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Audit scope

- Performance audit on the action taken by the Swedish
  - Government
  - Board of Fisheries
  - Coast Guard
- Main period covered: 2002-2007
- Actions covered:
  - Conservation measures
  - Structural measures
  - Control system
= Entire Swedish saltwater fisheries policy
Audit criteria

Intentions of the EU and the Swedish Parliament
- Economically, socially and environmentally long-term sustainable development
- Precautionary approach

- Ensure the viability of the fisheries sector
- Promote employment in small-scale coastal fisheries
- Stop overfishing that threatens fish stocks
Methodology

- Legal analysis
  - Extent of national discretion within the CFP
  - Sweden's use of its national discretion
  → Quality assurance by a leading expert in EU law

- Analysis of economic data
  - Costs for and effects of different structural measures
  - Value added and net profit relative to direct and indirect support
  → Quality assurance by external economic experts

- Analysis of the control system
  - Mapping of shortcomings and gaps
Main findings

- Unclear prioritisation of objectives and policy instruments
- Material shortcomings in analysis and reporting
- More effective use can be made of national discretion
- Financial support counteracts achievement of objectives
- Shortcomings in the implementation of fisheries control
Recommendations

- Lay down clear priorities in relation to the objectives
- Use the policy instruments in a co-ordinated and cost-effective way to bring about fleet reductions
- Consider if the tax exemption can be reduced or abolished
- Enable a clear overview of the (un-) balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities
- Analyse the costs and impacts of different policy instruments
- Ensure that national discretion is effectively exploited
- Address weak links in the control system
Challenges / lessons learned

- **Challenges**
  - Lack of "official" reliable data for the economic analysis
  - Looking through the argument that "everything is decided by the EU"

- **Lessons learned**
  - Focus on the economic analysis if you have to choose one audit area
  - Try to relate the outcome of policy instruments by cases in point
  - Mixed competence in the audit team was very valuable
Impact

- Large media coverage

- Quoting of the audit in parliamentary committee report on exemption of taxes

- The Agency for Marine and Water Management has in a strategic document for 2020 suggested that the tax exemption should be abolished

- Some improvements have been made to the control system
**SNAO’s experiences - summary**

| Audit scope, criteria and questions | • Broad scope – “three audits in one” – was necessary  
| | • EU's / Parliament's intentions/objectives  
| | • Audit questions: Focus on effectiveness |

| Methodology / data | • Lack of official data – try to find data via other channels  
| | • Contradictory objectives – is there a prioritisation?  
| | • No analysis of national discretion – SNAO had to analyse it |

| Recommendations | • Directed to the Government and the Board of Fisheries in different layers  
| | • The recommendation of considering whether the tax exemption should be reduced/abolished was the most controversial one |

| Impact | • Large media coverage  
| | • Good way to use cases in point to show that policy instruments are counteracting each other |
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