

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(REQUIRED UNDER SECTION 38(8) OF THE NHRA (No. 25 OF 1999))

FOR THE PROPOSED MAKGANYANE MINING PERMIT, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

Type of development:

Mining Development

Client:

Greenmined Environmental

Environmental Impact Practitioner information:

Christine Fouche

E – mail:

Christine.F@greenmined.co.za

Developer:

Makganyane Resources (Pty) Ltd



Beyond Heritage

Private Bag X 1049

Suite 34

Modimolle

0510

Tel: 082 373 8491

Fax: 086 691 6461

E-Mail: jaco@heritageconsultants.co.za

Report Author:

Mr. J. van der Walt

Project Reference:

Project number 2172

Report date:

August 2021

APPROVAL PAGE

Project Name	Makganyane Mining Permit
Report Title	Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Makganyane Mining Permit, Northern Cape Province
Authority Reference Number	NC30/5/1/3/2/10915MP
Report Status	Draft Report
Applicant Name	Makganyane Resources (Pty) Ltd

Responsibility	Name	Qualifications and Certifications	Date
Fieldwork and reporting	Jaco van der Walt - Archaeologist	MA Archaeology ASAPA #159 APHP #114	September 2021
Fieldwork	Ruan van der Merwe - Archaeologist	BA Hons Archaeology	September 2021
Palaeontologist	Prof Marion Bamford	PhD Paleo Botany	September 2021

DOCUMENT PROGRESS**Distribution List**

Date	Report Reference Number	Document Distribution	Number of Copies
7 September 2021	2172	Greenmined Environmental	Electronic Copy

Amendments on Document

Date	Report Reference Number	Description of Amendment

INDEMNITY AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO THIS REPORT

The findings, results, observations, conclusions and recommendations given in this report are based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. The report is based on survey and assessment techniques which are limited by time and budgetary constraints relevant to the type and level of investigation undertaken. Beyond Heritage reserves the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations if and when new information becomes available from ongoing research or further work in this field or pertaining to this investigation.

Although Beyond Heritage exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents Beyond Heritage accepts no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies Beyond Heritage against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by Beyond Heritage and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This report must not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of this report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports, including main reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must make reference to this report. If these form part of a main report relating to this investigation or report, this report must be included in its entirety as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright on all documents, drawings and records, whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document, shall vest in Beyond Heritage.

The client, on acceptance of any submission by Beyond Heritage and on condition that the client pays to Beyond Heritage the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit:

- The results of the project;
- The technology described in any report; and
- Recommendations delivered to the client.

Should the applicant wish to utilise any part of, or the entire report, for a project other than the subject project, permission must be obtained from Beyond Heritage to do so. This will ensure validation of the suitability and relevance of this report on an alternative project.

REPORT OUTLINE

Appendix 6 of the GNR 326 EIA Regulations published on 7 April 2017 provides the requirements for specialist reports undertaken as part of the environmental authorisation process. In line with this, Table 1 provides an overview of Appendix 6 together with information on how these requirements have been met.

Table 1. Specialist Report Requirements.

Requirement from Appendix 6 of GN 326 EIA Regulation 2017	Chapter
(a) Details of - (i) the specialist who prepared the report; and (ii) the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Section a Section 12
(b) Declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	<i>Declaration of Independence</i>
(c) Indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
(cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report	Section 3.4 and 7.1.
(cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change;	9
(d) Duration, Date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	Section 3.4
(e) Description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used	Section 3
(f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of site plan identifying site alternatives;	Section 8 and 9
(g) Identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 8 and 9
(h) Map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 8
(l) Description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge	Section 3.7
(j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity including identified alternatives on the environment or activities;	Section 1.3
(k) Mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 10.1
(l) Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	Section 10. 1.
(m) Monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 10. 5.
(n) Reasoned opinion - (i) as to whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised; (iA) regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and (ii) if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Section 10.3
(o) Description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report	Section 6
(p) A summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and	Refer to BAR report
(q) Any other information requested by the competent authority	N.A

Executive Summary

Greenmined Environmental was appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) by Makganyane Resources (Pty) Ltd to undertake the required Environmental Authorisation Process for the proposed Makganyane Mining Permit, west of Postmasburg. Beyond Heritage was appointed to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the project and the study area was assessed on desktop level and by a non-intrusive pedestrian field survey. Key findings of the assessment include:


- The study area is situated on the slopes of a small valley between two ridges and is characterised by Banded Ironstone gravel infill.
- Isolated scatters of Middle Stone Age lithics were recorded washing down the slopes from higher up. The artefacts are out of context, scattered sparsely and of no significance apart from mentioning them in this report;
- The study area is indicated as of moderate paleontological sensitivity and an independent study was conducted by Prof Marion Bamford. The study concluded that there is a very small chance of fossils being disturbed;
- No other heritage features (archaeological, built environment or graves) of significance were recorded during the survey.

The impact of the project on heritage resources are low and the project can commence provided that the recommendations in this report are adhered to, based on the South African Heritage Resource Authority (SAHRA) 's approval.

Recommendations:

- Implementation of a chance find procedure for the project.

Declaration of Independence

Specialist Name	Jaco van der Walt
Declaration of Independence	<p>I declare, as a specialist appointed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 108 of 1998) and the associated 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, that I:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I act as the independent specialist in this application; • I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant; • I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work; • I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity; • I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation; • I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity; • I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority; • All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and • I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.
Signature	
Date	07/09/2021

a) Expertise of the specialist

Jaco van der Walt has been practising as a CRM archaeologist for 15 years. He obtained an MA degree in Archaeology from the University of the Witwatersrand focussing on the Iron Age in 2012 and is a PhD candidate at the University of Johannesburg focussing on Stone Age Archaeology with specific interest in the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Later Stone Age (LSA). Jaco is an accredited member of ASAPA (#159) and have conducted more than 500 impact assessments in Limpopo, Mpumalanga, North West, Free State, Gauteng, KZN as well as he Northern and Eastern Cape Provinces in South Africa.

Jaco has worked on various international projects in Zimbabwe, Botswana, Mozambique, Lesotho, DRC Zambia, Guinea and Tanzania. Through this, he has a sound understanding of the IFC Performance Standard requirements, with specific reference to Performance Standard 8 – Cultural Heritage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT OUTLINE	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE	6
A) EXPERTISE OF THE SPECIALIST	6
ABBREVIATIONS	10
GLOSSARY	10
1 INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE:	11
1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE	11
1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	12
1.3 ALTERNATIVES.....	12
2 LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS	16
3 METHODOLOGY	17
3.1 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
3.2 GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY AND GOOGLE EARTH MONUMENTS	17
3.3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:	17
3.4 SITE INVESTIGATION	18
3.5 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	20
3.6 LIMITATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS OF THE STUDY	20
4 DESCRIPTION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT.....	21
5 RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:	21
6 LITERATURE / BACKGROUND STUDY:	21
6.1 LITERATURE REVIEW (SAHRIS).....	21
6.2 SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING	22
6.3 BACKGROUND TO THE GENERAL AREA.....	23
6.4 CULTURAL LANDSCAPE	29
6.5 GRAVES AND BURIAL SITES.....	31
7 DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	31
8 FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY	32
8.1 PALEONTOLOGICAL HERITAGE	33
9 POTENTIAL IMPACT.....	35
10 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	36
10.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONDITION OF AUTHORISATION	36
10.2 CHANCE FIND PROCEDURES.....	36
10.3 REASONED OPINION.....	38
10.4 POTENTIAL RISK.....	38
10.5 MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	39
10.6 MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR INCLUSION IN THE EMPR.....	41
10.7 KNOWLEDGE GAPS.....	42
11 REFERENCES.....	43

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1.1. REGIONAL SETTING (1: 250 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP) OF THE PROJECT.....	13
FIGURE 1.2. LOCAL SETTING OF THE PROJECT.....	14
FIGURE 1.3. AERIAL IMAGE OF THE DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT.....	15
FIGURE 3.1: TRACKLOG OF THE SURVEY IN GREEN.....	19
FIGURE 6-1. 1929 PHOTOGRAPH OF BLINKKLIPKOP, WITH A CAVE IN THE RIGHT MIDDLE DISTANCE. HEMATITE AND SPECULARITE WERE MINED HERE. (NARSSA SAB, MNW: 976 MM1204/29).	25
FIGURE 6-2. 1891 CONSECRATION OF THE REFORMED CHURCH. (SNYMAN 1983: 43).....	27
FIGURE 6-3. REFORMED CHURCH BUILDING THAT WAS COMPLETED IN 1908. (SNYMAN 1983: 43).....	27
FIGURE 6-4. PORTION OF THE FIRST AGRICULTURAL PLOTS THAT WERE SURVEYED BY JOHN MINTERS IN 1881 IN THE BLINKKLIP VALLEY. (SNYMAN 1983: 6)	28
FIGURE 6.1. 1967 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF THE STUDY AREA. NO DEVELOPMENTS ARE INDICATED.	29
FIGURE 6.2. 1982 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF THE STUDY AREA – NO DEVELOPMENTS ARE INDICATED.....	30
FIGURE 6.3. 2009 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP OF THE STUDY AREA. A SMALL TRACK TRAVERSE THE SOUTH-EASTERN CORNER OF THE STUDY AREA.....	31
FIGURE 7.1. IRON ORE OUTCROPS.....	32
FIGURE 7.2. VEGETATION DOMINATED BY BLACKTHORN THICKETS.....	32
FIGURE 7.3. EXPLORATION ACTIVITIES IN THE STUDY AREA.....	32
FIGURE 7.4. STUDY AREA VIEWED FROM THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY.....	32
FIGURE 8.1. DORSAL AND VENTRAL VIEWS OF MSA LITHICS.....	33
FIGURE 8.2. PALEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY OF THE STUDY AREA AS INDICATED ON THE SAHRA PALAEOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY MAP.....	34

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. SPECIALIST REPORT REQUIREMENTS.....	4
TABLE 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	12
TABLE 3: INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROJECT ACTIVITIES	12
TABLE 4: SITE INVESTIGATION DETAILS	18
TABLE 5. HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATINGS.....	23
TABLE 6. CRM REPORTS CONSULTED FOR THE STUDY.	21
TABLE 7. IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.	35
TABLE 8. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROJECT.....	39
TABLE 9. HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR EMPR IMPLEMENTATION	41

ABBREVIATIONS

ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BGG Burial Ground and Graves
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CFPs: Chance Find Procedures
CMP: Conservation Management Plan
CRR: Comments and Response Report
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
DEA: Department of Environmental Affairs
EA: Environmental Authorisation
EAP: Environmental Assessment Practitioner
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMPr: Environmental Management Programme
ESA: Early Stone Age
ESIA: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
GIS Geographical Information System
GPS: Global Positioning System
GRP Grave Relocation Plan
HIA: Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA: Late Iron Age
LSA: Late Stone Age
MEC: Member of the Executive Council
MIA: Middle Iron Age
MPRDA: Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (Act No. 28 of 2002)
MSA: Middle Stone Age
NEMA National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998)
NHRA National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999)
NID Notification of Intent to Develop
NoK Next-of-Kin
PRHA: Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SADC: Southern African Development Community
SAHRA: South African Heritage Resources Agency

**Although EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age both are internationally accepted abbreviations and must be read and interpreted in the context it is used.*

GLOSSARY

Archaeological site (remains of human activity over 100 years old)

Early Stone Age (~ 2.6 million to 250 000 years ago)

Middle Stone Age (~ 250 000 to 40-25 000 years ago)

Later Stone Age (~ 40-25 000, to recently, 100 years ago)

The Iron Age (~ AD 400 to 1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

1 Introduction and Terms of Reference:

Beyond Heritage was appointed to conduct a HIA for the proposed mining permit over a 4.9 ha area of the proven iron ore resource on the remaining extent of the farm Makganyane No 667, Northern Cape Province (Figure 1-1 to 1-4). The report forms part of the Basic Assessment (BA) and Environmental Management Programme Report (EMPr) for the development.

The aim of the study is to survey the proposed development footprint to identify cultural heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within local, provincial and national context. It serves to assess the impact of the proposed project on non-renewable heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner. It is also conducted to protect, preserve and develop such resources within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999). The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized before and during the survey, which includes: Phase 1, review of relevant literature; Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey, a background scatter of Middle Stone Age artefacts were recorded. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations and site descriptions. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report. SAHRA as a commenting authority under section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) require all environmental documents, compiled in support of an Environmental Authorisation application as defined by NEMA EIA Regulations section 40 (1) and (2), to be submitted to SAHRA for commenting. Upon submission to SAHRA the project will be automatically given a case number as reference. As such the EIA report and its appendices must be submitted to the case as well as the EMPr, once it's completed by the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP).

1.1 Terms of Reference

Field study

Conduct a field study to: (a) locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest; b) record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas; c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources affected by the proposed development.

Reporting

Report on the identification of anticipated and cumulative impacts the operational units of the proposed project activity may have on the identified heritage resources for all 3 phases of the project; i.e., construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Consider alternatives, should any significant sites be impacted adversely by the proposed project. Ensure that all studies and results comply with the relevant legislation, SAHRA minimum standards and the code of ethics and guidelines of ASAPA.

To assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, and to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999).

1.2 Project Description

Makganyane Resources (Pty) Ltd holds a prospecting right (NC 30/5/1/1/2/2292 PR) over Portion 2 (portion of Portion 1), Remainder Extent, Remainder Portion of Portion 1, and Portion 3 of the farm Makganyane No 667. Consequently, the company identified the need to apply for a mining permit over a 4.9 ha area of the proven iron ore resource on the Remaining Extent of the farm Makganyane No 667. Project components and the location is outlined under Table 2 and 3.

Table 2: Project Description

Project area	4.9 ha area on the Remaining Extent of the farm Makganyane No 667
Magisterial District	Kuruman Magisterial District Northern Cape
Central co-ordinate of the development	28° 8'19.24"S 22°56'19.43"E
Topographic Map Number	2822 BB

Table 3: Infrastructure and project activities

Type of development	Mining Permit
Size of development	4,9 hectares
Project Components	The mining method will represent open-cast mining where blasting will be used to loosen the hard rock, the loosened material will then be transported to a mobile processing plant where it will be screened to various stockpiles. The iron ore will be hauled from the property to the Sishen iron ore export railway line. The processing plant will be of temporary nature. This will also apply to the offices and other infrastructure to be established on site. Presently, no permanent infrastructure is planned for the proposed development.

1.3 Alternatives

No alternatives were provided to be assessed although the extent of the area assessed allows for siting of the development to minimise impacts to heritage resources.




Figure 1.1. Regional setting (1: 250 000 topographical map) of the project.




Figure 1.2. Local Setting of the project




Figure 1.3. Aerial image of the development footprint.

2 Legislative Requirements

The HIA, as a specialist sub-section of the EIA, is required under the following legislation:

- National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Act No. 25 of 1999)
- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), Act No. 107 of 1998 - Section 23(2)(b)
- Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), Act No. 28 of 2002 - Section 39(3)(b)(iii)

A Phase 1 HIA is a pre-requisite for development in South Africa as prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by legislation. The overall purpose of heritage specialist input is to:

- Identify any heritage resources, which may be affected;
- Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources;
- Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;
- Assess the negative and positive impact of the development on these resources; and
- Make recommendations for the appropriate heritage management of these impacts.

The HIA should be submitted, as part of the impact assessment report or EMPr, to the PHRA if established in the province or to SAHRA. SAHRA will ultimately be responsible for the evaluation of Phase 1 HIA reports upon which review comments will be issued. 'Best practice' requires Phase 1 HIA reports and additional development information, as per the impact assessment report and/or EMPr, to be submitted in duplicate to SAHRA after completion of the study. SAHRA accepts Phase 1 HIA reports authored by professional archaeologists, accredited with ASAPA or with a proven ability to do archaeological work.

Minimum accreditation requirements include an Honours degree in archaeology or related discipline and 3 years post-university CRM experience (field supervisor level). Minimum standards for reports, site documentation and descriptions are set by ASAPA in collaboration with SAHRA. ASAPA is based in South Africa, representing professional archaeology in the SADC region. ASAPA is primarily involved in the overseeing of ethical practice and standards regarding the archaeological profession. Membership is based on proposal and secondment by other professional members.

Phase 1 HIA's are primarily concerned with the location and identification of heritage sites situated within a proposed development area. Identified sites should be assessed according to their significance. Relevant conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations should be made. Recommendations are subject to evaluation by SAHRA.

Conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations, as approved by SAHRA, are to be used as guidelines in the developer's decision-making process.

Phase 2 archaeological projects are primarily based on salvage/mitigation excavations preceding development destruction or impact on a site. Phase 2 excavations can only be conducted with a permit, issued by SAHRA to the appointed archaeologist. Permit conditions are prescribed by SAHRA and includes (as minimum requirements) reporting back strategies to SAHRA and deposition of excavated material at an accredited repository.

In the event of a site conservation option being preferred by the developer, a site management plan, prepared by a professional archaeologist and approved by SAHRA, will suffice as minimum requirement.

After mitigation of a site, a destruction permit must be applied for with SAHRA by the applicant before development may proceed.

Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act, with reference to Section 36. Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of SAHRA. The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36[5]) of Act 25 of 1999 is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in this age category, located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority, require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years, in addition to SAHRA authorisation. If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery, but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws, set by the cemetery authority, must be adhered to.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected under Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance No. 7 of 1925), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial MEC for Local Government and Planning; or in some cases, the MEC for Housing and Welfare. Authorisation for exhumation and reinternment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. To handle and transport human remains, the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of Act 65 of 1983 (Human Tissues Act).

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Literature Review

A brief survey of available literature was conducted to extract data and information on the area in question to provide general heritage context into which the development would be set. This literature search included published material, unpublished commercial reports and online material, including reports sourced from the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS).

3.2 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where sites of heritage significance might be located; these locations were marked and visited during the fieldwork phase. The database of the Genealogical Society was consulted to collect data on any known graves in the area.

3.3 Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

Stakeholder engagement is a key component of any EA process, it involves stakeholders interested in, or affected by the proposed development. Stakeholders are provided with an opportunity to raise issues of concern (for the purposes of this report only heritage related issues will be included). The aim of the public consultation process was to capture and address any issues raised by community members and other stakeholders during key stakeholder and public meetings. The process involved:

- Placement of advertisements and site notices
- Stakeholder notification (through the dissemination of information and meeting invitations);
- Stakeholder meetings undertaken with I&APs;
- Authority Consultation
- The compilation of Basic Assessment Report (BAR).

3.4 Site Investigation

The aim of the site visit was to:

- survey the proposed project area to locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest;
- record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas;
- determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area.

Table 4: Site Investigation Details

	Site Investigation
Date	7 September 2021
Season	Spring – Blackthorn thickets dominate the environment resulting in low archaeological visibility across the study area. The project area was however sufficiently covered to understand the heritage character of the area (Figure 3-1).




Figure 3.1: Tracklog of the survey in green.

3.5 Impact Assessment Methodology

The criteria below are used to establish the impact rating on sites:

- The **nature**, which shall include a description of what causes the effect, what will be affected and how it will be affected.
- The **extent**, wherein it will be indicated whether the impact will be local (limited to the immediate area or site of development) or regional, and a value between 1 and 5 will be assigned as appropriate (with 1 being low and 5 being high):
- The **duration**, wherein it will be indicated whether:
 - * the lifetime of the impact will be of a very short duration (0-1 years), assigned a score of 1;
 - * the lifetime of the impact will be of a short duration (2-5 years), assigned a score of 2;
 - * medium-term (5-15 years), assigned a score of 3;
 - * long term (> 15 years), assigned a score of 4; or
 - * permanent, assigned a score of 5;
- The **magnitude**, quantified on a scale from 0-10 where; 0 is small and will have no effect on the environment, 2 is minor and will not result in an impact on processes, 4 is low and will cause a slight impact on processes, 6 is moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way, 8 is high (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease), and 10 is very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes.
- The **probability of occurrence**, which shall describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring. Probability will be estimated on a scale of 1-5 where; 1 is very improbable (probably will not happen), 2 is improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood), 3 is probable (distinct possibility), 4 is highly probable (most likely) and 5 is definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures).
- The **significance**, which shall be determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above and can be assessed as low, medium or high; and
- the **status**, which will be described as either positive, negative or neutral.
- the degree to which the impact can be reversed.
- the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.
- the *degree* to which the impact can be mitigated.

The **significance** is calculated by combining the criteria in the following formula:

$$S=(E+D+M) P$$

S = Significance weighting

E = Extent

D = Duration

M = Magnitude

P = Probability

The **significance weightings** for each potential impact are as follows:

- < 30 points: Low (i.e., where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),
- 30-60 points: Medium (i.e., where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated),
- 60 points: High (i.e., where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

3.6 Limitations and Constraints of the study

The authors acknowledge that the brief literature review is not exhaustive on the literature of the area. Due to the nature of heritage resources and pedestrian surveys, the possibility exists that some features or artefacts may not have been discovered/recorded and the possible occurrence of graves and other cultural material cannot be excluded. Similarly, the depth of cultural deposits and the extent of heritage sites cannot be accurately determined due its subsurface nature. This report only deals with the footprint area of the proposed development and consisted of non-intrusive surface surveys. This study did not assess the impact on medicinal plants and intangible heritage as it is assumed that these components would have been highlighted through the public consultation process if relevant. It is possible that new information could come to light in future, which might change the results of this Impact Assessment.

4 Description of Socio-Economic Environment

According to census 2011, there are 35 093 people in the municipality. Of these, 52,8% are African black, 37,6% are coloured, and 8,4% are white. Other population groups make up the remaining 1,2% of the population. Of those aged 20 years and older, 13,9% had some primary schooling, 5,3% had completed primary, 35,4% had some secondary, and 25,4 had matric. Only 6,4% had a higher qualification, and 13,7% had no form of schooling. Economically Tsantsabane is known for being rich in minerals, and for its mining, agriculture, manufacturing and farming sectors. Tsantsabane has reinvented itself over the years as one of the leading investment hot spots in the Northern Cape. The construction of the Anglo American Kumba Iron Ore's Kolomela mine has brought an implosion of development to the area.

5 Results of Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

5.1.1 Stakeholder Identification

Adjacent landowners and the public at large were informed of the proposed activity as part of the BA process. Site notices and advertisements notifying interested and affected parties were placed at strategic points and in local newspapers as part of the process.

6 Literature / Background Study:

6.1 Literature Review (SAHRIS)

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where archaeological and historical sites might be located.

Few sites are known for the area. The following CRM assessments (Table 6) were consulted for this report:

Table 5. CRM reports consulted for the study.

Author	Year	Project	Findings
Beaumont, P.	2007	Phase 1 HIA for the Farm Makganyane, Postmasburg, Northern Cape.	8 Stone Artefacts, no sites of significance.
Van der Ryst, M.	2011	Specialist report on the Stone Age and other heritage resources at Kolomela, Postmasburg, Northern Cape	Stone Age features and historical features.
Kusel, U.	2013	Phase 1 AIA report on archaeological contexts and heritage resources on the farms Heuningkrans 364 and Langverwacht 432 in the	Structures and Stone Age sites.

		Postmasburg District Municipality of the Northern Cape Province	
Van der Walt, J.	2019	Heritage Impact Assessment Makganyane Prospecting Application, Northern Cape Province	10 find spots consisting of isolated stone tools were recorded. The survey also recorded four features consisting of two cemeteries, a stone cairn that could possibly mark a pre-colonial burial and one feature relating to previous exploration

6.2 Site Significance and Field Rating

Section 3 of the NHRA distinguishes nine criteria for places and objects to qualify as 'part of the national estate' if they have cultural significance or other special value. These criteria are:

- Its importance in/to the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa;
- Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

The presence and distribution of heritage resources define a 'heritage landscape'. In this landscape, every site is relevant. In addition, because heritage resources are non-renewable, heritage surveys need to investigate an entire project area, or a representative sample, depending on the nature of the project. In the case of the proposed project the local extent of its impact necessitates a representative sample and only the footprint of the areas demarcated for development were surveyed. In all initial investigations, however, the specialists are responsible only for the identification of resources visible on the surface. This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. The following criteria were used to establish site significance with cognisance of Section 3 of the NHRA:

- The unique nature of a site;
- The integrity of the archaeological/cultural heritage deposits;
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site;
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features;
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined/is known);
- The preservation condition of the sites; and
- Potential to answer present research questions.

In addition to this criteria field ratings prescribed by SAHRA (2006), and acknowledged by ASAPA for the SADC region, were used for the purpose of this report. The recommendations for each site should be read in conjunction with section 10 of this report.

Table 6. Heritage significance and field ratings

FIELD RATING	GRADE	SIGNIFICANCE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; national site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; provincial site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High significance	Conservation; mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High significance	Mitigation (part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP. A)	-	High/medium significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP. B)	-	Medium significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	-	Low significance	Destruction

6.2.1 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

No known grave sites are indicated in the study area.

6.3 Background to the general area

6.3.1 The Stone Age

South Africa has a long and complex Stone Age sequence of more than 2 million years. The broad sequence includes the Later Stone Age, the Middle Stone Age and the Earlier Stone Age. Each of these phases contains sub-phases or industrial complexes, and within these we can expect regional variation regarding characteristics and time ranges. For Cultural Resources Management (CRM) purposes it is often only expected/ possible to identify the presence of the three main phases. Yet sometimes the recognition of cultural groups, affinities or trends in technology and/or subsistence practices, as represented by the sub-phases or industrial complexes, is achievable (Lombard 2011). The three main phases can be divided as follows;

- Later Stone Age; associated with Khoi and San societies and their immediate predecessors. Recently to ~30 thousand years ago.
- Middle Stone Age; associated with Homo sapiens and archaic modern humans. 30-300 thousand years ago.
- Earlier Stone Age; associated with early Homo groups such as Homo habilis and Homo erectus. 400 000-> 2 million years ago.

The larger study area has a wealth of pre-colonial archaeological sites (Morris & Beaumont 2004). Famous sites in the region include the world renowned Wonderwerk Cave to the north of the study area. Closer to Kuruman two shelters on the northern and southern faces of GaMohaana (in the Kuruman Hills north west of the town) contain Later Stone Age remains and rock paintings. Rock art is known to occur at Danielskuil to the north east and on Carter Block (Morris 2008). Middle Stone Age material is on record around the study area where archaeological surveys have shown rocky outcrops and hills, drainage lines, riverbanks and confluences to be prime localities for archaeological finds and specifically Stone Age sites (Van der Ryst 2011), as these areas were utilized for settlement of base camps close to water and hunting ranges.

According to Morris (2005) in the immediate area to the north of the study area, the Earlier Stone Age is represented by 11 known sites (Bruce, Kathu, Uitkoms, Sishen, Demaneng, Lylyveld and Mashwening); the Middle Stone Age by 5 sites (all in the vicinity of Kathu); and the Later Stone Age by 10 sites (one on

King, one at Mashwening and eight at Kathu). Rock engravings have been identified from Sishen and Bruce (the Bruce site was salvaged and recorded by Fock & Fock 1984), as well as at Beeshoek (Fock & Fock 1984; Morris 1992; Beaumont 1998). Specularite sources are known on Demaneng and Lylyveld and were mined in Stone Age times at a site on Doornfontein to the south (Beaumont 1973; Beaumont & Boshier 1974) and at Tsantsabane to the east of Postmasburg (Beaumont 1973; Thackeray et al. 1983): numerous other specularite workings have also been recorded (Beaumont 1973).

Stone Age artefacts are often recorded at industrial sites like the Beeshoek mine operations and the effects of heavy-duty earth moving machinery on the formation of lithic debitage at open-air Stone Age/Palaeolithic sites was examined by Bradfield and Van der Walt (2018) at a site close to Kathu. The experiment with heavy-duty machinery produced only one pseudo-formal tool, most of the debitage produced mimics that occasioned by knapping and this could attribute to some of the debitage/ artefacts identified on industrial sites.

6.3.2 Iron Age

Iron Age expansion southwards past Kuruman into the Ghaap plato and towards Postmasburg dates to the 1600's (Humphreys, 1976 and Thackeray, 1983). Definite dates for Tswana presence in the Postmasburg area are around 1805 when Lichtenstein visited the area and noted the mining activities of the Tswana (probably the Thlaping) tribes in the area. The Thlaro and Thlaping settled the area from Campbell in the east to Postmasburg and towards the Langeberg close to Olifantshoek in the north west before 1770 (Snyman, 1988). The Korana expansion after 1770 started to drive the Thlaro and Thlaping further north towards Kuruman (Shillington, 1985); Morris (2005) indicated that 3 Iron Age sites close to the study area are on record (Demaneng, Lylyveld and Kathu).

6.3.3 Historical information

Postmasburg is situated on the Cape Plateau, 1300 meters above sea level. An average of 325 millimeters of rain is usually recorded in the autumn and summer seasons. This area is semi-arid and forms part of the Kalahari thornveld biome. Farming practices include livestock cultivation and, to a much lesser degree, crop farming. It could not yet be determined with certainty what group of people had lived in the Postmasburg area before the Bushmen. However, a large number of stone tools, as well as glass beads, have been found in the Blinkklipkop ("Shiny Stone Hill"), which testifies to early human activity. (Snyman 1983: 1)

Rock paintings in the area serve as evidence that the hunter gatherer Bushmen had inhabited Griqualand West for centuries. In the 1770s, the Korana (people of Nama ancestry) moved into the Postmasburg area and disrupted the Bushmen's way of life. The Korana regularly visited a primitive mine in the Blinkklipkop, which today forms part of the town of Postmasburg, to exploit shimmering substances, namely hematite and specularite, which were mixed with fat and applied to the skin to give a sought-after shiny red appearance. With the later arrival of the Tswana, Korana, Griqua and Europeans the Bushmen gradually emigrated to the Kalahari, Botswana and Namibia. (Snyman 1983: Foreword, 1-3).



Figure 6-1. 1929 photograph of Blinkklipkop, with a cave in the right middle distance. Hematite and specularite were mined here. (NARSSA SAB, MNW: 976 MM1204/29).

The Tswana (Western Sotho) invaded the Northern Cape about 500 years ago, but the later Hay district in which Postmasburg was located was only occupied in the early 1800s. Long before settling in this area the Tswana also undertook journeys to Blinkklipkop to mine for the cosmetic substance that they called *sibilo*. In 1813 the missionary John Campbell came across a group of Bushmen near the mine and commented the following: “Blink Mountain is a kind of Mecca to the nations around, who are constantly making pilgrimages to it, to obtain fresh supplies of the blue shining powder and the red stone.” (Snyman 1983: 3-4)

In the 1820s the Griqua leader Andries Waterboer was able to expel his enemies, the Bergenaars of the Langeberge, from Blinkklip, as the area was called at the time. This became a permanent outpost of the Griqua tribe. The remaining Tswana and Bushmen either moved away or were assimilated by Waterboer’s people. By the 1830s the Blinkklip population had grown to the extent that missionary of the London Mission Society, John Baillie, was stationed there for a time. Nikolaas Waterboer succeeded his father in 1853, and after this the tribe’s authority in the area started to wane. Waterboer and his tribe became British subjects in 1871 after the British annexed Griqualand West. The discovery of diamonds further paved the way for white settlement in this district. (Snyman 1983: 4-5; Breutz 1963: 8)

The reason that the settlement of Europeans in Postmasburg took so long was that the country was so bare, waterless and stony that it was almost impossible to make a living there. Tribes that lived in the area occupied large parts of the country because it was so difficult to find water for their stock. It was only the later prosperity that came from mining that sparked agricultural development, the sinking of thousands of boreholes and the construction of roads. (Breutz 1963: 21)

Farms were surveyed by the British in the Griekwastad district in the 1870s, and between 1876 and 1878 the first farms owned by Europeans were purchased in this area. There were still a number of Griqua landowners in the area as well. The Griqualand West Rebellion disrupted life in the region in 1878, causing some to move away. In 1880 the Griqualand West district was incorporated into the Cape Colony and brought under formal administration. As of the early 1880s a much larger area surrounding Blinkklip was surveyed and more white settlers moved into the area. It was however only in 1882 with the establishment of a Reformed Church five kilometers south of Blinkklip that this settlement started to gain prominence. Between 1884 the Magistrate of the Hay district, J. J. Christie, lobbied for the establishment of a town at Blinkklip. This was already the most populous part of the Hay district. By the late 1880s the Reformed Church and its members were also campaigning for the establishment of the town, and on 30 November 1889 it was finally decided that the church would move to Blinkklip. The church was consecrated in Blinkklip on 28 February 1891, and a new Reformed Church building was completed in 1908. (Snyman 1983: 5-10, 43)



Figure 6-2. 1891 consecration of the Reformed Church. (Snyman 1983: 43)




Figure 6-3. Reformed Church building that was completed in 1908. (Snyman 1983: 43)

It was only in 1891 that 82 town plots were surveyed around the existing police station at Blinkklip. In the same year members of the church petitioned the Commissioner of Crown Lands to rename this town Postmasburg, in remembrance of Professor Dirk Postma, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa. This name change was affected in April 1892. (Snyman 1983: 10).




Figure 6-4. Portion of the first agricultural plots that were surveyed by John Minters in 1881 in the Blinkklip Valley. (Snyman 1983: 6)

By June 1892 there were only three buildings in the town of Postmasburg: a police station, a church building and a small house belonging to a policeman. This soon changed, and by March 1893 the little settlement that was established around a church had a post office, two shops, a partially completed school building and twenty dwelling houses. The town's first town management council was elected in May of that year. (Snyman 1983: 10-11)

The manganese fields in the Postmasburg area were opened for prospecting in 1922, and this greatly boosted the development of the town and caused an influx of new residents. The economic depression of the 1930 adversely affected mining in the area, but the town economy could still rely on the agricultural sector. Postmasburg became a municipality in 1936. (Snyman 1983: 12)

6.3.4 Anglo-Boer War

There are no battlefields or concentration camp sites close to the study area.

6.4 Cultural Landscape

Historical land use and the cultural landscape are linked since the cultural landscape is shaped to some extent by the history of the area. The farm is used for the farming of livestock in recent years, evident by fences and watering holes. Historical maps indicate older mining activities in the surrounding area with no developments in the project area.




Figure 6.5. 1967 Topographic map of the study area. No developments are indicated.




Figure 6.6. 1982 Topographic map of the study area – no developments are indicated.




Figure 6.7. 2009 Topographical map of the study area. A small track traverse the south-eastern corner of the study area.

6.5 Graves and Burial Sites

No known graves are indicated on databases consulted but graves and cemeteries are widely distributed across the landscape and can be expected anywhere.

7 Description of the Physical Environment

The general area consists of two kinds of topographical elements: undulating plains characterised by thick Quaternary sand cover and a range of hills. The local geology is not conducive to the forming of shelters on the ridges in contrast to areas where small shelters have been noted with lithic scatters to the north-west and to the east on the farms Heuningkrans, Langverwacht and Mookaneng (Kusel 2013; van der Walt 2019).

The study area is situated within a small valley near a rocky ridgeline (Figure 7.1). Iron ore outcrops are present between dense thickets of Swarthaak (*Acacia mellifera*) resulting in low archaeological visibility (Figure 7.2). The study area is undeveloped, but some exploration points was noted (Figure 7.3).



Figure 7.1. Iron Ore outcrops



Figure 7.2. Vegetation dominated by Blackthorn Thickets.



Figure 7.3. Exploration activities in the study area.



Figure 7.4. Study area viewed from the northern boundary.

8 Findings of the Survey

It is important to note that only the development footprint was surveyed over 1 day. The terrain is predominantly rocky, situated on the slopes of a small valley between two ridges. The Iron Ore is located close to the surface but covered with a gravel infill. A Background scatter of isolated MSA artefacts were recorded, possibly washed down from higher up on the ridge. The artefacts are all made from the abundance of raw material (Chert and Quartzite) originating from the Banded Iron Stone formation characteristic of the area and include cores, blades and flakes with faceted striking platforms characteristic

of the MSA (Figure 8.1). The stone tools are isolated, out of context and scattered too sparsely to be of significance apart from mentioning them in this report and is given a field rating of GP C.



Figure 8.1. Dorsal and ventral views of MSA lithics.

8.1 Paleontological Heritage

Based on the SAHRA Paleontological map the study area is of moderate sensitivity and an independent study was conducted by Prof Marion Bamford for this aspect (Figure 8.2). The study concluded that the proposed site lies on Quaternary Kalahari Aeolian sands that might have palaeopans or palaeo-springs that have entrapped fossils. It also lies partly on the non-fossiliferous Makganyane Formation (Postmasburg Group, Griqualand West Sequence of the Transvaal Supergroup) that is non-fossiliferous. Since there is a very small chance of fossils being disturbed in the Quaternary sands, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMP. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found once excavations and mining commence. As far as the palaeontology is concerned, this project may be authorised.



Colour	Sensitivity	Required Action
RED	VERY HIGH	Field assessment and protocol for finds is required
ORANGE/YELLOW	HIGH	Desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely
GREEN	MODERATE	Desktop study is required
BLUE	LOW	No palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required
GREY	INSIGNIFICANT/ZERO	No palaeontological studies are required
WHITE/CLEAR	UNKNOWN	These areas will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map

Figure 8.2. Paleontological sensitivity of the study area as indicated on the SAHRA Palaeontological sensitivity map.

9 Potential Impact

No significant resources were noted in the project area and no adverse impact to heritage resources is expected. Any additional effects to subsurface heritage resources can be successfully mitigated by implementing a chance find procedure. Mitigation measures as recommended in this report should be implemented during all phases of the project. Impacts of the project on heritage resources is expected to be low during all phases of the development (Table 7).

9.1.1 Pre-Construction phase

It is assumed that the pre-construction phase involves the removal of topsoil and vegetation as well as the establishment of infrastructure. These activities can have a negative and irreversible impact on heritage features if any occur. Impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

9.1.2 Construction Phase

During this phase, the impacts and effects are similar in nature but more extensive than the pre-construction phase. Potential impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

9.1.3 Operation Phase

Impacts and effects during open pit mining operations include excavations. Potential impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

9.1.4 Impact Assessment for the Project

Table 7. Impact assessment of the proposed project.

Nature: During the construction phase activities resulting in disturbance of surfaces and/or sub-surfaces may destroy, damage, alter, or remove from its original position archaeological and paleontological material or objects.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation (Preservation/ excavation of site)
Extent	Local (2)	Local (2)
Duration	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
Magnitude	Minor (2)	Minor (2)
Probability	Probable (3)	Improbable (2)
Significance	27 (Low)	18 (Low)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Not reversible	Not reversible
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Yes
Can impacts be mitigated?	NA	NA
Mitigation: Implementation of a chance find procedure for the project.		
Cumulative impacts: The proposed project will have a low cumulative impact as no significant heritage resources will be adversely affected.		
Residual Impacts: Although surface sites can be avoided or mitigated, there is a chance that completely buried sites would still be impacted on, but this cannot be quantified.		

10 Conclusion and recommendations

The terrain is predominantly rocky, characterised by the slopes of a small valley between two ridges. The Iron Ore that will be mined is located close to the surface but covered with a gravel infill. A Background scatter of isolated MSA artefacts were recorded, possibly washed down from higher up on the ridge. The artefacts are all made from the abundance of raw material (Chert and Quartzite) originating from the Banded Iron Stone formation characteristic of the area and include cores, blades and flakes with faceted striking platforms characteristic of the MSA. The stone tools are isolated, out of context and scattered too sparsely to be of significance apart from mentioning them in this report and is given a field rating of GP C. This is in line with studies by Beaumont (2007) and van der Walt (2019) on the same farm currently assessed that recorded isolated artefacts and concluded that the study area is of low archaeological significance.

The study area is indicated as of moderate paleontological sensitivity and an independent study was conducted by Prof Marion Bamford. The study concluded that there is a very small chance of fossils being disturbed in the Quaternary sands and a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMP. Therefore, no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found once excavations and mining commence. As far as the palaeontology is concerned, this project may be authorised.

The impact of the proposed project on heritage resources low and it is recommended that the proposed project can commence on the condition that the following recommendations (Section 10.1) are implemented as part of the EMP and based on approval from SAHRA:

10.1 Recommendations for condition of authorisation

The following recommendations for Environmental Authorisation apply and the project may only proceed based on approval from SAHRA:

Recommendations:

- Implementation of a chance find procedure for the project (as outlined in Section 10.2).

10.2 Chance Find Procedures

10.2.1 Heritage Resources

The possibility of the occurrence of subsurface finds cannot be excluded. Therefore, if during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped, and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find and therefore chance find procedures should be put in place as part of the EMP. A short summary of chance find procedures is discussed below.

This procedure applies to the developer's permanent employees, its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, and service providers. The aim of this procedure is to establish monitoring and reporting procedures to ensure compliance with this policy and its associated procedures. Construction crews must be properly inducted to ensure they are fully aware of the procedures regarding chance finds as discussed below.

- If during the pre-construction phase, construction, operations or closure phases of this project, any person employed by the developer, one of its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, or service provider, finds any artefact of cultural significance or heritage site, this person must cease work at the site of the find and report this find to their immediate supervisor, and through their supervisor to the senior on-site manager.

- It is the responsibility of the senior on-site Manager to make an initial assessment of the extent of the find and confirm the extent of the work stoppage in that area.
- The senior on-site Manager will inform the ECO of the chance find and its immediate impact on operations. The ECO will then contact a professional archaeologist for an assessment of the finds who will notify the SAHRA.

10.2.2 Palaeontological resources

Monitoring Programme for Palaeontology – to commence once the excavations / drilling / mining activities begin.

1. The following procedure is only required if fossils are seen on the surface and when drilling/excavations/mining commence.
2. When excavations begin the rocks and must be given a cursory inspection by the environmental officer or designated person. Any fossiliferous material (plants, insects, bone, stromatolites) should be put aside in a suitably protected place. This way the project activities will not be interrupted.
3. Photographs of similar fossils must be provided to the developer to assist in recognizing the fossil plants, vertebrates, invertebrates or trace fossils in the shales and mudstones. This information will be built into the EMP's training and awareness plan and procedures.
4. Photographs of the putative fossils can be sent to the palaeontologist for a preliminary assessment.
5. If there is any possible fossil material found by the developer/environmental officer/miners then the qualified palaeontologist sub-contracted for this project, should visit the site to inspect the selected material and check the dumps where feasible.
6. Fossil plants or vertebrates that are considered to be of good quality or scientific interest by the palaeontologist must be removed, catalogued and housed in a suitable institution where they can be made available for further study. Before the fossils are removed from the site a SAHRA permit must be obtained. Annual reports must be submitted to SAHRA as required by the relevant permits.
7. If no good fossil material is recovered, then no site inspections by the palaeontologist will be necessary. A final report by the palaeontologist must be sent to SAHRA once the project has been completed and only if there are fossils.
8. If no fossils are found and the excavations have finished, then no further monitoring is required.

10.3 Reasoned Opinion

The overall impact of the project is considered to be low and residual impacts can be managed to an acceptable level through implementation of the recommendations made in this report. The socio-economic benefits also outweigh the possible impacts of the development if the correct mitigation measures are implemented for the project.

10.4 Potential risk

Potential risks to the proposed project are the occurrence of intangible features and unrecorded cultural resources (of which graves are the highest risk). This can cause delays during construction, as well as additional costs involved in mitigation, as well as additional layout changes.

10.5 Monitoring Requirements

Ideally, site monitoring should be conducted by an experienced archaeologist or heritage specialist. Day to day monitoring can be conducted by the Environmental Control Officers (ECO). The ECO or other responsible persons should be trained along the following lines:

- *Induction training:* Responsible staff identified by the developer should attend a short course on heritage management and identification of heritage resources.
- *Site monitoring and watching brief:* As most heritage resources occur below surface, all earth-moving activities need to be routinely monitored in case of accidental discoveries. The greatest potential impacts are the initial soil removal and subsequent earthworks during construction. The ECO should monitor all such activities daily. If any heritage resources are found, the chance finds procedure must be followed as outlined above.

Table 8. Monitoring requirements for the project

Heritage Monitoring					
Aspect	Area	Responsible for monitoring and measuring	Frequency	Proactive or reactive measurement	Method
Clearing activities and construction	Entire project area	ECO	Weekly (Pre construction and construction phase)	Proactively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If risks are manifested (accidental discovery of heritage resources) the chance find procedure should be implemented: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cease all works immediately; 2. Report incident to the Sustainability Manager; 3. Contact an archaeologist/ palaeontologist to inspect the site; 4. Report incident to the competent authority; and 5. Employ reasonable mitigation measures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant authorities.

Heritage Monitoring					
Aspect	Area	Responsible for monitoring and measuring	Frequency	Proactive or reactive measurement	Method
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only recommence operations once impacts have been mitigated.

10.6 Management Measures for inclusion in the EMPr

Table 9. Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation

Area	Mitigation measures	Phase	Timeframe	Responsible party for implementation	Target	Performance indicators (monitoring tool)
General project area	Implement chance find procedures in case possible heritage finds are uncovered	Pre Construction and construction	Throughout the project	Applicant EAP	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35, 36 and 38 of NHRA	ECO Checklist/Report

10.7 KNOWLEDGE GAPS

Due to the subsurface nature of heritage resources, the possibility of discovery of heritage resources during the construction phase cannot be excluded. This limitation is successfully mitigated with the implementation of a chance find procedure.

11 References

- Bamford, M. 2021. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the Mining Rights Application for Farm Makganyane 667, Kuruman District, Northern Cape Province
- Beaumont, P. B. 1973. The ancient pigment mines of Southern Africa. *South African Journal of Science*. 69: 140-146. Beaumont, P.B., Smith, A.B., & Vogel, J.C. 1995. Before the Einiqua: the archaeology of the frontier zone. In A. B. Smith (ed.) *Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Beaumont, P.B. & Boshier, A.K. 1974. Report on test excavations in a prehistoric pigment mine near Postmasburg, Northern Cape. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 29:41-59.
- Breutz, P.L., 1963. *The tribes of the districts of Kuruman and Postmasburg* (No. 49). Government Printer.
- Fock, G.J. & Fock, D.M.L. 1984. *Felsbilder in Südafrika: Kinderdam und Kalahari*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag.
- Kusel, U. 2013 Phase 1 AIA report on archaeological contexts and heritage resources on the farms Heuningkrans 364 and Langverwacht 432 in the Postmasburg District Municipality of the Northern Cape Province
- Morris, D. 2002. Report on an archaeological impact assessment for Kumba Resources Ltd on properties south west of Postmasburg, Northern Cape. Unpublished report.
- Morris, D. 2005. Archaeological Impact assessment of mining areas on the farms Bruce, King, Mokaning and Parson between Postmasburg and Kathu in the Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2008. Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment on Remainder of Carter Block 458, near Lime Acres, Northern Cape. McGregor Museum.
- Morris, D. And Beaumont, P.B. 1994. *Ouplaas 2: Rock engravings, Daniëlskuil*. McGregor Museum
- Morris, D. & Beaumont, P. 2004. *Archaeology in the Northern Cape: some key sites*. Kimberley: McGregor Museum
- National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999)
- SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009
- Shillington, K. 1985. *The Colonisation of the Southern Tswana, 1870-1900*. Braamfontein: Ravan Press
- Snyman, 1983. *Daniëlskuil: van Griekwa-buitepos tot dienssentrum*. Pretoria: HSRC
- South African Heritage Information System 2015
- Thackeray, A.I., Thackeray, J.F. & Beaumont, P.B. 1983. Excavations at the Blinkklipkop specularite mine near Postmasburg, Northern Cape. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 38:17-25.
- Van Der Walt, J. and Bradfield, J., 2018. The effects of heavy-duty machinery on the formation of pseudo-knapping debitage in Stone Age cultural landscapes. *antiquity*, 92(366), pp.1429-1444.
- Van der Walt, J. 2019. Heritage Impact Assessment Khumani Mine. Unpublished report