forest policy instruments would have been preferable.
COMMON CHALLENGES IN AUDITING FORESTS

The various audits presented at the workshop demonstrated the auditors’ possibilities of improving the national management of forests. Several audits informed of a noted impact of the audits, showing how audits can make a difference. Presentations and following discussions also identified some common challenges in the auditing of forest and the sustainable management of forest.

The quality of risk assessments was mentioned by several presenters as highly important when initiating forest audits. The complexity of forest management makes it difficult to pinpoint areas where the potential for improvement is the highest. Forests are natural resources that can be demanding to manage for national and local authorities. In consequence, issues related to monitoring and control systems, as well as the availability of data are areas that should be interesting for SAIs to look into. Examples could be how the government keeps track of felled timber, whether they have control with how private owners manage their forests, the quality of monitoring and control systems, and the sanctioning of illegal management of forests.

Data availability and reliability is a recurring challenge when auditing forests. Data might be lacking or of poor quality, which makes it difficult to evaluate the different aspects of forest management. The lack of reliable data, or the lack of data in general, was a problem encountered by the SAIs of Estonia, Poland and Norway, among others.

The ownership structure of forests was a challenge mentioned by both the SAI of Poland and the SAI of Norway. To invest, maintain and manage forests according to national goals may not be in the private owner's interest, which creates particular challenges for national authorities. Forests are either owned by individuals, farmers or by companies that may or may not be wholly or partially owned by the state. This may be a particular challenge for auditors.

The sustainable management of forests means that economic, environmental and social demands need to be balanced. This often results to be a problem, as forests may be perceived by owners as an economic asset, whereas environmental authorities and NGOs perceive it as containing important biodiversity or other environmental values. Reconciling the three and arriving at sustainable management of forests is definitively a challenge, as was demonstrated by the presentations in the workshop. Hopefully, national management of forests will improve over time and sustainable management will be the main driver for forest management.
SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Introducing the session on sustainable fisheries management was Mr Jesper Raakjær, Professor in Marine Governance from Aalborg University, Denmark. With a point of departure in the European Union’s Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), Raakjær spoke about the possibilities for a future sustainable management of fish resources.

The problem of overfishing has been evident for many years, and has resulted in a critical situation for several fish stocks. For some stocks there are signs of improvement, but the general picture is that there are high discard rates and no real control on fishing mortality. An economically fragmented fishing industry has led to a fragmented interest structure in the fishing industry in the European Union. Also, there is a lack of political commitment within the EU Council to ensure sustainable fishing, as well as a persistent lack of political will in the Council and the Member States to reform the Common Fisheries Policy.

According to Mr Raakjær, one of the main problems with the current CFP is the continuing tendency of applying a one-size-fits-all approach to its implementation. There are inconsistencies between structural policy elements and conservation elements within the CFP, and great problems of implementation drift and lack of enforcement in the EU Member States.

The clash between the ways in which administrators and fishermen view the goals and means of the fisheries management regime, has resulted in unsuccessful attempts to introduce elements of new modes of governance in the fisheries domain. Additionally, the type of co-management introduced has not led to responsible behaviour.

Mr Raakjær contended that there is an urgent need to reform the CFP to secure sustainable fisheries, especially in the present economic crisis. Introducing some key points in the CFP reform proposal, Mr Raakjær emphasised regionalisation of the CFP through a
geographical framework synonymous with the major marine ecosystems of the European seas as an essential element. Regionalisation of the CFP will meet some legal challenges, but is according to Mr Raakjær how the CFP should have been initially constructed.

Regionalisation implies, in Mr Raakjær’s words, the ‘moving down’ (decentralisation) and the ‘moving out’ (devolution) of fisheries management and decision-making authorities currently held by the central EU level institutions. Decentralising the fisheries management means enabling low level authorities to step in and design more tailor-made management for particular seas and fisheries. Devolution of fisheries management refers to the potentially increased involvement of stakeholders in the fisheries management process by transferring authorities from pure public institutions to public-private cooperative institutions, or to the fisheries sector itself.

Mr Raakjær reflected on how SAIs may contribute to improve the management of national fisheries. Raakjær pointed to focusing on the implementation drift, both legal (against policy intentions) and non-legal (violation of management rules), and one should harmonise fisheries inspections to ensure appropriate and identical enforcement across the EU.

WORKSHOP II AUDITING FISHERIES

In the workshop on fisheries the second day of the seminar, five national audits were presented, followed by discussion about common challenges in auditing fisheries.

WHY THE CFP HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO GUARANTEE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF FISHERIES

In recent years, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) has published two special reports that both conclude that the EU Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) has failed to guarantee the sustainability of fisheries activities.

The principles upon which the CFP is based are good:

- The catches should not put in danger the renewability of fish resources
- The fisheries capacity of the fleet and fisheries opportunities should be balanced.

The cornerstone of the Community policy for the management of the fisheries resources is limiting catch volumes by setting Total Allowable Catches (TAC), divided into national quotas. The existence of complete and reliable data and the application of effective inspection and penalty systems are essential to the success of such an approach.
The ECA audit looked into whether the Commission and the Member States are taking the necessary steps towards an effective system of control, inspection and sanctions for the conservation of fisheries resources. Three main findings of the audit were highlighted by Mr Osete and Mr do Jogo.

First, the catch data are neither complete nor reliable. This makes it impossible to know what the real level of catches is, which again prevents the proper application of TAC and quota systems. In Member States, the regulatory frameworks and procedures in force cannot guarantee that the data collected is complete, nor guarantee that inconsistencies are detected when it is validated. On the other hand, the EU Commission is not in a position that makes it able to satisfactorily identify errors and misstatements in the data forwarded by the Member States. Consequently, the Commission is not able to take the timely decisions necessary to protect the resource.

Secondly, inspection systems do not prove assurance that infringements are effectively prevented and detected. There is an absence of a general control standard, which is an impediment to the adequate control pressure and optimisation of inspection activities in the Member States.

Third, the sanctions are not dissuasive. The procedures for dealing with reported infringements do not support the assertion that every infringement is followed up, and still less that such infringements attract penalties. Even when penalties are imposed, their deterrent effect is, on the whole, very limited.

The ECA warns that if this situation continues, it will bring grave consequences not only for the natural resource, but also for the future of the fishing industry and the areas associated with it.

ECA presented a range of recommendations that they allege should be implemented if the objective of sustainable exploitation of the fisheries resources is to be achieved. ECA recommended that the Commission should ensure that the electronic system for recording and reporting of fishing activity data is implemented as quickly and widely as possible. The Member States were recommended to improve the quality of their catch data by carrying out systematic compliance checks on all operations. Member States should also develop analytical, programming and follow-up tools for their inspection activities that enable them to ensure an adequate overall control pressure and optimal deployment of resources.
The ECA concluded that the overcapacity of the fishing fleet continues to be one of the main reasons for the failure of the CFP in assuring a sustainable fishing activity. Because measures taken to reduce the fishing overcapacity have failed, either a new approach should be taken or existing measures need to be better enforced.

**Norwegian Aquaculture Management**

The audit considered three main audit questions:

1. To what extent the development and status of the aquaculture industry in Norway is in line with the national goal of a sustainable and environmentally sound aquaculture industry
2. To what extent the national goal of sustainable aquaculture is achieved through the use of policy instruments
3. To what extent the authorities’ control and follow-up is sufficient in order to ensure a sustainable development of the aquaculture industry

The report concluded that the aquaculture industry is facing significant environmental challenges, among other things in the form of high figures for escaped fish, salmon lice and extensive losses due to disease. The report also concluded that the extent of these and other environmental challenges is so great that it is necessary to strengthen the management of aquaculture in order to ensure environmental sustainability and the possibility of future growth in the industry.

Mr Ørvim elaborated a bit on vignette surveys that were used to shed light on parts of the second audit questions. The aim of the vignette surveys was to assess to which extent the sustainability aspect was taken into account by the competent government bodies and to assess whether similar applications were treated similarly. In the audit, the OAG of Norway sent identical cases (vignettes) to different offices in order to uncover variations in the treatment and processing of licenses. Three vignettes were sent to 19 offices of the Norwegian Food Safety Authorities, and three to 8 County Governors Offices.

The OAGN uncovered variations in the processing of licenses both in the Norwegian Food Safety Authorities, and to a smaller extent in the County Governor Offices. The OAGN found that it could be difficult for the government bodies to assess the quality of a site. For the Norwegian Food and Safety Authorities in particular the existing overall guidance available as regards license processing was insufficient. The OAGN recommended that the Ministries to a larger degree should ensure uniformity in processing applications for licenses to engage in aquaculture.
The Sustainability of Markets - Can Private Stakeholders Realise Public Policy Goals for Sustainable Fisheries?

The audit is a follow-up audit to the 2008 Dutch audit of sustainable fisheries in the North Sea.

The 2008 audit focused on the performance of the Dutch government with regards to the results of fleet reduction, fleet innovation, surveillance, and the relationship between economic and ecological interests. In the new ongoing audit, the Rekenkamer is focusing on the efforts of the Dutch government in cooperating with NGOs, fisheries and consumers.

The background for the new approach is that the civil society has become much more active when it comes to issues of sustainable fisheries, even more active than the government itself. The audit looks into the effectiveness of cooperation in fisheries, asking what the most appropriate role for government is in this new playing field.

The certification of fisheries can be viewed as the best proof of non-governmental initiatives, and the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) is a very important actor. However, MSC is not the only certification system, and it is not transparent for consumers. MSC cannot guarantee biodiversity in the sea, but has potential to be successful in this if consumers ask for it. The Rekenkamer asks about the effects of this, and how the Dutch government is reacting to these new developments. Does the fisheries policy remain the same, or is it adjusted to the demands of civil society? How can the government cooperate with actors such as MSC in order to ensure sustainable fisheries?

Thus far, the Rekenkamer has tried to analyse the process of certification in comparison with the governmental fisheries policy. Central questions were whether these two processes fit, and how it is possible to audit the government when including a new playing field.

Ms van Dijk and Mr de Vries pointed to some possible actions that might be taken by government in optimising the market. Certification systems should be harmonised, and cooperation between the government's inspections and MSC inspectors should be initiated. The government could for example give financial support to certification systems and ask for transparency of sustainable fisheries performances.

The preliminary conclusion of the Rekenkamer is that there are possibilities that private stakeholders can realise some public policy goals in cooperation with the government.
THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT’S ACTIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES

The main objectives of the audit was to examine whether the central government's actions in promoting the intentions of the fisheries policy had been effective, and whether the Government and government agencies had fulfilled their obligations under the legislation that governs fisheries policy.

In order to shed light on whether the conservation measures, structural measures and control system of the Swedish central government complied with the intentions of the EU and the Swedish Parliament, three different analyses were conducted: legal analysis, analysis of economic data, and analysis of the control system.

The analyses made it clear how the responsibility is divided among the ministries and government agencies involved. Regarding the legal analysis, an aim was to assess whether there is any national discretion within the legal framework of the CFP and, if so, whether that discretion is extensive enough to affect Sweden’s possibilities for attaining the objectives of the fisheries policy. The part of the analysis that relates to Community law, in particular to national discretion, as well as the analysis of economic data, was scrutinised for purposes of quality assurance by external researchers and experts. The financial-audit function of the SNAO also participated in assessments.

The main findings of the audit were that there was an unclear prioritisation of objectives and policy instruments, and material shortcomings in analysis and reporting. The SNAO found that there was potential for a more effective use of national discretion, and that financial support counteracts achievements of objectives. Additionally, the SNAO identified shortcomings in the implementation of fisheries control.
A major challenge was a lack of "official" reliable data for the economic analysis. A suggested solution to this problem was to try to find data via other channels. Of the lessons learned, Mr Engström pointed to the focus on the economic analysis if one has to choose one audit area, and that one should try to relate the outcome of policy instruments by cases in point. Finally, a mixed competence in the audit team proved highly valuable to the process and outcome of the audit.

AUDIT OF THE FRENCH FISHERIES CONTROL SYSTEM

The background of the audit was the European Court of Justice ruling from 2005 on continued failure by France in complying with fisheries obligations, and the new European fisheries control system (Council regulation no 1224/2009) that established a Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rule of the Common Fisheries Policy.

The audit concluded that the French control system appears to comply with EU regulations. The efficiency of the system is improving, and this holds true especially for inspections at sea. French inspectors do, however, face difficulties in meeting the level of inspection in ports set by Annex I of regulation no 1224/2009, due to the great number of authorised ports in France.

One of the main challenges the auditors faced was assessing the effectiveness of sanctions, due to a lack of data on the incurred administrative sanctions. The creation of a national register on infringements (art. 93 of the Regulation no 1224/2009) could make it easier to conduct such performance audits in the future.

A lack of data was also apparent when assessing the costs of the fisheries control system. The French administrations were not able to provide reliable data on the costs arising from the control system. The Cour des comptes was able to estimate the costs only for the year 2009, which appears to be quite high, around 59 million Euros, which represents 6% of the harvest values of fisheries in France in 2009.

The French audit resulted in 17 recommendations to improve the efficiency of the French control system and its compliance with European rules.
THIRD PARALLEL AUDIT ON ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL IN THE BALTIC SEA

Participating in the audit were Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Russia and Sweden.

The audit covered the period between 2005 and 2007. Participating countries took part in one or both of the audit's two parts: Audit of the environmental monitoring in the Baltic Sea (Part 1), and/or Audit of the fisheries management and control in the Baltic Sea (Part 2). The overall objective of the audit was to look into how the environmental monitoring and fisheries control authorities have contributed to preserve the marine environment and protect the fish stock in the Baltic Sea.

The overall conclusions from the audit:

- A major obstacle for the fisheries control is a lack of effective fisheries monitoring systems supporting a risk based fisheries control
- The cross-checking of fisheries control data is not always done systematically and is not being effectively supported by electronic fisheries information systems
- There are major differences between the countries when it comes to instance expertise, training and control strategy
- The EU Member States regulate quotas and lay down structural policies in compliance with EU regulations

Some of the recommendations made:

- Implementing more risk based control strategies is crucial if a more effective fisheries control is to be established
- Consistent and reliable data is a prerequisite for conducting cooperative audits
- There should be an enhanced focus on development and implementation of electronic logbooks and support of cross-checking fisheries control data by well-functioning electronic fisheries information systems
- Cooperation should continue to be a main task between Baltic Sea countries

On the question about whether a joint report should finalise each international environmental audit, Mr Pedersen noted that this depends on the subject and scope of the audit. Making a joint report is time consuming, and should be written if it makes sense to focus on comparative data, and if this data is validated, of high quality and indicate best practices and lessons learned. In this, it is highly important
that a common scale for assessments is agreed upon. If a common scale for assessments is lacking, a joint final report cannot be provided.

Not writing a joint report should not inhibit SAI cooperation, however. Workshops during the audit processes can be organised to develop audit criteria, methodologies, and agreements about scope. Workshops are also good for discussing objectives, audit findings, common problems and possible solutions.

**Practice of Implementation of Parallel Audit of Management by Aquatic Biological Resources of the Barents Sea and Norwegian Sea with the Office of the Auditor General of Norway**

The presentation considered experiences and lessons learned from the parallel audit conducted by the Office of the General Auditor of Norway and the Account Chamber of the Russian Federation on the management and control of fish resources in the Barents Sea and the Norwegian Sea in 2005–2007 (initial audit) and 2008–2010 (follow-up audit).

The audit represented a good case for SAI cooperation because Norwegian and Russian fishermen fish on the same stocks. In the first phase of the audit (2005–2007), the auditors identified the main auditing risks, and defined audit goals and objectives common for both SAIs.

One experience drawn from the 2005–2007 phase was how time consuming it was to study and harmonise the terms of the audit. Two working groups spent a lot of time getting to know each other and learn the methods and scales of finance control of the two countries. Ms Urazova highlighted the importance of achieving mutual trust and to develop tools for communication and direct contact between the members of the two working groups. The INTOSAI WGEA guidance on SAI cooperation was found to be very useful at this stage of the audit and the mechanisms for cooperation were based on the step-by-step principle outlined in the guidance.

The SAIs agreed on writing two separate reports and one joint document (the Memorandum). In the Memorandum, each audit issue was reflected upon, and common conclusions and recommendations were presented. This was according to Ms Urazova found to be the most efficient way of presenting audit results.

In the 2008–2010 phase (the follow-up), the auditors decided to work together as one joint working group. According to Ms Urazova this work was carried out with a high level of mutual confidence and understanding of common goals, already established in the previous period. The joint working group took part in inspections of fishing boats held by fishing control bodies of Norway and Russia, as well
as in the control procedure in Russian and Norwegian ports. This made it possible to conduct comparative analyses of the two systems and make suggestions about their improvement.

The parallel audit had a positive impact on several issues, amongst other the levels of illegal and non-regulated catches. Finally, Ms Urazova pointed out that cooperation on a long-term basis gives practical tools to implement internal audits, using the international experience and international methodology.
COMMON CHALLENGES IN AUDITING FISHERIES

Several common themes were addressed and discussed in the fisheries workshop. Also in the area of fisheries, the presentations showed the potential impact of audits, and many of the audits presented had a significant impact on fisheries policy and administrative procedures.

The overcapacity of the fishing fleet in relation to the fishing opportunities (fish stocks) is the overarching problem of fisheries policy. When discussing how SAIs may address this problem, one suggested solution was to analyse and calculate the sum of the costs for fisheries policy (direct support, indirect support, such as tax exemptions, fisheries control), and perform cooperative audits in order to recommend governments to elaborate indicators so that the overcapacity can be calculated correctly. The identified costs can be related to calculations of the fisheries industry's added value. Most likely, the costs are almost as high, or higher, than the fishing industry's added value.

Ensuring an environmentally, economically and socially long-term sustainable development is a main objective of fisheries legislation. How might sustainability be used as criteria in audits on fisheries? The objectives and possible sub-criteria underpinning these are vague. A way of coming around this problem might be, with reference to the Norwegian audit on aquaculture, to break down one or more objectives into several sub areas. In the Norwegian case the objective on environmental sustainability was used. Also, it can be possible to use obvious audit findings, such as "it is not sustainable when 20% of the fish dies," as supplementary criteria. Yet another solution could be to regard the environmental, economic and social objectives as a coherent chain. For example, if the overcapacity of the fishing fleet leads to overfishing, this leads to poor profitability and, in turn, to a decreased social sustainability.

That the European Union and different European states are leaving more and more space to stakeholders and the civil society is a third challenge identified in the fisheries workshop. This constitutes a new landscape for governments and authorities, and even for SAIs. It could in fact be that it is easier for governments not to comply with the legislation, and instead rely on market mechanisms. De-regulation will lead to more space for different certifications, several of them being financed or co-financed by fisheries organisations. The question becomes whether the certifications are trustworthy, and whether governments have strategies and are able to follow up in the area. If individual countries, such as EU Member States, complied with the existing legislation, there would not be that many problems in the area.

In terms of the fisheries control, there are still large problems, and improvements are urgently needed. The workshop participants identified a need for more cooperative audits in this area.

Regarding data and method, a lack of data was apparent in all the presented audits on fisheries. One suggested solution to the problem of lack of data was to try to find data via other channels than
official channels. A new method to use for examining whether authorities handle/process similar cases in the same manner was vignette surveys. A key characteristic of this method is sending similar application forms to different authority offices in order to investigate whether the case treatment is consistent across different offices.
INTOSAI WGEA: RELEVANT GUIDANCES

During the plenary session 15 May 2012, Ms Tuuli Rasso from the INTOSAI WGEA Secretariat presented the INTOSAI WGEA Guidances relevant to auditing fisheries and forests. Mr Kjell Kristian Dørum from the Office of the General Auditor of Norway presented the soon to be finalised INTOSAI WGEA project on integrating fraud and corruption issues into the audit of environmental and natural resource management.

AUDITING FORESTS: GUIDANCE FOR SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTIONS

The SAI of Indonesia was project leader of the guidance, published in 2010, and the sub-committee members consisted of the SAIs of Bahamas, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Estonia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mexico, South Africa, Uganda and Zimbabwe. Ms Rasso highlighted the global importance of forests, and how auditing sustainable forest management, which means integrating social, environmental and economic aspects, represents a major challenge to auditors.

The INTOSAI WGEA Guidance considers the global importance of forests in sustainable development, as well as the different roles of government in forestry. It accounts for a range of risks associated with unsustainable forest management, and suggests a work process for a risk-based audit approach. The guidance also discusses some of the major challenges related to auditing forests, such as the difficulty of measuring volumes of timber and evaluating the state of forests, as well as the fact that the forest sector seems to be a sector that uses a difficult language and is characterised by having a close circle of forest experts.

Ms Rasso pointed to the usefulness of GIS in the planning phase (determining the audit sample), execution phase (extending the audit coverage, prove and collect evidence), and reporting phase (creating a more valuable report) of the audit.

Ms Rasso underlined that, although the Forest Guidance is not Europe centred, with Estonia being the only case example from Europe, the guidance's audit design matrix will most probably serve as very useful for planning forest audits. While recognising that different types of forests face different challenges, Ms Russo pointed out that there are in fact many similar challenges across regions.

Finally, Ms Rasso informed that the INTOSAI Development Initiative (IDI) is leading a project on forestry audits which will suggest some modifications to the INTOSAI WGEA Forest Guidance. In addition, the SAI of Indonesia is currently in the process of developing training materials based on the guidance. The training material will be available on web June 2013.
AUDITING FISHERIES: GUIDANCE FOR SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTIONS

The SAI of South Africa was project leader of the guidance, and the SAIs of Canada, Bahamas, Botswana, Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway participated in the sub-committee.

The guidance accounts for some of the major threats to fisheries, such as over-exploitation (especially overfishing), illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, habitat loss, limited knowledge of aquatic ecosystems, and consequences of improved fishing technology. With this, the guidance outlines a conceptual framework for the governing and managing of fisheries.

When choosing and designing audits of fisheries, there are four basic steps:

1. Identify the country's fisheries and the main threats
2. Understand the government's response to these threats and the relevant actors
3. Choose audit sub-topics and priorities
4. Decide audit approaches, audit objectives and lines of enquiry

The guidance considers each of these phases, focusing on relevant issues and pitfalls. The overall aim of the guidance is to enable public sector auditors to contribute to good governance in the management of fisheries in their respective countries. European case examples are included from Denmark, Estonia, European Court of Auditors, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia, and Sweden.

INTEGRATING FRAUD AND CORRUPTION ISSUES INTO THE AUDITING OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

A growing body of evidence indicates that fraud and corruption represent a serious challenge within the natural resource and environmental sectors. The international focus on this issue has become stronger in recent years, and the existence of fraud and corruption in these sectors was one of the special themes at the last Conference of the Parties of the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) in Morocco in October 2011. A challenge when attempting to integrate fraud and corruption issues into the auditing on environmental and natural resource management is to find a balance between the generic and the specific. Most of the relevant criteria, theory...
and methods pertaining to auditing and to fraud and corruption are generic. Fraud and corruption are not challenges that are specific to environmental and natural resource sectors, but pose serious challenges in these sectors as well as in other sectors. In the INTOSAI WGEA guidance this is dealt with all the way through by first presenting the general issues of fraud and corruption and then relating these more specifically to the environmental and natural resource sectors through cases, examples and other empirical references.

Integrating fraud and corruption into the auditing of environmental and natural resource management is a challenging task, as different SAIs may be uncertain whether they have the mandate to prevent and detect fraud and corruption. Mr Dørum underlined that the guidance should not be regarded as binding requirements in the detection of fraud and corruption. Hence, the audit questions and procedures suggested in the guidance should certainly be adjusted to the mandate of individual SAIs. Irrespective of the various mandates particular to different SAIs, however, most SAIs will have some kind of role to play along the continuum proper management → addressing weak internal controls → criminal investigation. Under any circumstance, when using the INTOSAI Guidance, auditors should exercise due professional care in order to make sure that the SAI's mandate is not exceeded.

As regards risk assessments, the INTOSAI WGEA Guidance contains a risk assessment scheme that is supposed to assist auditors in this process. Using the fisheries sector as an example, Mr Dørum introduced a value chain that illustrated the different stages and levels at which fraud and corruption may occur. Mr Dørum pointed out the possible existence of fraud and corruption in for example the setting of terms of licenses, the allocation of licenses, and in the monitoring and inspection of activities. Additionally, both low and high level officials inside the public sector, as well as various actors outside the public sphere (NGOs, banks, multinational corporations, and more) may be involved in such practices.

Finally, Mr Dørum pointed out that he did not think that fraud and corruption represent the most serious problem in the fisheries sector in Europe, and that the relevancy of detecting fraud and corruption as opposed to focusing on other problems should be considered. Mr Dørum suggested that some of the greatest challenges in the European fisheries sector are overcapacity, destructive but not necessarily illegal fishing practices, and perhaps also sea temperature rise due to climate change. At the same time, however, Mr Dørum emphasized that fraud and corruption sometimes is the 'missing piece of the puzzle', and he thought that this is something that environmental auditors also should be aware of.

The guidance will be finally approved at the 15th assembly meeting of INTOSAI WGEA in June 2013.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.00 - 13.30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 - 13.40</td>
<td>Welcome by the EUROSAI WGEA Secretariat</td>
<td>Opening by Mr Helge Strand Østtveiten, Director General, Performance Audit Department II, Office of the Auditor General of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.40 - 15.00</td>
<td>SESSION I: SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT</td>
<td><strong>Keynote speakers:</strong>&lt;br&gt;State of Europe’s forests&lt;br&gt;by Mr Dominique Reeb, Deputy Chief, Forestry and Timber Section, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe/Food and Agriculture Organization&lt;br&gt;Policies for sustainable forest management in Europe&lt;br&gt;by Mr Arne Ivar Sletnes, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Norway&lt;br&gt;<strong>Presentation of relevant INTOSAI WGEA activities:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Presentation of the INTOSAI WGEA guide “Auditing Forests: Guidance for Supreme Audit Institutions” (2010)&lt;br&gt;by Ms Tuuli Rasso, INTOSAI WGEA Secretariat&lt;br&gt;Integrating fraud and corruption risks into the auditing of fisheries and forestry&lt;br&gt;by Mr Kjell Kristian Dørum, Office of the Auditor General of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20 – 17.00</td>
<td>SESSION II: SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT</td>
<td><strong>Keynote speaker:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Fisheries policy and management in Europe. Can we expect sustainable fisheries in future?&lt;br&gt;by Mr Jesper Raakjær, Professor/Head of Centre, Innovative Fisheries Management, University of Aalborg&lt;br&gt;<strong>Presentation of relevant INTOSAI WGEA activities and cooperative audits:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Presentation of the INTOSAI WGEA guide &quot;Auditing Sustainable Fisheries Management: Guidance for Supreme Audit Institutions&quot; (2010)&lt;br&gt;by Ms Tuuli Rasso, INTOSAI WGEA Secretariat&lt;br&gt;<strong>Presentation of the Joint Final Report on the Audit of Environmental Monitoring and Fisheries Management and Control in the Baltic Sea”</strong>&lt;br&gt;by Mr Yvan Pedersen, Assistant Auditor General, National Audit Office of Denmark&lt;br&gt;<strong>Presentation of the parallel audit on the Barents Sea,</strong>&lt;br&gt;by Ms Antonina Urazova, the Account Chamber of the Russian Federation</td>
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## WORKSHOP SESSIONS 09.00-12.00

### WORKSHOP I  
**Auditing Sustainable Fisheries Management**

The main purpose of the workshop will be to share experience and knowledge from audits in this field, as well as to discuss common challenges/opportunities and future directions for auditing. Topics covered in performed audits include fisheries and aquaculture management, as well as stock management, illegal fishing, data quality, control systems and inadequate enforcement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of lessons learned from audits of the Common EU Fisheries Policy</strong>&lt;br&gt;by Mr Francois Osete and Mr Armando do Jogo, European Court of Auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.50</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of audit on Norwegian Aquaculture Management</strong>&lt;br&gt;by Mr Bjørn Martin Ørvim, Office of the Auditor General of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.50</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit “Sustainable Fisheries”</strong>&lt;br&gt;by Ms Hilde van Dijk and Mr Gert Jan de Vries, the Netherlands Court of Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit “The central Government’s actions for sustainable fisheries”</strong>,&lt;br&gt;by Mr Fredrik Engström, Swedish National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of audit on Fisheries</strong>,&lt;br&gt;by Mr Jerome Brouillet, Cour des Comptes France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.35</td>
<td><strong>Summing up, preparations for plenary session after lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WORKSHOP II  
**Auditing Sustainable Forest Management**

The main purpose of the workshop will be to share experience and knowledge as well as to discuss common challenges/opportunities and future directions for auditing. Various topics related to forest management have been addressed in audits during the last few years ranging from sustainability of forests, management of publicly owned forests, biodiversity, national park management and government funding towards forest protection and management. Audits covering these and other topics will be presented in this workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit “Management of the state forest in the State Forest Management Centre”</strong>,&lt;br&gt;by Mr Matis Mägi, National Audit Office of Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.45</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit of “The EU Rural development support for the improvement of the economic value of forests”</strong>,&lt;br&gt;by Mr Joël Costantzer, European Court of Auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.45 – 10.00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.45</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of audit on Forest Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Ms Katarzyna Papińska, Supreme Audit Office of Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit “Sustainable Management of Norwegian Forest Resources”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Ms Camilla Constance Fredriksen, Office of the Auditor General of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit “Efficiency of managing forest in Slovenia”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Ms Jerneja Vrabic, The Court of Audit of the Republic of Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the audit “State-owned forest enterprise Sveaskog: Contradictory targets and operations”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Ms Camilla Gjerde, the Swedish National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 – 12.00</td>
<td><strong>Summing up, preparations for plenary session after lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 - 13.30</td>
<td>Lunch hosted by the Office of the auditor General of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 - 15.00</td>
<td>PLENARY SESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 – 14.00</td>
<td>Summary of workshops (from moderators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 14.30</td>
<td>Reflections on future directions for environmental auditing (fisheries/forests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Topical issues (fisheries/forests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Methodological approaches, data sources and use of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How can SAIs contribute to better management of fisheries and forests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 – 15.00</td>
<td>Upcoming activities and closing remarks by EUROSAI WGEA secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EUROSAI WGEA Secretariat
Ms Herdis Laupsa, Head of Secretariat, Assistant Director General
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