

Regulation of
Felling and
Restocking
SEA Post Adoption
Statement



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

Table of Contents

1	Background	3
2	The Strategic Environmental Assessment process.....	4
3	Integration of environmental considerations into the approach	5
4	The findings of the SEA.....	6
5	How the opinions expressed have been taken into account	7
6	Comments on the proposal	8
7	Comments on the Environmental Report.....	13
8	Reasons for selecting the final approach	16
9	Monitoring	17
10	Conclusion	18

1 Background

- 1.1.1 In August 2018 the Scottish Government launched a national consultation on the regulation of felling and restocking. This was to inform the secondary legislation required to implement the Forestry and Land Management (Scotland) Act 2018 ('the 2018 Act'). The 2018 Act controls felling and restocking, based on an offence of unauthorised felling. Any felling of trees in Scotland must be carried out in accordance with a permission or direction from the regulator, or in a way that has been made exempt from requiring permission.
- 1.1.2 Forestry was previously regulated in Scotland by the Forestry Commissioners, according to rules set out in the Forestry Act 1967 ('the 1967 Act') and the Forestry (Exceptions from Restriction of Felling) Regulations 1979 ('the 1979 Regulations'). The consultation stated that the Scottish Government intended to 'remain as close as possible to the current position and make changes only where they will make the processes more transparent, simpler or reduce the potential for inappropriate deforestation'.
- 1.1.3 The finalised proposals, informed by analysis of consultation responses, came into force on 1st April 2019 as the 'The Felling (Scotland) Regulations 2019' and 'The Forestry (Exemptions) (Scotland) Regulations'.
- 1.1.4 The 2018 Act also came into force on 1 April meaning that forestry functions in Scotland are now the responsibility of the Scottish Ministers and two new agencies of the Scottish Government will discharge those functions.
- 1.1.5 A proposal was prepared in 2018 and was subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The associated Environmental Report was consulted on alongside the proposal. The consultation ended on 14 October 2018 and the results can be found here: <https://consult.gov.scot/forestry/fellingandrestocking/>

2 The Strategic Environmental Assessment process

- 2.1.1 The Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 (the ‘2005 Act’) requires public bodies in Scotland to carry out SEA on their plans, programmes and strategies (PPS). SEA is a way of examining plans, programmes and strategies as they develop, to identify any significant effects they may have on the environment. It ensures that environmental considerations are taken into account. SEA also aims to build in mitigation measures, to avoid or minimise any potentially significant adverse effects on the environment, and look for opportunities to enhance a plan’s environmental performance.
- 2.1.2 This SEA process began with the production of a Scoping Report which was submitted to the SEA Gateway in April 2018. Representations received from the SEA Consultation Authorities (Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and Historic Environment Scotland (HES)) to the scoping stage, helped to inform the content of the proposal and the following stages of the SEA process. All SEA topic areas were scoped into the assessment.
- 2.1.3 The assessment and the production of the SEA Environmental Report progressed during summer 2018, in parallel with the preparation of the proposal.
- 2.1.4 Following consultation on the proposal and associated Environmental Report, an independent analysis of consultation responses received was carried out and is available online at:
- <https://www.gov.scot/publications/analysis-responses-consultation-regulation-felling-restocking/>
- 2.1.6 This Post Adoption Statement concludes the SEA process and section 18(3) of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 sets out the information that should be included in the Post Adoption Statement. This can be summarised as:
- how the environmental considerations have been integrated into the approach;
 - how the Environmental Report has been taken into account;
 - how the opinions of consultees have been taken into account;
 - the reasons for choosing the final approach, in light of the other reasonable alternatives considered; and
 - the measures to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the Regulations.

3 Integration of environmental considerations into the approach

- 3.1.1 This section explains how key environmental considerations were identified and how these were taken into account in the development of the Regulations.
- 3.1.2 From the outset, the preparation of the environmental baseline for the SEA helped to frontload environmental considerations into the proposal. Subsequent consultation with the SEA Consultation Authorities assisted in highlighting key environmental issues for further consideration.
- 3.1.3 Formal engagement with stakeholders commenced in September 2017 and continued throughout the development of the regulations. A number of structured discussions took place with a range of stakeholders including the five Regional Forestry Fora, Woodland Trust Scotland, the Community Woodlands Association, The Confederation of Forest Industries (Confor) and Forest Enterprise Scotland. The discussions allowed the proposal to be shaped prior to consultation.
- 3.1.4 In addition, during the development of the BRIA a range of businesses and membership organisations were contacted to discuss the impacts of the proposals. These included small, medium and large forest management companies and sawmills, private landowners, community landowners and membership organisations.
- 3.1.5 SEPA, SNH and HES were contacted during consultation to discuss the proposals and a meeting with HES took place to specifically consider the SEA.
- 3.1.6 Stakeholder engagement continued during and after the consultation period specifically with Confor, Scottish Land and Estates and Woodland Trust Scotland.

4 The findings of the SEA

- 4.1.1 The Environmental Report detailed the conclusions and recommendations of the assessment on the consultation proposals. The key themes drawn from the assessment are outlined here.
- 4.1.2 The changes to exemptions and guidance were predicted to have a mostly minor positive effect with a cumulatively major positive effect in the long term. Mitigation of environmental effects associated with tree felling and restocking was expected to continue primarily at a forest plan and site level.
- 4.1.3 A number of existing measures were identified that serve to ensure that forestry-related operations in Scotland abide by the principles of sustainability and environmental protection. For example, the UK Forestry Standard (UKFS) sets standards that must be met when felling trees.
- 4.1.4 A wide range of existing programmes exist to report on environmental status and assess performance against indicators. Given this and the generally minor effect the Regulations were predicted to have in isolation, the Environmental Report recommended that existing indicators are utilised to monitor its cumulative effects with that of other PPS.
- 4.1.5 It was also recommended that timing of felling and restocking should also be monitored – with a suggested requirement to report once the activity has happened as part of the permission conditions.

5 How the opinions expressed have been taken into account

- 5.1.1 The Environmental Report was issued for consultation alongside the proposal and views were invited on 22 questions with 2 of the questions related to the SEA and other statutory impact assessments.
- 5.1.2 The consultation received 37 responses from 18 individuals and 19 organisations. The organisations that took part included 3 non-departmental bodies, 4 businesses, 4 environmental bodies, 5 membership associations/representative bodies and 3 local authorities.
- 5.1.3 Four participants commented specifically on the SEA (aside from the Consultation Authorities). Two highlighted aspects that they agreed with; two identified gaps in the SEA or issues that they would like to see covered in more detail. Some participants referenced environmental considerations in response to other questions in the consultation document, typically in relation to climate, biodiversity, ecology, ancient trees and habitat. All comments were taken into account. The Post Adoption Statement has, where appropriate, grouped responses relating to a similar theme and has made comments on the most commonly occurring responses and themes.
- 5.1.4 Following the public consultation, the proposals were adjusted, taking into account the findings of the Environmental Report and the views expressed during the consultation, as well as to reflect developments since the draft was published in August 2018.

6 Comments on the proposal

- 6.1.1 The majority of respondents wanted to reconsider aspects of some exemptions, typically in relation to changes put forward by the Scottish Government. Approximately two thirds of consultation respondents, 24 participants, identified exemptions to remove, adjust or add.
- 6.1.2 There were some calls for the term ‘sustainable forest management’ to be defined within the regulations as the UKFS. In addition, one participant recommended that the wording of the Regulations and/or supporting guidance and advice could clarify that the definition of environment encompasses both the natural and historic environment to avoid a narrower, natural environment, focused understanding of the term.
- 6.1.3 *Guidance will make it clear that all decisions relating to Sustainable Forest Management will be based on the UKFS, which includes the natural and historic environment.*
- 6.1.4 A few participants described potential confusion about the interpretation of some aspects of the proposed exemptions. The Scottish Government was asked for clearer definitions and/or guidance on some aspects of the proposals.
- 6.1.5 *Guidance will be developed which will provide clearer definitions and detail on the proposals.*

6.2 Exemption on the requirement to have permission to fell

- 6.2.1 A common theme related to the proposed exemption from the requirement to have a felling permission for dead trees and concern that the amount of deadwood left for biodiversity would be reduced by this exemption.
- Guidance will set out in detail what this exemption will cover and include reference to the UKFS guidance on deadwood.*
- 6.2.2 A small number of respondents commented on the specific reference to Dutch Elm Disease (DED). One agreed with the decision to retain the exemption but asked for inclusion of other diseased trees affected by other pathogens. A few suggested DED should be removed from the proposals. They felt it was unclear why this was maintained as a stand-alone category.
- DED trees remain exempt. Removal of the exemption would increase the regulatory burden for those with DED infected trees. Other diseases are dealt with, where appropriate, through plant health legislation.*
- 6.2.3 A small number of respondents wanted the Scottish Government to increase the volume exemption and some respondents were concerned that native pinewoods would not be given the same level of protection as the proposals set out for other native woodlands.
- The Regulations exclude Caledonian Pinewoods from the volume exemption. Guidance will explain that long term forest plans can provide flexibility for example through the use of tolerance tables or where a forest plan is not in place, ten years of thinning approval may be gained through the submission of a management plan.*

- 6.2.4 A number of respondents (10) disagreed with the Scottish Government's proposal that windblow be removed from exemptions and this was a dominant theme across responses. Respondents highlighted practical difficulties they envisaged arising from the removal of the exemption, such as adverse commercial impacts, technical and legal disputes, the urgency to remove windblow and the potential danger of windblow.

Guidance will set out when a 'fast track' approval process may be used and provide clarity on the use of tolerance tables within long term forest plans for clearance of windblow.

- 6.2.5 A few participants also called for the Scottish Government to reconsider aspects of the new proposals, particularly requesting that exemptions for coppicing and small woodlands be retained, and for the small trees diameter to be revisited.

The threshold diameter was revised following consultation and the Regulations have set the threshold to 10cm.

6.3 Applications, issuing permissions and compensation

- 6.3.1 Two thirds of consultation participants responded to the questions on applications, permissions and compensation with the majority agreeing with the proposals. Respondents tended to focus on the changes to permissions and compensation; around a third called for adjustments or additions to the proposals.

- 6.3.2 Three participants objected to the requirement to notify an intended change of ownership, believing this will compromise commercial transactions, be costly and bureaucratic and place a strain on the Registers of Scotland. One participant described 'significant concerns' about the proposed use of "notices to comply". They believe the proposals are open to interpretation and lacking important details.

A risk based approach will be taken to registration. Guidance will detail what information will be required and how it will be used. Information required will always be the minimum information necessary for the Scottish Ministers to take a risk-based approach.

- 6.3.3 Another minor theme in responses related to the proposals on consultation requirements. A small number of respondents expressed concerns about the extent of consultation on applications required. There were suggestions this would be time-consuming, expensive and act as a barrier to economic activity.

- 6.3.4 One participant raised an objection to inclusion of conditions relating to the impacts of the felling and subsequent management of the site(s) on communities or individuals.

The consultation process will not change as a result of the Regulations. Guidance will set out the type of conditions which will be set as standard on most felling permissions.

- 6.3.5 There were a small number of comments on the proposed minimum information required for felling applications.

The information requested is the minimum required to allow Scottish Ministers to assess and process an application.

- 6.3.6 Comments were also made about adjustments relating to the continuation of the application requirements for thinning, calling for the Scottish Government to use the new proposals as an opportunity to make changes particularly in relation to the detail asked of applicants.

The required information relating to thinning was changed as a result of consultation comments and information requested will relate to the proposed thinning intensity and can be described as either the volume, number of trees or basal area.

- 6.3.7 Four respondents welcomed the indication that applications will be processed quickly but called for clarity around timescales for the processing of applications. There were also calls for more detail about applications for felling in specific environments, a more flexible approach to applications, greater simplicity, and guidance on specific aspects.

Guidance will provide more detail on application processing, including timescales.

- 6.3.8 Two participants highlighted concerns about any intention to make compensatory planting a condition of felling, describing this as potentially detrimental to habitat restoration.

Restocking conditions will be considered on a case by case basis.

6.4 Felling directions

- 6.4.1 Two thirds of consultation participants responded to the questions on the felling directions; with the majority agreeing with the proposals.

- 6.4.2 Seven respondents described adjustments for the Scottish Government to consider. Two suggested greater clarity was required regarding the meaning of 'prevent or reduce harm caused by the presence of trees'. One respondent called for more clarity on the process for assessing the 'impacts of felling'. Another respondent said felling directions should have the flexibility to enhance as well as protect biodiversity. One respondent suggested the application of a Felling Direction needs to include the facility for compensation for the woodland owner; another questioned aspects of the principles underpinning the new proposals.

There is no mechanism in place for granting compensation alongside the serving of a felling direction. If required, additional guidance will be developed to add clarity to the processes involved in issuing a felling direction.

6.5 Appeals

- 6.5.1 Just over half of the consultation participants responded to the questions on the appeals process. The responses were largely positive.

- 6.5.2 Four respondents called for adjustments to the proposed appeals process. They expressed a general concern about the level of expertise of those involved in the appeals process, and stated that more information is needed on which organisations will be called upon. For example, respondents suggested that certain organisations would need to be involved depending on the topic of an appeal - stating that this aspect of the process is not currently clear.

- 6.5.3 Three respondents called for additions to the proposed appeals process. One expressed concerns about the lack of scope for appeals to be made by parties other than the appellant.
- 6.5.4 Two participants commented on timeframes for processing appeals. One highlighted that it could take a long time; another expressed hope that the Scottish Government would reduce the length of time that appellants must wait for a decision.

Appeals which cannot be easily addressed by Scottish Forestry will be passed to the Scottish Government Planning and Environmental Appeals Department (DPEA) who may gather additional information by way of request written submissions, holding oral hearings or inspecting the land to which the appeal relates. Timescales of appeals will be kept to a minimum but will not be specified in guidance.

6.6 Compliance

- 6.6.1 Just over half of the consultation participants responded to the questions on the proposals concerning matters of compliance. The responses were largely positive.
- 6.6.2 One participant warned against compensation, another requested further detail on the limits to compensation claims for Temporary Stop Notices (TSNs) and what would be considered suitable proof of costs incurred.
- 6.6.3 One respondent called for the proposed compensation element of TSNs to be removed. They described a fear that the compensation process may mean TSNs are not used by the forestry regulator in order to avoid risk of compensation claims.

Compensation can only be claimed if a TSN was issued where the felling of trees was being done in accordance with an exemption or permission. Guidance will set out what would be considered suitable proof of costs incurred.

- 6.6.4 One organisation called for some specific adjustments to the proposals on compliance, asking for greater references to environmental considerations. Another respondent highlighted inconsistent references to ecological protection across the various proposals.

Conditions will be set which relate to the avoidance or mitigation of impacts on the environment, biodiversity, species, communities or individuals or the retention of, or increase in, woodland cover.

- 6.6.5 Four respondents suggested additions to the compliance proposals. They called for a clear statement that compliance with the UKFS should be a condition for all felling permissions and directions, and for compliance to be quantifiable against 'measurable and auditable specifications and/or standards'. One highlighted issues around clarity, and two respondents noted the need to have more reference to Environmental Impact Assessments and other relevant legislation within the compliance.
- 6.6.6 *Guidance will set out the type of conditions which will be set as standard on most felling permissions. Site specific conditions will be set on a case by case basis. The principles of sustainable forest management will be embedded in all conditions.*

6.7 Impact Assessments

- 6.7.1 Of those that responded to the question on the Partial Business Regulatory Impact Assessment (BRIA), the Partial Data Protection Impact Assessment and the SEA within the consultation on the proposals, 13 agreed, 6 disagreed and 1 did not answer the yes/no question but made a general comment in relation to impact assessments. A total of 7 comments were made on the impact assessments, these focussed on the BRIA and the SEA.
- 6.7.2 In addition SEPA, SNH and HES responded separately with comments specific to the SEA. During consultation, all three organisations were offered a meeting to discuss the proposals and this offer was taken up by HES. The points raised within HES' response reflect the discussions which took place during the meeting.
- 6.7.3 Three participants felt that the impact assessments failed to recognise the strengths of the existing regime. In other parts of their responses some participants described potential commercial impacts or opportunities arising from the proposals. Key themes included bureaucracy, impact on practice and additional costs.
- 6.7.4 Four participants identified issues in relation to the BRIA that they wanted the Scottish Government to consider, with three urging the Scottish Government to retain the existing arrangements on the basis of their flexibility.

Following the consultation, the BRIA was updated and finalised to take account of the changes made to the approach, such as the change to the small trees and volume exemptions and the felling permission information required for thinning. The BRIA was also changed to reflect the comments relating to the need for clear guidance to be developed and issued.

- 6.7.5 No comments were received on the Data Protection Impact Assessment.
- 6.7.6 Four participants commented specifically on the SEA and these are covered in the next section (7).
- 6.7.7 All assessments are available at:
<https://consult.gov.scot/forestry/fellingandrestocking/>

7 Comments on the Environmental Report

- 7.1.1 Four participants commented specifically on the SEA in response to the consultation on the proposals. Two highlighted aspects that they agreed with; two identified gaps in the SEA or issues that they would like to see covered in more detail. These included the potential impact of felling and restocking on biodiversity and specific habitats such as deadwood; as well as cumulative impacts, connections between the proposals and other consenting regimes, the role, expertise, training and capacity of regulatory staff and potential legal and regulatory loopholes and problems.
- 7.1.2 The Galloway Fisheries Trust expressed agreement with the SEA. They welcomed Table 2 in the Environmental Report on issues and opportunities associated with soil and water. One of these respondents also said they supported the comment from a Consultation Authority (SEPA) on the Scoping consultation that 'a specific question on peat and peatland restoration should be included to address issues around restocking in areas of deep peat'.
- 7.1.3 The Consultation Authorities also commented separately on the SEA. SNH agreed with the consideration of and assessment of predicted environmental effects set out in the Environmental Report, and that the exemptions are likely to have a cumulative positive effect on the preservation of native woodlands and the value of forestry as a resource.
- 7.1.4 HES was broadly in agreement with the findings in relation to the significance of effects on the historic environment. However, they would have welcomed more detail on the consideration of effects, particularly in relation to aspects of designated and non-designated historic environment assets and landscapes other than native and ancient woodland.
- 7.1.5 SEPA was generally satisfied with the adequacy and accuracy of the ER but would have welcomed more detail on the consideration of effects of restocking on deep peat including considerations of implications of different ground preparation techniques, machinery types and tree species in line with the FCS practical guide.
- 7.1.6 In noting that the proposed mitigation largely consists of that which will be provided through consideration of environmental effects at forest plan or site level, both HES and SEPA would welcome more specific information about the mechanisms through which the mitigation will be achieved. SEPA recommended that to ensure such mitigation is enacted, the post adoption statement (and the regulations themselves) should clearly set out these mechanisms (e.g. as a condition of any permissions granted). Such mitigation should include issues such as site preparation in relation to machinery type, soil type and species planted. SEPA also requested a full explanation of who is the primary regulator for assessing whether permissions are being complied with.
- 7.1.7 SEPA also referenced a section of the Environmental Report which refers to controls over heavy machinery use by the Regulator but doesn't specify who that regulator is. SEPA would expect such controls to be specified by the permissions granted based on soil type, ground conditions, species planted which should then dictate ground preparation techniques favoured which then dictates machinery type used. SEPA stated that it has no rules on such matters, and can only intervene with appropriate enforcement action if the machinery used causes pollution.

7.1.8 SEPA noted an omission of peaty soils from both the Environmental Report and the Regulation of Felling and Restocking Consultation document and sought a full justification for any restocking proposals on deep peat as a separate section, referencing SEPA's support of the FCS position on deep peats.

7.1.9 In addition SEPA believed there should be full consideration and site assessment of the importance of Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems referencing a guidance note that they produced in consultation with forestry practitioners.

The Scottish Government is content with the level of detail included within the Environmental Report. Whilst the comments received are not considered to alter the results of the assessment, where applicable, they have been noted for future reference. Details surrounding restocking on deep peat, ground preparation techniques, species to be planted and the importance of Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems will be considered on a case by case basis when assessing a felling permission application, and will take into account relevant guidelines and policies, including guidance notes, where appropriate, which SEPA have referenced in their response.

7.2 Other environmental issues

7.2.1 In addition to the specific question on impact assessments, some participants referenced environmental considerations in response to other questions in the consultation document. These are summarised here under key themes. Comments have been made on the most commonly occurring responses and themes.

7.2.2 Regulation

- A fear that any costs associated with the felling consents regime may be counterproductive. This could lead to insufficient levels of applications, more environmental loss and damage and poor forestry practice, and increased need to search for non-compliance.
- Concern that the switch from felling and the regulation of it, related to 'wilful damage of a growing tree' to consent for 'killing' a tree with exemptions for dead trees, will be subject to new case law and '*likely to have unintended loopholes, regulatory problems and environmental damage*'.
- A contrasting view that the proposal to consult on thinning applications will affect woodland management which should 'be encouraged, not over-controlled'.

The application process remains similar to the previous process. Guidance will be developed which will set out more detail, including processing timescales and the consultation process.

7.2.3 Biodiversity

- A view that tree felling should take into consideration the ecological effects of such removal. Any change to a forested area should be considered in line with local and national biodiversity plans, as well as knowledge of sensitive species or ecosystems local to planned felling.

The ecological effects of proposed tree removal will be considered on a case by case basis, taking into account whether the proposals are in line with sustainable forest management.

7.2.4 Habitat

- A call for recognition that solitary ancient trees should be maximally protected, as even single specimens create a unique habitat for, for example, for invertebrates, fungi, and plant life. A call for greater protection of hedgerows because of their value for wildlife/invertebrates.

Solitary trees and hedgerows remain exempt from the requirement for a felling permission but in some circumstances solitary trees can be protected by the use of other legislation such as Tree Preservation Orders.

- Concerns that the removal of the volume exemption in respect of small native woodlands is potentially detrimental to the management of those woodlands and may be counterproductive.

Ten years of thinning approval can be gained via submission of a management plan.

- A suggestion that an improved definition of public open space is required as these may incorporate a number of small blocks of woodland and exemption would allow removal of such areas with an overall loss of woodland cover.

Regulations include an improved definition of public open space to ensure that woodland blocks are not covered by the exemption.

- Calls for small remnants of native pinewoods to be protected from felling, by excluding such areas from the exemption.

Caledonian Pinewoods have been excluded from the volume exemption.

- Greater consideration of the need to remove trees to assist habitat restoration when making decisions related to restocking or compensatory planting.

These kinds of consideration will be made on a case by case basis.

- A call to use tools, such as the existing Ancient Woodland Inventory, for identifying native ancient woodland where there should be no exemptions.

Guidance will signpost users to the Ancient Woodland Inventory.

8 Reasons for selecting the final approach

- 8.1.1 The 2005 Act requires the Scottish Government to identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of any reasonable alternatives to the draft Regulations, taking into account its objectives and geographical scope.
- 8.1.2 Consideration of alternatives was undertaken during the preparation of the proposals and these were discounted as unreasonable. The alternatives were broken down by exemption and for some the only alternative was not carrying forward the exemption, essentially a 'do nothing' option. For some of the other exemptions several options were looked at and discounted.
- 8.1.3 The Scottish Government considered the overall 'do nothing' option; i.e. to have no exemptions and require all felling (no matter how insignificant or urgent) to require permission to be sought (i.e. no Regulation is put in place and the current exemptions fall by virtue of the 2018 Act coming into force). However, this was not considered to be feasible as it would negate the objectives of the new Regulation which include reducing the administrative burden, maximising timber availability to market and make enforcement easier.
- 8.1.4 A detailed process was undertaken to discount the individual alternatives as unreasonable for each exemption. The reasons for discounting the alternatives as unreasonable included:
- unjustified burdens on woodland managers (e.g. for the alternative of not carrying forward any diameter exemption for small trees);
 - a cause for confusion and enforcement difficulty (e.g. for maintaining the existing exemptions);
 - impracticality (e.g. for creating an exemption that defines diameter at ground level); and
 - causing undue constraints on native woodland owners (e.g. for creating the volume exemption for non-native woodlands only).
- 8.1.5 It was considered that these justifications cascaded to all of the alternatives that were considered for each exemption. For the reasons illustrated it is considered that the preferred options for the exemptions were the only options that were reasonable for assessment.

9 Monitoring

- 9.1.1 Section 19 of the 2005 Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act requires the Responsible Authority to monitor significant environmental impacts arising as a result of the implementation of the plan, programme or strategy. The purpose of the monitoring is to identify any unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and to enable appropriate remedial action to be taken.
- 9.1.2 A wide range of existing programmes are in place at the national and local level to report on environmental status and assess performance against established environmental indicators. Given the minor effect the Regulations are predicted to have in isolation, and the range of indicators currently in use, it is recommended that existing indicators are utilised to monitor any cumulative effects arising from the Regulations together with other PPS.
- 9.1.3 Linked with this, Scotland's Forestry Strategy will be monitored and a delivery report published every 3 years. The information gathered during the monitoring of the Strategy will be analysed to determine whether it indicates that adjustments are required to the Regulations.

10 Conclusion

- 10.1.1 The Scottish Government is content that the level and scope of the SEA is proportionate and that it has been pitched at the appropriate level to reflect the scope and level of detail of the Regulations.
- 10.1.2 This Post Adoption Statement concludes the SEA process, setting out the ways in which the findings of the SEA Environmental Report and the views expressed during the consultation on the SEA Environmental Report, as well as on the consultation proposals, have been taken into account within the Regulation of felling and restocking.