

Avifauna Scoping Report for the proposed Lesaka 1 Solar Energy Facility near Loeriesfontein, Northern Cape Province, South Africa

February 2023

APPLICANT:

Lesaka 1 Solar Energy Facility (Pty) Ltd

EAP:

SiVEST Environmental

SPECIALIST:

Enviro-Insight CC

Sam Laurence (*Pr. Sci. Nat.*)

sam@enviro-insight.co.za

Specialist Declaration

I, Sam Laurence *Pr. Sci. Nat.*, declare that the work presented in this report is our own and has not been influenced in any way by the developer or the EAP. At no point has the developer asked us as specialists to manipulate the results in order to make it more favourable for the proposed development. We consider ourselves bound to the rules and ethics of the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (SACNASP) and the EIA Regulations (2014, as amended). We have the necessary qualifications and expertise (*Pr. Sci. Nat. Zoological Science*) in conducting this specialist report.



Sam Laurence *Pr. Sci. Nat*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF FIGURES	5
LIST OF TABLES	5
GLOSSARY and ACCRONYMS	7
1 Introduction and Project Background	9
1.1 Study area	9
1.2 Project description	9
1.3 Objectives	10
1.4 Avifauna specialist assessment and minimum report content requirements	11
1.5 Study Limitations	11
2 Legislative Framework.....	12
2.1 National environmental screening tool and Environmental Theme Protocols	12
2.1.1 Screening Report	12
2.2 Renewable Energy Development Zone	13
2.3 Birds and Solar Energy Best-Practice Guidelines (2017)	14
3 Methods.....	14
3.1 GIS	14
3.2 Desktop and Literature Survey	15
3.3 Preconstruction bird monitoring survey design	16
3.3.1 Walking Transects.....	17
3.3.2 Driven Transects	18
3.3.3 Nesting sites	18
3.3.4 Incidental or Random Observations	18
3.4 Species of Conservation Concern	19
4 Results	20
4.1 Regional Context	20

4.2	Description of the major bird habitats	21
4.2.1	Open Sandy Grassland/ Hantam Karoo Shrubland.....	21
4.2.2	Open Karoo Shale.....	22
4.2.3	Isolated Rocky Ridge “Koppies”	23
4.2.4	Drainage lines	23
4.3	Critical Biodiversity areas (CBA’s) of the Lesaka 1 SEF.....	25
4.4	Protected Areas and Important Bird (IBA) and Biodiversity Areas.....	27
4.5	Expected and Observed Avifauna	28
4.5.1	Total species composition and abundance	28
4.5.1	Priority species list.....	28
5	Impact assessment.....	35
5.1	Background to Interactions between solar Energy Facilities, Power Lines and Birds.....	35
5.1.1	Construction Phase	35
5.1.2	Operational Phase.....	39
5.2	Cumulative Impact Assessment	42
5.2.1	General Mitigation of Impacts.....	45
5.2.2	Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures.....	45
5.2.3	Species Specific Risk Analysis and Recommended Mitigations	46
6	Comparative assessment of alternatives.....	49
7	Sensitivity	50
8	Conclusions.....	51
9	References	53
10	Appendix	54
10.1	APPENDIX 1: Expected & Observed Avifauna Species List.....	54
10.2	APPENDIX 2: Observed Avifauna Species List.....	57
10.3	APPENDIX 2: Observed Avifauna Species List.....	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: Screening tool map of relative animal species theme sensitivity for the proposed Lesaka 1 SEF.....	13
Figure 3-1: The proposed Lesaka 1 SEF in relation to the SABAP2 pentads.	16
Figure 3-2: The Driving and Walking Transects identified for the project study area	19
Figure 4-1: The proposed Lesaka 1 SEF in relation to regional vegetation types.....	21
Figure 4-2: Open Sandy Grassland.....	22
Figure 4-3: Open Karoo Shale.	22
Figure 4-4: Rocky ridges "koppies".	23
Figure 4-5: Dry Drainage Lines	24
Figure 4-6: Delineated Habitat Types within the Lesaka 1 SEF cluster.	24
Figure 4-7: The study area in relation to the Northern Cape Critical Biodiversity Areas (2016).	26
Figure 4-8: Important Bird Areas in the region in relation to the Lesaka 1 SEF	28
Figure 4-9: Ludwig's Bustard flying over the proposed Lesaka 1 SEF Cluster.....	30
Figure 4-10: Red Lark observed within the Lesaka 1 SEF	31
Figure 4-11: Unoccupied Martial Eagle Nest adjacent to the Lesaka 1 SEF.....	31
Figure 4-12: Site records and delineations of associated habitats within the Project Footprint.....	32
Figure 5-1: The map of regional WEFs and SEFs in relation to the Lesaka 1 SEF.....	44
Figure 6-1: Preliminary avifauna sensitivity map for the Lesaka 1 SEF.	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Avifauna monitoring sampling period for the Lesaka 1 SEF.	17
Table 4-1: Attributes of the Hantam Karoo vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006, as amended).....	20
Table 4-2: Priority avifauna species list (both expected and recorded) for the study area	29
Table 4-3: Summary of avifauna species of conservation concern of known distribution, previously recorded in or adjacent to the study area pentads.....	33
Table 5-1: Habitat destruction during construction phase.	35
Table 5-2: Disturbance of bird roosts during the construction phase.	38
Table 5-3: Disturbance due to noise such as, machinery movements and maintenance operations during the construction and	

operational phase of the proposed PV solar farm	39
Table 5-4: Bird mortalities during the operational phase.....	39
Table 5-5: Loss of Bird Foraging Habitat.....	40
Table 5-6: Disruption of bird migratory pathways during the operational phase.....	41
Table 5-7: The attraction of some novel bird species due to the development of a solar farm with associated infrastructure such as lake effect, perches, nest and shade opportunities	41
Table 5-8: Chemical pollution: Chemicals being used to keep the PV panels clean from dust (suppressants) etc.....	42
Table 5-9: Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area	43

GLOSSARY and ACCRONYMS

Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA)	An area that must be maintained in a good ecological condition (natural or semi-natural state) in order to meet biodiversity targets. CBAs collectively meet biodiversity targets for all ecosystem types, as well as for species and ecological processes that depend on natural or semi-natural habitat that have not already been met in the protected area network. CBAs are identified through a systematic biodiversity planning process in a configuration that is complementary, efficient and avoids conflict with other land uses where possible.
Cumulative impact	Impacts on a species, ecosystem or resource as a result of the sum of actions in the past, present and foreseeable future, from multiple renewable energy projects or a renewable energy project in combination with other developments.
DT	Drive Transect
Ecological Support Area (ESA)	The ESA are supporting zones or areas which must be safeguarded as they are needed to prevent degradation of Critical Biodiversity Areas and formal Protected Areas.
Endemic	A species that is naturally restricted to a particular, well-defined region. This is not the same as the medical definition, which is 'occurring naturally in a region.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	The process of identifying environmental impacts due to activities and assessing and reporting these impacts
IBA	Important Bird and Biodiversity Area. Part of a global network of sites that are critical for the long-term viability of bird populations. Now known as Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas.
IUCN Red Listed Categories and Criteria	International Union for Conservation of Nature.
Preconstruction Phase	The period prior to the construction of a solar energy facility
Priority species	Threatened or rare birds (in particular those unique to the region and especially those which are possibly susceptible to solar energy impacts), which occur in the given development area at relatively high densities or have high levels of activity in the area. These species should be the primary (but not the sole) focus of all subsequent monitoring and assessment.
SABAP	The Southern African Bird Atlas Project. A project in which data on bird distribution and relative

abundance are collected by volunteers. There have been two SABAP projects; i.e. SABAP1 (completed in 1991) and SABAP2 (started in 2007 and on-going). See <http://sabap2.adu.org.za> for more information.

SACNASP	South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions
SANBI	South African National Biodiversity Institute
SEF	Solar Energy Facility
WT	Walking Transect

1 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

Enviro-Insight CC was commissioned by Enertrag South Africa (Pty) Ltd on behalf of Lesaka 1 Solar Energy Facility (Pty) Ltd to perform a Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment for the proposed construction of the Lesaka 1 Solar Energy Facilities (SEF) located near Loeriesfontein in the Northern Cape Province, South Africa.

The distinct Environmental Authorisation that is required for the respective Project Infrastructure is as follows:

- Lesaka 1 SEF (up to 240MW)

The proposed SEF will be subject to full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) processes in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) (NEMA) as amended and EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended). Accordingly, the EIA processes as contemplated in terms of the EIA Regulations (2014, as amended) are being undertaken in respect of the proposed SEF project. The competent authority for this EIA is the national Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE).

Enviro-Insight CC was appointed to undertake the requisite avifauna assessment associated with the proposed SEF. The aim of this report is to undertake a desktop analysis and compile a Scoping Report (Plan of Study), which includes a reconnaissance study.

1.1 STUDY AREA

Lesaka 1 SEF is located approximately 35km north of the Loeriesfontein town within the Hantam Local Municipality, in the Namakwa District Municipality, in the Northern Cape Province. The Lesaka 1 SEF is located on Portion 0 of the Farm Kluitjes Kraal No. 264. The buildable area for the SEF will be approximately 600ha, pending environmental constraints and buffers, and final facility design.

There are two site access roads to the Project site. The first access road is via the R355, which is approximately 34km south from the proposed development area; and the second access road is on the north of the proposed development area, namely, the Grannaatboskolk road.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project aims to supply suitable private off-taker initiatives (direct supply or wheeling agreements, as applicable), or be bid into the government coordinated Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Procurement Programme (“REIPPPP”) or similar procurement program under the Integrated Resource Plan (“IRP”). The Lesaka 1 SEF Project will be administered under the respective Project Companies, and the Project will be required to be composed of the following:

Lesaka 1 Solar Energy Facility (Pty) Ltd

- Lesaka 1 SEF (up to 240MW)
- Battery Energy Storage System (“BESS”)
- On-site Independent Power Producer (“IPP”) Substation (up to 33/132kV)

- All associated grid infrastructure

Location Alternatives

- No other activity alternatives are being considered. Renewable Energy development in South Africa is highly desirable from a social, environmental and development.

Technology Alternatives

- No other activity alternatives are being considered. Renewable Energy development in South Africa is highly desirable from a social, environmental and development point of view.

SEF Layout Alternatives

- Design and layout alternatives will be considered and assessed as part of the EIA. These include alternatives for the Substation locations and also for the construction / laydown area.

No-Go Alternative

- The 'no-go' alternative is the option of not undertaking the proposed SEF infrastructure project. Hence, if the 'no-go' option is implemented, there would be no development. This alternative would result in no environmental impacts from the proposed project on the site or the surrounding local area. It provides the baseline against which other alternatives are compared and will be considered throughout the report.

1.3 OBJECTIVES

The Scoping Report will describe the full terms of reference for the Final EIA Report and not all information listed below is included in the Scoping Report. The principal aim of the avifaunal assessment will be to determine how this development (and its separate elements) will impact on the terrestrial ecological integrity of the area (as it pertains to avifauna) and if necessary, demarcate appropriate ecological buffers around sensitive communities or receptors.

The main objectives for the main EIA Report are as follows:

- Provide quantitative information on the abundance, distribution, and risk to key avifaunal species or groups of species and serve to inform and improve mitigation measures.
- Determine how this development (and its separate elements) will impact on avifauna, particularly relating to habitat loss/fragmentation, alteration of habitat quality, species assemblage changes, microclimate disturbance and reduced connectivity between populations in some species.
- Include a corridor analysis for the migration of avifauna across the landscape, taking the cumulative impact of the Project with other proposed and/ or existing regional facilities (phases) into account.
- Identify actual and potential species of conservation concern/importance (protected – NEMBA, endemic, threatened or identified as Priority classified as per the recommendations from Jenkins *et. Al.* 2017)). GPS the position of all sensitive receptors (protected, endemic and/or red data species) - the co-ordinates should be in degrees and decimal minutes. The minutes should have at least three decimals to ensure adequate accuracy. The projection that must be used in all

cases is the WGS84 spheroid in a national or local projection. Alternatively, exact timed records of all species observed within the prescribed transects (Driving, Walking and Random) will suffice in order to model required densities.

- Demarcate appropriate ecological buffers around sensitive communities or receptors.
- Compile a search and rescue plan for relevant species to be adopted prior to construction (if required).
- Identify and quantify the perceived impacts and propose mitigations to be included in the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr). The potential impacts and recommended mitigations must be identified for the planning and design, pre-construction, construction, and post-construction (e.g., monitoring rehabilitation of the construction site) only.
- The impacts must be assessed and evaluated according to the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended (<https://cer.org.za/wp-content/uploads/1999/01/EIA-Regulations.pdf>) or the Impact Assessment Criteria and Matrix to be supplied by the client.
- Undertake a cumulative impact assessment for the Project. Then, in addition to the development site, also take into consideration other similar or proposed facilities within a 30 km radius of the proposed development site. Information on the location of renewable energy developments can be accessed from https://egis.environment.gov.za/renewable_energy.
- Draft the basic elements of a Monitoring Program.

1.4 AVIFAUNA SPECIALIST ASSESSMENT AND MINIMUM REPORT CONTENT REQUIREMENTS

To reiterate, the Scoping Report will describe the full terms of reference for the Final EIA Report and not all information listed is included at this point of the study.

- Perform the Avifaunal Specialist Assessment according to the criteria provided by the Terrestrial Animal Species protocol published on 30 October 2020 in Government Gazette No. 43855.
- Write up the findings of the specialist assessment in an Avifaunal Specialist Assessment Report that contains the minimum report content requirements prescribed in the same protocol, and the applicable guidelines for solar developments (Jenkins *et. Al.* 2017).
- According to Regulation 13(1)(b) and 13(1)(e) read together with Regulation 18 of the amended EIA Regulations, 2014, Specialists must have knowledge of any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity and have regard to the need for and desirability of the undertaking of the proposed activity. BirdLife SA's Best Practice Guidelines on Birds and Solar Energy (Jenkins *et al.*, 2017) was consulted when compiling the Plan of Study.
- Ensure that the avifauna assessment and reporting meet all the requirements of the relevant protocol.

1.5 STUDY LIMITATIONS

- It is assumed that all third-party information acquired is correct (e.g. GIS data and scope of work); and
- Owing to extremely dry, early spring conditions occurring during the reconnaissance site visit in July 2022, bird activity was at its lowest.

2 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

2.1 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TOOL AND ENVIRONMENTAL THEME PROTOCOLS

2.1.1 Screening Report

The Minister of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries, gave notice that the submission of a report generated from the national web-based environmental screening tool¹, as contemplated in Regulation 16(1)(b)(v) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014, published under Government Notice No. R982 in Government Gazette No. 38282 of 4 December 2014, as amended, will be compulsory from 4 October 2019 when submitting an application for environmental authorisation in terms of regulation 19 and regulation 21 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014.

In addition, a set of protocols that an applicant needs to adhere to in the Environmental Authorisation (EA) process were developed and on 20 March 2020 the Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment gazetted the Protocols for national implementation purposes. The gazette '*Procedures to be followed for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting of Identified Environmental Themes in terms of Section 24(5)(a) and (h) of the National Environmental Management Act (1998) when Applying for Environmental Authorisation*', has protocols that have been developed for environmental themes which include agriculture, avifauna, biodiversity (Terrestrial and Aquatic Biodiversity), noise, defence and civil aviation.

The protocols set requirements for the assessment and reporting of environmental impacts of activities requiring EA. The higher the sensitivity rating of the features on the proposed site as identified by the screening tool report, the more rigorous the assessment and reporting requirements.

Based on the generated screening report, the relative animal species theme is indicated as high sensitivity, due to confirmed presence of two Red List species, *Neotis ludwigii* and *Calendulauda burra* (Figure 2-1). Accordingly, a full assessment is required as per the relevant protocol.

¹ <https://screening.environment.gov.za/screeningtool/#/pages/welcome>




Figure 2-1: Screening tool map of relative animal species theme sensitivity for the proposed Lesaka 1 SEF.

2.2 RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ZONE

On 17 February 2016, Cabinet approved the Renewable Energy Development Zones (REDZs) for large scale wind and solar photovoltaic development and associated Strategic Transmission Corridors (STC) which support areas where long term electricity grid will be developed.

The procedure to be followed in applying for EA for a large-scale project in a REDZ or in a Power Corridor was formally gazetted on 16 February 2018 in GN113 and GN114. On 17 July 2020, Minister Barbara Dallas Creecy, published Government Gazette 43528, Notice 786 for consultation with the intention to identify three additional Renewable Energy Development Zones to the eight Renewable Energy Development Zones published under Government Notice No. 114 in Government Gazette No. 41445 of 16 February 2018. REDZs are also aligned with the powerline corridors that were identified in the Electricity Grid Infrastructure

SEA completed in 2016 and gazetted as powerline corridors in February 2018. In this way, the combination of the REDZs and power corridors provides strategic guidance to Eskom on where to prioritise investment in grid infrastructure.

New renewable energy projects located within one of the 11 REDZ areas, and new electricity grid expansion within the 5 Strategic Transmission Corridors are subject to a Basic Assessment and not a full EIA process, as well as a shortened timeframe of 147 days (90-day BA process and 57 decision-making process).

The proposed Lesaka 1 SEF is not located in a REDZ which ensures that the study must fulfil a Scoping & EIA process.

2.3 BIRDS AND SOLAR ENERGY BEST-PRACTICE GUIDELINES (2017)

The “*Best-Practice Guidelines for assessing and monitoring the impact of solar energy facilities on birds in southern Africa*” (Jenkins *et al.*, 2017) are followed in order to fulfil the outlined requirements.

As per Appendix 2 - *Minimum requirements for avifaunal impact assessment*, an avifaunal impact assessment for a SEF should follow a two-tier process (of which this report services the Tier 2 component):

Tier 1

1. **Scoping report:** process to identify issues that are likely to be important in the impact assessment process and to define the scope of work required in the assessment (e.g. timing, spatial extent and data collection methodologies). Largely based on desktop analysis of available data, but preferably also informed by a brief site visit.
2. **Preliminary assessment:** This is part of the planning for the EIA application, giving an overview on the biological context, likely impacts and potential red flags to the development, identifying alternatives and determining the appropriate assessment regime.

Tier 2

3. **In-depth Study:** Could including structured and repeated data collection on which to base the impact assessment report and provide a baseline against which post-construction monitoring can be compared.
4. **Impact assessment:** Informed by the data collected during the preliminary assessment.

3 METHODS

3.1 GIS

Existing data layers were incorporated into a GIS to establish how the proposed SEF layout and associated activities interact with important terrestrial entities. Emphasis was placed on the following spatial datasets:

- Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (SANBI, 2018);
- Important Bird and Protected Areas (Marnewick *et al.*, 2015);
- South African Protected Areas Database (SAPAD); and
- GIS layers of proposed layout provided by the client.

All mapping was performed using open-source GIS software (QGIS²).

3.2 DESKTOP AND LITERATURE SURVEY

A desktop survey is conducted to consider the best information available, in order to provide a better evaluation of all conditions present within the study area. An initial literature review was undertaken to assess which bird species could potentially occur in the vicinity of the Lesaka 1 SEF using data from the second South African Bird Atlas Project (SABAP 2³; [SABAP2, 2020]). SABAP 2 records were developed based on records per pentad (i.e., 5' X 5'). A list of species potentially occurring was developed from SABAP 2 data for the pentads within which the study area falls (3030_1920, 3030_1925, 3030_1930, 3035_1920, 3035_1925, 3035_1930 3040,_1920, 3040_1925, 3040_1930 Figure 3-1: The proposed Lesaka 1 SEF in relation to the SABAP2 pentads.

The expected species list is therefore based on an area much larger than the actual study area and was therefore subsequently refined. This approach was adopted to ensure that all species potentially occurring within the study area, whether resident, nomadic, or migratory, are identified.

Species were considered sensitive (priority) based on their abundance, flight characteristics, ecological role, population trend and conservation status.

The following main literature sources have been consulted for the avifauna study:

- Information relating to avifauna species of conservation concern (SCC) was obtained from Taylor *et al.* (2015) and the IUCN Red List of threatened species (IUCN, 2022);
- del Hoyo *et al.* (1992) and Hockey *et al.* (2005) were consulted for general information on the life history attributes of relevant bird species;
- Distributional data was sourced from the Southern Africa Bird Atlas Project (SABAP 2, 2021), del Hoyo *et al.* (1992) and Sinclair & Ryan (2010);
- INaturalist and Virtual Museum (ADU) was used to source the distribution bird data in the area; and
- Nomenclature and taxonomy followed the IOC World Bird Names unless otherwise specified (see www.worldbirdnames.org; Gill & Donsker, 2012).

² <http://qgis.osgeo.org/en/site/>

³ <http://sabap2.birdmap.africa/>




Figure 3-1: The proposed Lesaka 1 SEF in relation to the SABAP2 pentads.

3.3 PRECONSTRUCTION BIRD MONITORING SURVEY DESIGN

The proposed study area is classified as a Regime 2 based on the size of the study area, high avifaunal sensitivity and type of technology that will be used for the proposed project. The avifaunal sensitivity was also determined based on the number of priority species occurring, or potentially present, within or around the study area, the regional or globally threat status of these species, avifaunal habitat found in the area, population of priority species, bird movement corridor and Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas.

Based on the site sensitivity, a Regime 2 assessment was followed. The duration, in terms of data collection, for this study was 1 reconnaissance and 2 peak season visits of 3 days. This complied with the requirements of the Best Practice Guidelines available at the time (Jenkins *et al.*, 2017).

The first site visit was a site reconnaissance and dry-season verification survey conducted to identify site characteristic found within the study area such as habitats, important bird species and site sensitivities including sensitive habitats with their

associated sensitive bird species and observation of nests of sensitive bird species. The site visit was conducted in July 2022, during sub-optimal conditions where the area receives the most rainfall but is extremely cold with low activity. During the site visit, sampling was done by means of walking and driving transects in and around the study area. Waterbodies in- and outside of the study area were identified and observed whilst powerlines and pylons were scanned for any possible nests from sensitive bird species. The second site visit was conducted in October 2022 (Spring). The final site visit was conducted during the December season. All site visits formed part of the data sampling methods used as per the Best Practice Guidelines (Jenkins et al., 2017). Walking transects (WT) and driving transects (DT) were determined after the first day of the first site visit (**Error! Not a valid bookmark self-reference.**). Additional methods that commenced during the data collection site visit included nesting sites and Coordinated Waterbird Counts, (CWAC) (where possible).

Table 3-1: Avifauna monitoring sampling period for the Lesaka 1 SEF.

Date	Season	Methodology applied*
July 2022 (dry season) – Preassessment and SSV	Winter	WT, DT, NE, WB establishment
October 2022 – Second survey	Spring	WT, DT, NE, WB
December 2022 – Third survey	Summer	WT, DT, NE, WB

* WT – Walked transects; DT – Drive transects; NE – Nest searches, inspection, and monitoring; WB – Water body inspections.

3.3.1 Walking Transects

These methods are utilised to monitor small bird species within the major habitat types within a study area. Based on the variety of habitat types, transects and sample points were positioned at varying distances away from the proposed solar facilities in order to maximize the comparative value of the data which will be compared with the surveys from the post-construction phase results.

Linear transects are determined based upon habitat characteristics and are approximately 500 m each, conducted to characterize the passerine and small bird communities and end with a fixed sample point. These transects were representative of the biotopes present within the study area. The survey locations were selected based on the representation of the different habitats covering the proposed study area, in proportion to their availability. All of them were positioned at varying distances from the central development area (Jenkins *et al.*, 2017). Each linear transect was conducted by one expert bird observer at a time (more than one observer for all transects will be used), who records all bird contacts (both seen and heard) by walking slowly along the predetermined transect. Observations are made on both the left and right side of the predetermined transect and 360 degrees at the final fixed sample point. As a guideline, birds were only be recorded (seen or heard) within an estimated fixed maximum width of 200 m on either side of the transect line. The same transects were repeated in the October Spring season and was repeated in the Summer (December) season. Surveys commenced mostly after sunrise and are performed throughout the day to account for temporal variation in activity. As a general rule, transects were not walked in adverse conditions, such as heavy rain, strong winds or thick mist.

3.3.2 Driven Transects

Large terrestrial birds (e.g. cranes, bustards, storks, and most raptors) cannot be adequately surveyed using walked transects. Populations of such birds should be estimated on each visit to the project area by means of road counts (vehicle-based sampling; best applied for relatively large, proposed SEFs, especially those with good networks of roads and tracks).

Road counts of large terrestrial birds and raptors require that one or a few driven transects be executed (depending on site size, terrain and infrastructure), comprising one or a number of set routes, limited by the existing roadways but as far as possible directed to include a representative cross section of habitats within the project area of influence.

These transects were driven at a constant and slow speed ($\pm 20\text{km/h}$), and all sightings of large terrestrial birds and raptors are recorded in terms of the same data-capture protocols used for walked transects (above), and in general compliance with the road-count protocols described for large terrestrial species (Young et al., 2003) and raptors (Malan, 2009).

One observer travels slowly in a vehicle recording all species on both sides of the drive transect. The observer stops at regular intervals (every 300 m) to scan the environment with binoculars. The number, distance and locations of each driving transects were determined during the first site visit in July. The driving and walking transects are shown in Figure 3-2: The Driving and Walking Transects identified for the project study area

3.3.3 Nesting sites

Any habitats within the broader impact zone of the proposed SEF, or an equivalent area around the site, deemed likely to support nest sites of key raptor and other species of conservation concern, including power lines, stands of large trees, marshes and drainage lines, were searched for and surveyed. All potential breeding sites, once identified fully, were mapped, and checked during each survey to confirm occupancy, and all evidence of breeding and the outcomes of such activity, where possible, were recorded.

3.3.4 Incidental or Random Observations

All other sightings of priority species (and particularly those suggestive of breeding or important feeding or roosting sites or flight paths) on the SEF and control site as well as within the broader study area are recorded, along with additional relevant information such as habitat type, abundance, habit and weather data. These observations were used as complementary data to characterise the bird community and its utilisation of the site, as recommended by the Best Practice Guidelines (Jenkins et al., 2017).




Figure 3-2: The Driving and Walking Transects identified for the project study area

3.4 SPECIES OF CONSERVATION CONCERN

The Red List of threatened species generated by the IUCN (<http://www.iucnredlist.org/>) provided the global conservation status of avifauna. However, Taylor *et al.* (2015) produced a regional conservation status assessment following the IUCN criteria which was used for this assessment. The first three categories i.e. Critically Endangered, Endangered and Vulnerable, are collectively called ‘threatened’ species.

The conservation status categories defined by the IUCN, which are considered here to represent species of conservation concern (SCC), are defined as follows:

- **Critically Endangered (CR)** - Critically Endangered refers to species facing immediate threat of extinction in the wild.
- **Endangered (EN)** - Endangered species are those facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild within the foreseeable future.
- **Vulnerable (VU)** - Vulnerable species are those facing a high risk of extinction in the wild in the medium-term.
- **Near Threatened (NT)** - any indigenous species which does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or

Vulnerable now, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future.

The National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (Act 10 of 2004) (NEMBA) provides for listing threatened or protected ecosystems, in one of four categories: critically endangered (CR), endangered (EN), vulnerable (VU) or protected. NEMBA also deals with endangered, threatened and otherwise controlled species, under the Threatened or Protected Species Regulations (ToPS). A ToPS permit is required for any activities involving the removal or destruction of any ToPS-listed species.

Protected species: any species which is of such high conservation value or national importance that it requires national protection. Species listed in this category include, among others, species listed in terms of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES).

Priority species: any species which is qualifies as high risk to impacts from solar facilities as suggested by Jenkins *et al.* (2017).

4 RESULTS

4.1 REGIONAL CONTEXT

The study area is located in the Hantam Karoo vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006 – as amended), listed as Least Threatened (Figure 4-1; Table 4-1).

Table 4-1: Attributes of the Hantam Karoo vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006, as amended).

Name of vegetation type	Hantam Karoo
Code as used in the Book - contains space	SKt2
Conservation Target (percent of area) from NSBA	18%
Protected (percent of area) from NSBA	0.1%
Remaining (percent of area) from NSBA	98.6%
Description of conservation status from NSBA	Least threatened
Description of the Protection Status from NSBA	Hardly protected
Area (sqkm) of the full extent of the Vegetation Type	7463.56
Name of the Biome	Succulent Karoo Biome
Name of Group	Trans-Escarpment Succulent Karoo Bioregion
Name of Bioregion	Trans-Escarpment Succulent Karoo Bioregion




Figure 4-1: The proposed Lesaka 1 SEF in relation to regional vegetation types.

4.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE MAJOR BIRD HABITATS

The overall habitat delineation as expressed below is more complex than the habitats described below. However, for the purposes of avifaunal monitoring, the monitoring can be confined to the below-described habitat types which will encompass all delineated habitats below.

4.2.1 Open Sandy Grassland/ Hantam Karoo Shrubland

The open sandy grassland, Hantam Karoo Shrubland, is the most dominant vegetation type within the SEF. It supports a mix of grassland and sandy substrates with karoo shrubs. This type of vegetation also supports many priority avifauna species expected within the study area such as large terrestrial bird species, especially Red Lark.



Figure 4-2: Open Sandy Grassland.

4.2.2 Open Karoo Shale

To a smaller extent, open Karoo shale is present. It is characterised by open drought tolerant karroid vegetation, and is mostly present towards the eastern limits of the SEF. This type of vegetation also supports the lowest density of priority avifauna species expected within the PAOI.



Figure 4-3: Open Karoo Shale.

4.2.3 Isolated Rocky Ridge “Koppies”

Present in the north-western and eastern corners of the SEF are isolated rocky ridges, The rocky ridge found in the project footprint are linked to isolated inselbergs and connected ridges and hills which differ in size and height and can (regionally) form extensive ridge systems. These areas also support scattered larger bushes which representing more optimal nesting habitat for raptors as well as roosting and foraging areas for Ludwig’s Bustard.



Figure 4-4: Rocky ridges "koppies".

4.2.4 Drainage lines

While not too present in the west, drainage lines spread across the centre of the SEF and occupy the majority of the eastern side. The drainage lines throughout the PAOI were primarily sandy and dry with some structural differences to the surrounding Open Sandy Grasslands. It is anticipated that these habitats will provide significant roosting and foraging habitat for priority species such as Coursers, Owls and Karoo Korhaan.



Figure 4-5: Dry Drainage Lines




Figure 4-6: Delineated Habitat Types within the Lesaka 1 SEF cluster.

4.3 CRITICAL BIODIVERSITY AREAS (CBA'S) OF THE LESAKA 1 SEF

Critical biodiversity areas (CBA's) are terrestrial and aquatic features in the landscape that are critical for retaining biodiversity and supporting continued ecosystem functioning and services. The primary purpose of CBA's is to inform land-use planning in order to promote sustainable development and protection of important natural habitat and landscapes. Biodiversity priority areas are described as follows:

- Critical biodiversity areas (CBA's) are areas of the landscape that need to be maintained in a natural or near-natural state in order to ensure the continued existence and functioning of species and ecosystems and the delivery of ecosystem services. In other words, if these areas are not maintained in a natural or near-natural state then biodiversity conservation targets cannot be met. Maintaining an area in a natural state can include a variety of biodiversity-compatible land uses and resource uses. For CBA's the impact on biodiversity of a change in land-use that results in a change from the desired ecological state is most significant locally at the point of impact through the direct loss of a biodiversity feature (e.g. loss of a population or habitat). All FEPA prioritised wetlands and rivers have minimum category of CBA 1, while all FEPA prioritised wetland clusters have minimum category of CBA 2.
- Ecological support areas (ESA's) are areas that are not essential for meeting biodiversity representation targets/thresholds but which nevertheless play an important role in supporting the ecological functioning of critical biodiversity areas and/or delivery ecosystem services that support socio-economic development, such as water provision, flood mitigation or carbon sequestration. The degree of restriction on land use and resources use in this specific ESA is most significant elsewhere in the landscape through the indirect loss of biodiversity due to a breakdown, interruption or loss of an ecological process pathway (e.g. removing a corridor results in a population going extinct elsewhere or a new plantation locally results in a reduction in stream flow at the exit to the catchment which affects downstream biodiversity). All natural non-FEPA wetlands and larger rivers have minimum category of ESA.

In the context of the project, the CBA2 delineation is mainly due to the FEPA catchment, FEPA rivers and 500m buffer, as well as the vegetation type. The CBA1 are the NFEPA Rivers, Klein-Rooiberg and Rooiberg, both considered largely natural. The ESA towards the south-western section is the Krom River and associated wetlands, while the smaller scattered ESAs towards the south-eastern boundary are koppies, which are large, high-value, climate resilience areas (Figure 4-7).




Figure 4-7: The study area in relation to the Northern Cape Critical Biodiversity Areas (2016).

4.4 PROTECTED AREAS AND IMPORTANT BIRD (IBA) AND BIODIVERSITY AREAS

Figure 4-8 shows the identified IBAs in relation to the Lesaka 1 SEF. The Lesaka 1 SEF is not located in or directly adjacent to an Important Bird Area (IBA) or protected area. The closest IBA to the SEF is Bitterputs Conservation Area which is approximately 60 km north-west of the study area. The Bitterputs Conservation Area (SA036) is an arid landscape which consists of extensive sandy and gravel plains covered with sparse, perennial desert grassland. A few large salt pans are a unique habitat type in this IBA. The conservation area falls within the Bushmanland Bioregion and the Nama Karoo Biome. Three vegetation types are present: the Bushmanland Vloere (salt pans), Bushmanland Arid Grassland and Bushmanland Sandy Grassland. The ecosystem status for the entire area is Least Concern.

The Bitterputs Conservation Area is one of a few sites protecting both the globally threatened Red Lark (*Calendulauda burra*), which inhabits the red sand dunes and sandy plains where there is mixed cover of grasses and dwarf shrubs, and the near-threatened Sclater's Lark (*Spizocorys sclateri*). This site also holds 16 of the 23 Namib-Karoo biome-restricted assemblage species and a host of other arid-zone birds. Other priority species, including globally threatened species, within this IBA include Ludwig's Bustard (*Neotis ludwigii*), Kori Bustard (*Ardeotis kori*), Karoo Korhaan (*Eupodotis vigorsii*), Secretarybird (*Sagittarius serpentarius*) and Lanner Falcon (*Falco biarmicus*). Restricted-range and biome-restricted species are Stark's Lark (*Spizocorys starki*), Karoo Long-billed Lark (*Certhilauda subcoronata*), Black-eared Sparrow-Lark (*Eremopterix australis*), Tractrac Chat (*Cercomela tractrac*), Sickle-winged Chat (*C. sinuate*), Karoo Chat (*C. schlegelii*), Karoo Eremomela (*Eremomela gregalis*), Cinnamon-breasted Warbler (*Euryptila subcinnamomea*) and Black-headed Canary (*Serinus alario*).

The Bitterputs Conservation Area is one of three Bushmanland IBAs important for the conservation of endemic lark species. There has been a c. 75% loss of optimal habitat for the Red Lark over the past 100 years. The disappearance of this species from ranches where dune grassland has been replaced by ephemerals is probably linked to the reduction in grass awns for nesting, shelter and invertebrate and plant foods.

There is a serious threat from climate change, and it is predicted that temperatures will increase and rainfall decrease sharply in arid areas such as Bushmanland. Locally resident endemic larks, in particular, are at risk. Increased CO₂ can lead to the increase of C3 plants (shrubs) at the expense of C4 plants (mainly grasses), causing a shift in vegetation diversity and structure and making the habitat unsuitable for some species. It is expected that the Red Lark will not meet the challenge of global warming (BirdLife International, 2021).

Currently no part of this IBA is formally conserved and no conservation actions have been implemented. Bitterputs falls within the Central Astronomy Advantage Area, which has restrictions on activities that can take place in it. This could result in some protection for the IBA.




Figure 4-8: Important Bird Areas in the region in relation to the Lesaka 1 SEF

4.5 EXPECTED AND OBSERVED AVIFAUNA

4.5.1 Total species composition and abundance

A relatively moderate diversity of 93 bird species for the area have been recorded within the 16 SABAP pentads in which the study area is situated. A total of 65 bird species were recorded in the greater area (9 pentads), as shown in APPENDIX 1: Expected & Observed Avifauna Species Lists.

4.5.1 Priority species list

A list of expected and observed priority species in the project area is provided in Table 4-2. A total of 22 priority species are expected to occur on and surrounding the study area, of which 16 have been recorded either within or adjacent to the project area footprint (PAOI). Lappet-faced Vulture is included given the sighting of two individuals within the greater PAOI (in 2021) although the species is supposedly a highly uncommon vagrant within the region. However, evidence is growing that the species is undergoing a significant range expansion as a result of climate change.

It is clear from Table 4-2 that numerous priority avifauna species occur within the PAOI and can be expected to interact with the proposed Lesaka 1 SEF. Indeed, Van Rooyen (2020) suggests that displacement effects of the renewable energy developments are more significant than direct mortality which can greatly affect habitat specific species such as Red Lark and Ludwig's Bustard. Consequently, all applicable data of priority species observed within the monitoring seasons of field surveys allowed for careful evaluation of potential impacts and application of suitable mitigation measures to reduce these impacts where possible.

Table 4-2: Priority avifauna species list (both expected and recorded) for the study area.

Common name	Scientific name	Global Status	Regional Status	South African Endemic	Current pre-construction monitoring
Bustard, Kori	<i>Ardeotis kori</i>	NT	NT		
Bustard, Ludwig's	<i>Neotis ludwigii</i>	EN	EN		X
Buzzard, Jackal	<i>Buteo rufofuscus</i>	LC	LC	X	
Cursorer, Burchell's	<i>Cursorius rufus</i>	LC	VU	X	X
Cursorer, Double-banded	<i>Rhinoptilus africanus</i>	LC	NT		X
Eagle, Booted	<i>Aquila pennatus</i>	LC	LC		X
Eagle, Martial	<i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i>	EN	EN		X
Eagle, Verreaux's	<i>Aquila verreauxii</i>	LC	VU		
Eagle-owl, Cape	<i>Bubo capensis</i>	LC	LC		
Eagle-owl, Spotted	<i>Bubo africanus</i>	LC	LC		X
Falcon, Lanner	<i>Falco biarmicus</i>	LC	VU		X
Goshawk, Southern Pale Chanting	<i>Melierax canorus</i>	LC	LC	X	X
Kestrel, Greater	<i>Falco rupicoloides</i>	LC	LC		X
Kestrel, lesser	<i>Falco naumanni</i>	LC	LC		X
Kite, Black-winged	<i>Elanus caeruleus</i>	LC	LC		X
Korhaan, Karoo	<i>Eupodotis vigorsii</i>	LC	NT	X	X
Korhaan, Northern Black	<i>Afrotis afroides</i>	LC	LC		X
Lark, Red	<i>Calendulauda burra</i>	VU	VU		X
Lark, Sclater's	<i>Spizocorys sclateri</i>	NT	NT		
Secretarybird	<i>Sagittarius serpentarius</i>	EN	VU		

Common name	Scientific name	Global Status	Regional Status	South African Endemic	Current pre-construction monitoring
Snake- Eagle, Black-chested	<i>Circaetus pectoralis</i>	LC	LC		X
Vulture, Lappet-faced	<i>Torgos tracheliotus</i>	CR	CR		X

According to the literature, 15 Red-Listed species are known to occur in the region with seven species confirmed during the complete surveys, representing a very high success rate. Of the expected species and according to Taylor *et al.* (2015), one species is Critically Endangered, two of the species are Endangered, five of the species are Vulnerable and four are Near-Threatened. For the current study, it was deemed unnecessary that all SCC should be discussed in intensive detail unless deemed highly relevant to the proposed development. However, all SCC are described in brief (Table 4-3). Specifically excluded from initial discussions was Lappet-faced Vulture (rare vagrant). Selected relevant species that are possibly susceptible to the proposed development were discussed below in greater detail, which include specific (Guideline-based) recommendations for monitoring and mitigation. Photographic evidence of SCC observed during the current study is provided in Figure 4-9, Figure 4-10 and Figure 4-11.



Figure 4-9: Ludwig's Bustard flying over the proposed Lesaka 1 SEF Cluster.



Figure 4-10: Red Lark observed within the Lesaka 1 SEF




Figure 4-11: Unoccupied Martial Eagle Nest adjacent to the Lesaka 1 SEF.




Figure 4-12: Site records and delineations of associated habitats within the Project Footprint

Table 4-3: Summary of avifauna species of conservation concern of known distribution, previously recorded in or adjacent to the study area pentads.

Species	Global Conservation Status ⁴	National Conservation Status ⁵	Preferred Habitat	Potential likelihood of occurrence on study area and potential risk posed from the SEF
<i>Ardeotis kori</i> (Kori Bustard)	Near Threatened	Near Threatened	Primary upland grassland, desert savanna and karoo with foraging and roosting particularly on rocky/hilly terrain.	Unconfirmed: Low densities throughout the region and PAOI but surprisingly low densities within the study area. The species is likely to be a breeding resident within or adjacent to the study area. A large bodied species, it is highly susceptible to SEF development activities especially in relation to powerline collisions.
<i>Spizocorys sclateri</i> (Sclater's lark)	Near Threatened	Near Threatened	Dry shrubland, karroid drainage lines and karoo shrubveld	Unconfirmed: High densities throughout the region but uncommon in the study area. The species is likely to be a breeding resident within or adjacent to the study area. A localised low flying passerine, it is not highly susceptible to SEF development activities but is threatened by habitat loss
<i>Calendulauda burra</i> (Red lark)	Vulnerable	Vulnerable	Red dune open shrubland/ grassy duneveld	Confirmed: Moderate densities throughout the region but locally common in the project footprint. The species is likely to be a breeding resident within or adjacent to the study area. A localised low flying passerine, it is not susceptible to SEF development activities but is more threatened by habitat loss.
<i>Aquila verreauxii</i> (Verreaux's Eagle)	-	Vulnerable	Mountainous areas or areas with prominent outcrops with a high prey base (e.g. hyrax)	Regionally confirmed, absent from study area: Frequent foraging resident throughout the PAOI but far less frequent within the study areas due to the large distances to the mountainous preferred habitats and a general lack of localised abundant prey. Localised areas exhibiting high abundance of hyraxes and rock rabbits should be considered highly sensitive to the species. The species is susceptible to poisoning events and SEF facilities with a low risk from proposed activities.
<i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i> (Martial Eagle)	Endangered	Endangered	Open bushveld, desert savanna and karoo with adequate roosting and foraging potential.	Confirmed (although likely nest): A rare breeding resident and foraging visitor dependent on adequate food supply and roosts. At least one nest has been confirmed adjacent to the proposed SEF footprint but no sightings in terms of foraging activity was recorded on the development footprint area.

⁴ IUCN 2021

⁵ Taylor et al. 2015

Species	Global Conservation Status ⁴	National Conservation Status ⁵	Preferred Habitat	Potential likelihood of occurrence on study area and potential risk posed from the SEF
				Typically, the species would exhibit a Low to Moderate risk to the proposed development activities.
<i>Rhinoptilus africanus</i> (Double-banded Courser)	Least Concern	Near Threatened	Flat, stony or gravelly, semi-desert terrains with firm, sandy soil and tufty grass or thorn scrub	Confirmed. A fairly common breeding resident recorded in the current study. Not highly vulnerable to the proposed activities due to ground dwelling habitats. .
<i>Falco biarmicus</i> (Lanner Falcon)	-	Vulnerable	Varied, but prefers to breed in mountainous areas.	Confirmed: A fairly common foraging migrant recorded in the current study and expected periodically to occur. Not highly vulnerable to the proposed activities.
<i>Neotis ludwigii</i> (Ludwig's Bustard)	Endangered	Endangered	Primary upland grassland, desert savanna and karoo with foraging and roosting particularly on rocky/hilly terrain.	Confirmed: High densities throughout the study areas. The species is likely to be a breeding resident within or adjacent to the study area. A large bodied species, it is moderately susceptible to SEF development activities but is more likely to be affected by associated infrastructure (powerlines).
<i>Sagittarius serpentarius</i> (Secretarybird)	Vulnerable	Vulnerable	Prefers open grassland or lightly wooded habitat although forages extensively in open karroid savannah.	Unlikely: Irregular low-density resident which is most likely of lower risk to the proposed development activities given ground foraging habitats. In addition, persistent long term regional drought may have significantly decimated local prey sources (especially snakes) thus further reducing the likelihood of persisting local populations of significant densities.
<i>Eupodotis vigorsii</i> (Karoo Korhaan)	Near threatened	Near threatened	Karroid habitats, large saline pans and shallow impoundments.	Confirmed: Common resident occurring near areas with drainage lines (including ephemeral) and open areas. Individually susceptible to SEF development activities but as a species is considered low risk.
<i>Falco naumanni</i> (Lesser Kestrel)	Near Threatened	Near Threatened	Widespread species prefers open grassland or lightly wooded habitat although forages extensively in open karroid savannah. Roosts collectively in locations with tall trees.	Confirmed: Regular migrant of fluctuating seasonal density which is most likely of lower risk to the proposed development activities due to most pressures occurring with breeding grounds and migration routes.

Species	Global Conservation Status ⁴	National Conservation Status ⁵	Preferred Habitat	Potential likelihood of occurrence on study area and potential risk posed from the SEF
---------	---	---	-------------------	--

5 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 BACKGROUND TO INTERACTIONS BETWEEN SOLAR ENERGY FACILITIES, POWER LINES AND BIRDS

The effects of a solar farm on birds are highly variable and depend on a wide range of factors including the design and specification of the development, the topography of the surrounding land, the habitats affected and the number and species of birds present.

Typical potential impacts include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- Habitat loss (including foraging and breeding) and fragmentation due to displacement (avoidance of disturbance). Habitat loss has the tendency to not only destroy existing habitat but also displace bird species from large areas of natural habitat. This specifically has a greater impact on bird species restricted to a specific habitat and its requirements.
- Collision and electrocution with above-ground power transmission lines (to be assessed in separate application). In some cases, collision can be associated with combustion (streamers) from polarised light pollution and waterbird species mistaking large PV panels areas as wetlands or other waterbodies, a case known as the “lake effect” (as per Jenkins *et al.* 2017). The mitigation of these impacts will be finalised in the final EIA report with operational phase monitoring to be designed in the EMPr.
- Disturbance due to noise such as, machinery movements and maintenance operations during the construction and operational phase of the proposed PV solar farm.
- The attraction of some novel bird species due to the development of a solar farm with associated infrastructure such as perches, nest and shade opportunities
- Chemical pollution: Chemicals being used to keep the PV panels clean from dust (suppressants) etc.

5.1.1 Construction Phase

Table 5-1: Habitat destruction during construction phase.

Nature: Habitat loss (including foraging and breeding) and fragmentation due to displacement (avoidance of disturbance) as a result of infrastructure installation (panels, powerlines, roads, fences and sub surface cables) and associated dust effects. Habitat loss has the tendency to not only destroy existing habitat but also displace bird species from large areas of natural habitat. This specifically has a greater impact on bird species restricted to a specific habitat and its requirements.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation

Extent	2	1
Duration	4	3
Magnitude	8	3
Probability	5	4
Significance	High (70)	Low (28)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Medium	Low
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	

Mitigation Measures

Impacts associated with the loss of bird foraging habitat due to construction activity cannot be mitigated in relation to the majority of the habitats but can be mitigated by avoiding avifaunal specific highly sensitive areas and their associated buffers, such as the local drainage lines, impoundments, smaller watercourses, pans and rocky koppies. The overall severity of the impact can be reduced to being insignificant if avoidance mitigation is applied related to the positioning of the panels and supporting infrastructure and minimisation mitigation is applied. Finally, construction should be restricted to the months of April, May, June and July (latest) to minimise dust effects and subsequent destruction of the avifaunal habitats.

5.1.1.1 Specific Mitigations for Wetland and Waterbody Crossings

The Site Development Plan (SDP) provided clearly shows potential interaction between infrastructure and designated High Sensitivity avifaunal features. Methods used for constructing linear infrastructure (such as buried powerlines, pipelines, raised powerlines, roads) across wetlands or drainage lines will vary, depending on the nature of wetland hydrology and soils. Thus, the following specific prescribed mitigations as well as guiding principles and “best practice” are described below.

1. Horizontal directional drilling is preferred for the crossing of wetlands,
2. If as is more typical, an open trench is dug, mitigations should be implemented to reduce impacts to wetland hydrology and soil structure.
3. All Pipelines corridors (affected areas) should be implemented to a maximum 10 metres wide through wetlands during construction.
4. During construction, laydown areas must be located in uplands a minimum of 35 metres from the wetland edge.
5. Construction equipment used while working in wetlands is limited to only those pieces that are essential and non-essential equipment is allowed to travel through wetlands only once during deployment and once during extraction.
6. During vegetation clearing, sediment barriers such as silt fences must be installed and maintained adjacent to wetlands.
7. The method of pipeline construction used in wetlands depends on the stability of the soils. Overall, topsoil is first removed and stored separately from the subsoil. Where wetland soils are saturated, segregating topsoil is not possible. Large timber mats placed ahead of the construction equipment can provide a stable working platform and protect

wetland soils by spreading the weight of the construction equipment over a broad area.

8. Generally, the preferred method for crossing an actively flowing waterbody with a pipeline is horizontal directional drilling as compared to open-cut trenching. With this method, a hole is dug below the stream crossing and pulling a prefabricated section of pipe through the hole. The goal is for zero interruption to flow.
9. Open-cut crossings involve cutting a trench across the waterbody while water flows through the trenching area. Where the water is shallow enough, it may be diverted by flumes and pumps. A flume pipe may be placed to divert the water around the trenching area. Pumps in combination with dams may also be used to divert the water during open-cut trenching.
10. Where possible, pipelines can be installed using the push-pull technique-- stringing and welding the pipeline outside of the wetland and excavating and backfilling the trench using a backhoe supported by equipment mats or timber riprap. The prefabricated pipeline is installed in the wetland by pushing or pulling it across the trench. After the pipeline is floated into place, the floats are removed and the pipeline sinks into place. The trench is backfilled to the proper grade to maintain wetland hydrology and grades are restored to the original elevation.
11. If topsoil is segregated from subsoil, then subsoil is backfilled first.

5.1.1.2 Best Practice for Wetland Crossings

1. Avoidance. Avoid the construction of a crossing or staging area by either choosing an alternative route or by using aerial or overhead equipment;
2. Minimization. Limit the number of crossings and the number of equipment trips to as few as possible. Limit the number of equipment staging areas and spoil storage areas.
3. Use of Previously disturbed Areas. Use existing access roads, or staging areas.
4. Selection of Crossing Location. Consider criteria when locating crossing sites to minimize disturbance, such as shortest crossing point, avoiding unstable or steep banks, avoiding highly erodible soils, avoid unstable portions of stream channels.
5. Scheduling. Schedule construction during the season least damaging to the stream or wetland system (i.e. dry season).

5.1.1.3 Powerline Crossing of Wetlands

Presented below are design objectives, considerations and examples of construction techniques of best practices. Variables of avifaunal sensitivity include such factors as wetland quality, topography, congregatory avian populations, prey populations, line configuration, adjacent wetlands, and historical bird use areas, all of which have been assessed as part of the pre-construction monitoring. The following mitigation measures are suggested;

- Avoid siting lines in areas where birds concentrate;
- In all raised powerline crossings, powerlines must install bird diverters to enhance visibility of lines;
- Where possible, construction should involve the burying of lines underground.
- In order to reduce avian mortalities related to bird collisions or nests, perch guards should be installed on all infrastructure (such as poles and platforms).

5.1.1.4 Wetland Road Design and Construction Practices

- All road construction should preferably take place in the dry season.
- A temporary road in a wetland needs to provide adequate crossroad drainage at all natural drainageways. Temporary drainage structures include culverts, bridges, and porous material.
- Prior to construction, areas of infrastructure placement must be graded flat so as not to cause vegetation root mat loss or restriction to sub surface flow. Topsoil storage must be enacted. Construction of roads must occur at natural ground level (not below) to minimize to restricting water flow.
- Limit or restrict the construction of fill roads. All fill roads must use a permeable fill material (such as gravel or crushed rock) for at least the first layer of fill in order to maintain the natural flow regimes of subsurface water.
- It is preferable to eliminate fill roads and utilise raised bridges and culverts with adequate sizing and spacing of water crossing structures, proper choice of the type of crossing structure, and installation of drainage structures at a depth adequate to pass subsurface flow.

5.1.1.5 Post Construction Rehabilitation

- A rehabilitation plan must be commissioned before construction commences.
- All topsoil harvesting must take place in the dry season (late dry season).
- Returning the wetlands to their original grade must take place as minor differences in the final surface elevation can produce significant impacts on the type of vegetation that re-establishes itself (alien invasive species).
- When topsoil is salvaged and returned, it is anticipated without reseeding that dense vegetative communities of native species can regenerate within two growing seasons.
- As emergent wetlands will recover more quickly than others, artificial seeding is not advised as it creates competition for reestablishment of native facultative and obligate wetland vegetation.

Table 5-2: Disturbance of bird roosts during the construction phase.

Nature: The destruction or disturbance of bird roosts during the construction phase		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	2	2
Duration	2	2
Magnitude	8	4
Probability	5	3
Significance	(42)	Low (24)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	Yes
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	

Mitigation Measures

Bird nesting sites and roosts varied from artificial structures such as pylons and windmills to some trees within the project footprint and infrastructure development will be associated with the destruction or disturbance of such roosts. This impact cannot be mitigated within the open scrub habitat but can be mitigated by timing construction to May, June, July and August in order to avoid breeding periods of species within the sensitive drainage lines, wetlands and the general region. No construction vehicles or personnel may approach the Verreaux's/ Tawny Eagle nests within 1.5 km during the construction phase.

Table 5-3: Disturbance due to noise such as, machinery movements and maintenance operations during the construction and operational phase of the proposed PV solar farm

Nature: Disturbance (including of nesting SCC) due to noise such as, machinery movements and maintenance operations during the construction phase the proposed PV solar farm causing loss of offspring for a generation.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	3	3
Duration	4	3
Magnitude	8	2
Probability	5	2
Significance	High (75)	Low (16)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	Yes
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	

Mitigation Measures

As with other impacts, this impact can be mitigated by timing construction to May, June, July and August in order to avoid breeding periods of species within the sensitive drainage lines, wetlands and the general region.

5.1.2 Operational Phase

Table 5-4: Bird mortalities during the operational phase.

Nature: Bird mortalities during the operational phase due to vehicle collisions, collisions with infrastructure and/or combustion.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	3	3
Duration	4	4
Magnitude	10	6
Probability	5	3
Significance	High (85)	Medium (39)

Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	No
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Potentially
Can impacts be mitigated?	Partially	

Mitigation Measures

Impacts due to bird mortalities during the operational phase are practically unavoidable for any large facility, but with the appropriate mitigation measures these impacts can be minimised. It is likely that most of the avifaunal populations will be largely displaced from the majority of the project infrastructure, although significant risks are associated with the likelihood of project vehicles flushing birds into fencing infrastructure as well as collisions of large bodied species with powerlines. Although the current overall bird activity qualifies the proposed solar development boundary as a high-density area, there are certain times of the year (and day) when it appears that large flocks of birds (such as cranes bustards and large birds of prey) are far more prevalent. All powerline infrastructure must be fitted with approved bird diverters in order to provide visibility for large-bodied birds. In all areas where service road intersects with semi natural or natural habitat, all fences must be set back at least (strictly) 75 metres from the edge of every service road in order to allow for vulnerable species such as cranes and korhaans to obtain adequate height after being flushed by vehicle traffic. Alternative 2 and where a 75 metre buffer is not possible, **new** fences must be set back no more than 2 metres (directly adjacent) from the edge of service roads. Through the essential elimination of habitat, this will limit any chance of vulnerable species foraging on verge side vegetation and causing subsequent fence collisions.

Table 5-5: Loss of Bird Foraging Habitat

Nature: Loss of Bird Foraging Habitat		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	3	3
Duration	4	3
Magnitude	8	2
Probability	5	2
Significance	High (75)	Low (16)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	Yes
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	

Mitigation Measures

Impacts associated with the loss of bird foraging habitat due to operations can be mitigated by avoiding avifaunal specific sensitive areas and their associated buffers, such as the local drainage lines, impoundments, smaller watercourses, pans and

koppies. A green buffer should be maintained around all habitats with a SEI designated as High or above.

Table 5-6: Disruption of bird migratory pathways during the operational phase.

Nature: Disruption of bird migratory pathways during the operational phase		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	3	3
Duration	4	3
Magnitude	8	2
Probability	5	2
Significance	High (75)	Low (16)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	Yes
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	

Mitigation Measures

Migratory pathways of birds cannot be changed and the resulting impacts are unavoidable. However, severity of the impacts can be reduced with appropriate mitigation measures. Some significant discernible migratory flight pathways were able to be established which could be explained by large areas of generic habitats punctuated by some distinguishing geographic features in the landscape, such as large ridges, large impoundments, wetlands and drainage lines. The linear Drainage line habitats must be buffered by a minimum of 50 metres from the edge of the demarcated wetland.

Table 5-7: The attraction of some novel bird species due to the development of a solar farm with associated infrastructure such as lake effect, perches, nest and shade opportunities

Nature: The attraction of some novel bird species due to the development of a solar farm with associated infrastructure such as lake effect perches, nest and shade opportunities may cause both damage to the infrastructure through acidic defecation by certain species but also draw birds closer to infrastructure and cause significant direct mortality risks.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	3	3
Duration	4	3
Magnitude	8	2
Probability	5	2
Significance	High (75)	Low (16)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	Yes
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	No

Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes
----------------------------------	-----

Mitigation Measures

Essentially, all habitat attractants should be eliminated so that avifaunal populations will not embedded themselves within the infrastructure over time. This includes bird diverters, perch deterrents and the application of Non-polarising white tape can be used around and/or across panels to minimise reflection which can attract aquatic birds and insects (food) as panels mimic reflective surfaces of waterbodies.

Table 5-8: Chemical pollution: Chemicals being used to keep the PV panels clean from dust (suppressants) etc.

Nature: Chemical pollution: Chemicals being used to keep the PV panels clean from dust (suppressants) etc.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	3	3
Duration	4	3
Magnitude	8	2
Probability	5	2
Significance	High (75)	Low (16)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	Yes
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	

Mitigation Measures

The application of strict chemical control protocols as per the EMPR.

5.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The cumulative effects of regional solar farm developments on birds are highly variable and depend on a wide range of factors including the density, designs and layouts of the infrastructure. This will be evaluated within the framework of the final EIA report. The map of regional WEF and SEFs in relation to the Lesaka 1 SEF is shown as Figure 5-1.

There are a number of existing renewable energy projects (both solar and WEFs) that already have quantified negative impacts on the avifauna community in the region. Therefore, any impacts anticipated from the proposed solar facility will add to these existing impacts and require assessment under a Cumulative Impacts assessment. Results obtained during this preconstruction survey and from the subsequent impact analysis should be considered in conjunction with the impacts created by the proposed development. The current developments within the region raise the possibility of significant cumulative impacts, especially concerning collision risk, habitat loss and fragmentation and loss of suitable habitat for threatened species.

The following current impacts will be exacerbated through increased solar developments regionally;

- Habitat loss: The destruction of highly sensitive habitat (for example drainage line habitats for Blue Cranes) will potentially increase. Many SCC exist within a narrow ecological and distributional belt and loss of its ecologically specific habitat may be highly significant.
- Road-kills: Many birds are commonly killed on roads and flushed into fences associated with the facility (e.g. Karoo Korhaan).
- Regional saturation of solar facilities: This has implications for several priority species, both in terms of lake effect, collision mortality from additional powerline infrastructure (see below) for some species, especially Bustards and Raptors, and displacement due to transformation of habitats.
- Powerlines: Numerous existing and new power lines are significant threats to large terrestrial priority species in the region as powerlines may kill significant numbers of all large terrestrial bird species.

Table 5-9: Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area.

Nature: Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area		
	Overall impact of the proposed project considered in isolation	Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area
Extent	1	3
Duration	4	4
Magnitude	4	6
Probability	4	5
Significance	Medium (36)	High (65)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	No	No
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Yes
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	Possibly




Figure 5-1: The map of regional WEFs and SEFs in relation to the Lesaka 1 SEF

5.2.1 General Mitigation of Impacts

Due to the global demand for renewable energy, a strong research emphasis has been placed on describing and defining mitigation measures to negate or minimise the negative impacts associated with such facilities. In particular, much research is focused on bird impacts prevention/minimisation at solar facilities (see TBC 2021). New mitigation measures range from simple (e.g., buffering of habitats) to complex (retrofitting of panels to avoid Lake Effect Impacts). However, by far the best mitigation option remains the first step of the mitigation hierarchy which is “avoidance”. Consequently, all attempts will be made to avoid potential impacts arising from the proposed development through the application of necessary buffers for sensitive areas, where placement of panel infrastructure may not occur. Additional remaining impacts will be minimised through the application of known and previously tested mitigation measures.

Alternative additional mitigation measures may include change of the current land use to minimise attraction for priority species. Since development and construction go hand in hand with high ambient and stochastic noise levels (machinery) and habitat loss, it is possible for bird species and bird individuals to be displaced from the surrounding environment. For the proposed solar facilities as well as the cumulative impacts, it cannot be predicted to a 100% confidence to what degree these activities will affect the Priority Species, but it must be stated (as mentioned within the Verreaux’s and Martial Eagle interpretative section) that many bird species will become accustomed, or have the ability to learn and adapt, to constant occurring disturbance events of low magnitude (e.g. vehicle noise) unless they are directly affected (e.g. their physical habitat is affected). Collision with powerlines is the most significant impact for the species in the region.

Set-back areas or buffer zones are allocated to sensitive or important habitat features to alleviate the effect of foraging and nesting/ roosting habitat in particular. The choice of an appropriate set-back distance is complex since different species and even different taxon groups demand different habitat types or home ranges to maintain a viable population in the long term.. Given that the study area has been confirmed as a foraging site and breeding site for Martial Eagles and indeed most other raptor species, the mitigation recommendations that are proposed in order to preserve the ecological function of the raptor habitats, minimising collisions and to maintain foraging corridors for large SCC raptor species in the form of a set-back area of natural vegetation are considered non-negotiable.

5.2.2 Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures

It is deemed possible, through the application of appropriate mitigation measures, to restrict the impact of on the local and regional avifaunal population to a low level of significance. The following mitigation summary is provided:

Habitat destruction: Where possible, apply necessary buffers for roost sites and other sensitive bird habitat features, avoiding the construction of panels and access roads in these areas. Roads must utilise or upgrade existing farm roads as far as possible. All underground cables bisecting sensitive habitats must be placed below the subsurface flow of the ephemeral wetlands with the linear construction pits subjected to full rehabilitation in order to maintain normal subsurface flow. All roads and crossings must be engineered not to impede surface or subsurface flow in any way.

Bird mortality: Avoid placement of panels near sensitive bird breeding and roosting habitats. The application of adaptive mitigation measures (e.g., retrofitting non-polarising white tape can be used around and/or across panels to minimise reflection),

according to post-construction monitoring results (counted collisions of threatened species) must be informed by environmental correlates of avifaunal activity and/or collisions (EMPr). In addition, the addition of grazing sheep to the footprint may attract raptor SCC who may scavenge on dead lambs/ adult sheep or prey upon livestock. Strict carcass retrieval must be incorporated into the EMP where carcasses are removed and correctly disposed of within the same day of death. This will require constant monitoring of all sheep herds in the footprint.

Bird collisions with panels and powerlines: If possible, the use of parabolic (curved) mirrors is preferred instead of flat heliostats to reduce the likelihood of skyward reflection to minimise potential bird collisions. However the use of flat panels does not represent a fatal flaw. All powerlines must be flapped with appropriate diverters and no elevated powerlines are to cross drainage line habitats.

Avoidance: It is recommended that limited development takes place in High sensitivity areas. Minimise impacts to natural and artificial wetlands and water bodies by implementing the appropriate buffer areas where no development may take place. This includes a 50 m proposed no-go buffer proposed around small artificial water points as they serve as focal points for bird activity and 50 metres around drainage lines/ wetlands. All Martial Eagle nests must be buffered by at least 1 km. As some avoidance is not possible, the strict preconstruction prescriptive mitigation measures for infrastructure engineering described above must be applied.

General Mitigation Measures

- Formal post construction monitoring must be applied once the development have been activated, as per the most recent edition of the best practice guidelines (Jenkins et al. 2017). The exact scope and nature of the post-construction monitoring will be informed on an ongoing basis by the result of the monitoring through a process of an establishment of available new technology and adaptive management. The purpose of this would be to establish if and to what extent displacement of priority species has occurred through the altering of breeding and foraging behaviour post-construction, and to search for and identify carcasses near panels and newly erected powerlines (mortality).
- High value target species such as Ludwig's Bustard and Martial Eagles can be tracked using periodic ECO monitoring regimes to monitor movement patterns and breeding success. These programs should be implemented during and post construction.
- Post-construction monitoring should be undertaken as per the EMPr. The exact scope, nature and frequency of the post-construction monitoring will be informed on an ongoing basis by the results of the monitoring through a process of adaptive management.

5.2.3 Species Specific Risk Analysis and Recommended Mitigations

According to SABAP2 and Taylor *et al.* (2015), and as mentioned above, 22 (twenty-two) Priority Species /SCC are known to occur in the region with 16 (sixteen) species confirmed during the respective surveys, representing a very high success rate given the short study period. Of the confirmed species and according to Taylor *et al.* (2015), one of the species is Critically Endangered, two of the species are Endangered, two of the species are Vulnerable species and two are Near-Threatened.

Given that even long-term studies conducted over multiple periods, some of these species warrant increased contextual discussion in regard to predicted impacts and mitigation measures.

However, the areas showing large associations with ridges and/ drainage lines are characterised by some significantly unique (in the landscape) habitat attributes and are thus likely to provide refuge and foraging habitat for priority and large terrestrial bird species (e.g., Red Larks, Ludwig's Bustards) and/ or wetland associates/ foraging migratory raptors, therefore, elevating the sensitivity. Regarding the current study, it was deemed unnecessary that all species should be discussed in detail. Species such as Lanner Falcon and migratory raptors incur pressures outside of the borders of South Africa and do not warrant intensive discussion. Therefore, the selected relevant species that are possibly susceptible to the proposed development have been discussed in detail below.

Ultimately, it is suggested that the morphological and behavioural characteristics of a given bird species traits of birds, especially those related to size, wing beat, manoeuvrability, flight pattern and hunting/ foraging behaviour, are known to influence the relative collision risk with structures such as power lines and solar panels. Larger bird species often need to use thermal and updrafts to gain altitude, particularly for long distance flights. Thermal updrafts (thermals) and orographic lift (slope updraft) will affect the relative risk per species. The relatively variable nature of the survey area dictates that the overall topography related risks are moderate to high, However, some higher risk species have been identified and described below.

5.2.3.1 Ludwig's Bustard (*Neotis ludwigii*)

Ludwig's Bustards are globally and regionally listed as Endangered (BirdLife International 2012b and Taylor, *et. al.* 2015) which is cause for a significant evaluation of the species in relation to the proposed development. Actual counts were carried out although monitoring data suggest that a permanent (albeit seasonal) population including breeding pairs persist for prolonged periods within the study area. Multiple and frequent sightings were recorded.

The fact that sub-adults and juveniles were encountered in the study area provides strong anecdotal evidence of residential breeding behaviour which may have significance ramifications for the Cumulative Impact Assessment. This species is almost certainly resident and at risk to the creation of large, panel infrastructure in combination with non-marked powerlines may cause collision of birds which could significantly reduce local and regional populations. In addition, large-scale increases in fencing combined with a high volume of large maintenance trucks may cause drastic declines in bustard numbers due to flushing displacements, collisions and entanglements. The presence of this species must form a significant focal point of the mitigation measures.

On a final note concerning monitoring of the species (and possible mitigations), it is vital to highlight that fact that as an Endangered species, Ludwig's bustard demands higher degrees of auditing and monitoring attention than other Red-Listed birds (a fact supported by multiple publications including Visser *et. al.* 2018 and Scott *et. al.* 2012). It is also vital to highlight that presence or absence over time for a nomadic species is difficult to predict and spatial/ temporal population reductions may or may not be development-induced. For example, the cessation of predator poisoning activities within the study area may in fact cause a localised increase in jackal populations, thereby reducing the population of Bustards through good practice. Although it is highly feasible that the development may be directly responsible for local population reductions, comprehensive and

continuous data collection is required to monitor the situation on site and apply appropriate mitigation measures and far more significant weighting and value should be applied to the Cumulative Impact Assessment.

5.2.3.2 Verreaux's Eagle (*Aquila verreauxii*) and Martial Eagle (*Polemaetus bellicosus*)

All nesting raptors should be protected within the study area. Seen infrequently, Verreaux's eagle is most likely classified as a irregular foraging visitor on the study areas and a breeding resident in areas adjacent to the project footprint (mountainous habitat to the north). The IUCN Vulnerable Verreaux's Eagles and IUCN Endangered Martial Eagle provide a typical scenario where the foraging population (and breeding pairs) of resident raptor SCC can be significantly impacted.

Local populations are under constant pressure from development due to modifications and alterations of their preferred foraging habitat and dispersal networks. It must be stated that Martial Eagle rely on more ecologically "generic" habitats and are not bound by the ridge systems that define the presence and foraging of Verreaux's Eagle. However, the impacts of the development of Martial Eagle may be more severe, especially because nests were located within the project area of influence.

Generally, Verreaux's eagles occupy a home range size of approximately 20-35 km² (Van der Lecq 2012) or 35 - 65 km² in the Magaliesberg (Allan 1988; Anderson 2002) in areas where their preferred prey, the Rock Hyrax (*Procapra capensis*) is abundant (Gargett & Mundy 1990; Simmons 2005). Within the Lesaka 1 Footprint area, rock hyrax and Smith's red rock rabbit were observed in high densities, but Verreaux's eagles were not observed actively foraging. Overall, in areas of high disturbance, the species can increase their home range to an area of 150 - 200 km² which does not appear to be the case within in the PAOI given the seemingly high abundance of Verreaux's Eagle in more suitable regional habitats. Any future observed expansion of the home range of the local population can probably explained by the lack of sufficient densities of prey as a result of habitat loss within the landscape, thus representing a key indicator for future monitoring of cumulative impacts.

Martial Eagles are less predictable in their ecology and habits due to the fact that they are a low-density species although very widespread and with very generalist habitat requirements. The breeding pair located adjacent to the project footprint will almost certainly represent long term residents. The primary impacts relate to loss of foraging habitat and potential collision with new powerline infrastructure which requires detailed discussion.

The overall findings data reveal a number of risks in regard to the current study. Increased stress to obtain food in the area will almost certainly modify the eagles' behaviour within the national population. Breeding adults become more aggressive towards each other leading to increased post-hatchling mortalities (Anon 2012). This is especially relevant in regards to the loss of habitat for the cumulative effects due to much reduced available prey as well as the increased disturbance levels.

It is an undisputed fact that the fitness of large eagle (e.g. breeding success) is closely tied with the availability of its preferred prey and disturbance levels. The proposed future development will likely not threaten the long-term viability of suitable prey populations required to sustain both species although the cumulative increase in REFs within the region does pose a threat to the local populations.

Impacts

Disturbance applies to the disruption of a foraging, breeding or roosting bird caused by human-induced activities. Since development and construction go hand in hand with high ambient levels and habitat loss, it is possible for bird species and bird individuals to be displaced from the surrounding environment. It is essentially true for large species that require extensive home ranges, and those species that are inherently shy or unobtrusive by nature (e.g. raptors).

Displacement will be the response of eagles to the disturbance activity, for example when a bird changes its behaviour or takes flight by aborting its activity prior to the disturbance or being unsuccessful in completing its current activity (Ruddock & Whitfield 2007). Reactions are likely to differ between species and between individuals of the same species (Rogers & Smith 1995; Rogers & Schwikert 2002). Reactions are also positively correlated to the magnitude and frequency of a particular disturbance event. For the proposed solar farm application as well as future applications, it is currently unknown to what degree these activities will affect the Verreaux's and Martial Eagles and their prey (due to absence of approvals, long-term studies and detailed list of activities), but reactions can be estimated to be similar due to the surrounding development activities. It must be stated that many bird species will become accustomed, or have the ability to learn and adapt, to constant occurring disturbance events of low magnitude (e.g. vehicle noise), unless they are not directly affected (e.g. their physical habitat is left intact). However, reduced poisoning of local "vermin" such as caracal and jackals (that may or may not hunt or scavenge livestock) may in fact have a positive effect on the raptor population.

Reaction to disturbance events causes behavioural disruption which is likely to result in an increased energy expenditure (e.g. if a disturbed bird takes flight) and physical stress. In the case of breeding birds, disturbances could lead to the loss of eggs or nestlings, thereby affecting the breeding success of the population (Stillman *et al.* 2007). In addition, sustained disturbances could eventually result in less time for individuals to invest in breeding activities due to high energy demands compromising their survival. Displacement and disturbances are further aggravated by an increased loss of suitable foraging, breeding and roosting habitat.

6 COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

Key

PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a low impact / reduce the impact / result in a positive impact
FAVOURABLE	The impact will be relatively insignificant
LEAST PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a high impact / increase the impact
NO PREFERENCE	The alternative will result in equal impacts

Alternative	Preference	Reasons (incl. potential issues)
CONSTRUCTION LAYDOWN AREA SITE ALTERNATIVES		
Construction Laydown Area Option 1	Favourable	Since this proposed option is located adjacent to existing infrastructure where edge effects are already high and sensitivity for avifauna habitat is low, this is preferred. However, since the road network is unknown, this could increase the impact depending on where vehicle will cross sensitive areas and cause avifaunal specific impacts such as collisions. A disadvantage of this location is that it is not directly connected to the planned infrastructure and is further away from prospect 2 and 4.

Alternative	Preference	Reasons (incl. potential issues)
		Accordingly, this needs to be assessed in more detail once more information regarding infrastructure is available.
Construction Laydown Area Option 2	Preferred	This option will be located in an area which will be cleared for the installation of solar panels, which makes the location more preferable. It is not located in a sensitive habitats and is situated closer to all Prospect sites. As per the previous Option, the road network is unknown, this could increase the impact depending on where vehicle will cross sensitive areas causing avifauna specific impacts such as collision.

7 SENSITIVITY

The study area mostly consists of Open Grassland and Karoo Shale habitats with some drainage line and koppies found in parts of the proposed project footprint. The Sandy Grassland and Koppie vegetation provides potential nesting habitat for bird species such as Ludwig's Bustard, Raptors, Red Larks, Cisticola's and Karoo Korhaan, and possibly includes hunting/foraging habitat for species such as Lanner Falcon, Secretarybird and other larger raptors.

The site visit in July 2022 took place during the winter season, which means the habitat conditions were at their least optimal. When conditions are sub-optimal, avifaunal assemblages will carry out small scale migrations to more ecologically productive habitats (such as permanent water courses) and return after the commencement of the warmer months. The Spring and Summer surveys yielded more significant results due to the warmer temperatures and post rain ecological productivity.

The associated powerlines within the study area footprint showed significant signs of priority bird species nests and could lead to possible recolonisation in the future for species such as Martial Eagle. Accordingly, preliminary sensitivities have been shown in Figure 7-1. The figure indicates that the entire north-western area, as well as smaller pockets to the south and east, are "high sensitivity" areas, while the nest buffers towards the south-west and beyond the north-east border are "no-go" areas. The drainage line running across the site has also been marked as a "no-go".

Nest Specific Mitigations

Utilising the interpretations stipulated above and in the absence of any mitigation measures, a preliminary buffer of 1 km (Figure 7-1) is recommended as an exclusion zone of ALL project activities, in addition to stipulated mitigation measures (see species specific mitigation measures above). This applies to the two (seemingly) abandoned Martial Eagle nests within the PAOI.




Figure 7-1: Preliminary avifauna sensitivity map for the Lesaka 1 SEF.

8 CONCLUSIONS

The study area is situated within the Hantam Karoo vegetation type. The study area is not anticipated to support breeding populations of several large terrestrial bird species such as cranes and large raptor species in sufficiently large densities or within breeding habitat that may be considered a fatal flaw. However, given the size of the area, the proximity to a very large areas of suitable habitat, the high-density presence of Red Lark, Ludwig's Bustard and Karoo Korhaan is deemed to be a significant concern. Thus, in order to confirm that the study area is of low sensitivity in terms of conservation of these type of bird species., final conclusions cannot be documented until the full data set has been obtained and presented in the final EIA.

The CBAs of the Northern Cape designated that majority of the site falls within a CBA 1, CBA 2 and an ESA1. Avoidance mitigation could be applied wherever possible to project infrastructure design and limit the amount of habitat impacted.

The study area is classified as a Regime 2 assessment (Jenkins *et al.* 2017). The study area is not within a REDZ and requires a full S&EIA and the methods will follow the appropriate sampling method, which consists of 3 surveys of 3 days each (minimum) over a 6-month period.

Sampling methods used included walking and driving transects, bird species abundance at waterbodies and monitoring of new and previously observed nests on existing and constructed pylons. A total of twenty-two (22) priority species has the possibility of occurring within and around the study area.

Some of the priority bird species are not habitat-bound to the area for nesting and/or foraging purposes and is therefore important to focus on the some of the most significant cumulative impacts for the proposed solar project. Possible primary impacts of the proposed study area on avifauna included:

1. Potential habitat loss through the establishment of solar panel infrastructure.
2. The inclusion of livestock agriculture that might attract more avifauna species to the area.
3. Collision with solar panel infrastructure is possible albeit less likely than secondary collision risk.
4. Secondary collision risks are represented by supporting powerline infrastructure which are connected to solar panel infrastructure.

The study area is surrounded with existing renewable energy developments, both wind and solar developments, although a number are proposed which could manifest as significant cumulative impacts at the proposed site. Consequently, every effort is taken to finalise within an EIA Framework, all aspects of priority species observed within the field survey to allow for careful evaluation of potential impacts and application of suitable mitigation measures to reduce these impacts where possible.

9 REFERENCES

- Del Hoyo, J., Elliott, A. AND Sargatal, J. 1992. Handbook of the birds of the world. 1992 – 2011 editions, Lynx Editions, Barcelona.
- Gill, F. & Donsker, D. (Eds). 2019. IOC World Bird List (v9.2). doi: 10.14344/IOC.ML.9.2.
- Harrison, J.A., Allan, D.G., Underhill, L.G., Herremans, M., Tree, A.J., Parker, V., & Brown, C.J. (eds). (1997) *The Atlas of Southern African Birds*. BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg.
- Hockey P., Dean, W., Ryan, P., Maree S. & Brickman, B. (2005). *Roberts - Birds of Southern Africa* 7th ed. Trustees of the John Voelcker Bird Book Fun/ Africa Geographic Books. 1296 p.
- IUCN. (2021) The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. <http://www.iucnredlist.org>.
- Jenkins, A.R., Ralston-Paton, S. and Smit-Robinson, H.A. (2017). Birds & Solar Energy. Best Practice Guidelines: Guidelines for assessing and monitoring the impact of solar power generating facilities on birds in southern Africa.
- Malan, G. (2009) *Raptor Survey and Monitoring – a Field Guide for African Birds of Prey*. Briza Publications, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Marnewick, M., Retief, E., Theron, N., Wright, D., & Anderson, T. (2015). Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas of South Africa. BirdLife South Africa. Johannesburg.
- Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. (eds). (2006, as amended). *The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.
- SABAP2 (South African Bird Atlas Project). Visited February 2022. <http://vmus.adu.org.za/>
- South African National Biodiversity Institute. (2018) Beta Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (File Geodatabase) [File geodatabase] 2018. Available from the Biodiversity GIS website (<http://bgis.sanbi.org/SpatialDataset/Detail/670>).
- Taylor, M.R., Peacock, F. & Wanless, R.M. (eds). (2015). *The 2015 Eskom Red Data Book of Birds of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg, South Africa.

10 APPENDIX

10.1 APPENDIX 1: EXPECTED & OBSERVED AVIFAUNA SPECIES LIST

Avifauna recorded by SABAP1 and SABAP2 for the nine pentads.

	Common group	Common species	Genus	Species
1		Bokmakierie	<i>Telophorus</i>	<i>zeylonus</i>
2	Avocet	Pied	<i>Recurvirostra</i>	<i>avosetta</i>
3	Barbet	Acacia Pied	<i>Tricholaema</i>	<i>leucomelas</i>
4	Bee-eater	European	<i>Merops</i>	<i>apiaster</i>
5	Bishop	Southern Red	<i>Euplectes</i>	<i>orix</i>
6	Bulbul	African Red-eyed	<i>Pycnonotus</i>	<i>nigricans</i>
7	Bunting	Cape	<i>Emberiza</i>	<i>capensis</i>
8	Bunting	Lark-like	<i>Emberiza</i>	<i>impetuari</i>
9	Bustard	Kori	<i>Ardeotis</i>	<i>kori</i>
10	Bustard	Ludwig's	<i>Neotis</i>	<i>ludwigii</i>
11	Buzzard	Common	<i>Buteo</i>	<i>buteo</i>
12	Buzzard	Jackal	<i>Buteo</i>	<i>rufofuscus</i>
13	Canary	Black-headed	<i>Serinus</i>	<i>alario</i>
14	Canary	Black-throated	<i>Crithagra</i>	<i>atrogularis</i>
15	Canary	White-throated	<i>Crithagra</i>	<i>albogularis</i>
16	Canary	Yellow	<i>Crithagra</i>	<i>flaviventris</i>
17	Chat	Ant-eating	<i>Myrmecocichla</i>	<i>formicivora</i>
18	Chat	Familiar	<i>Oenanthe</i>	<i>familiaris</i>
19	Chat	Karoo	<i>Emarginata</i>	<i>schlegelii</i>
20	Chat	Sickle-winged	<i>Emarginata</i>	<i>sinuata</i>
21	Chat	Tractrac	<i>Emarginata</i>	<i>tractrac</i>
22	Cisticola	Grey-backed	<i>Cisticola</i>	<i>subruficapilla</i>
23	Courser	Double-banded	<i>Rhinoptilus</i>	<i>africanus</i>
24	Crow	Cape	<i>Corvus</i>	<i>capensis</i>
25	Crow	Pied	<i>Corvus</i>	<i>albus</i>
26	Dove	Cape Turtle	<i>Streptopelia</i>	<i>capicola</i>
27	Dove	Laughing	<i>Spilopelia</i>	<i>senegalensis</i>
28	Dove	Namaqua	<i>Oena</i>	<i>capensis</i>
29	Eagle	Black-chested Snake	<i>Circaetus</i>	<i>pectoralis</i>
30	Eagle	Martial	<i>Polemaetus</i>	<i>bellicosus</i>
31	Eagle-Owl	Spotted	<i>Bubo</i>	<i>africanus</i>

32	Eremomela	Karoo	<i>Eremomela</i>	<i>gregalis</i>
33	Eremomela	Yellow-bellied	<i>Eremomela</i>	<i>icteropygialis</i>
34	Falcon	Lanner	<i>Falco</i>	<i>biarmicus</i>
35	Fiscal	Southern	<i>Lanius</i>	<i>collaris</i>
36	Flycatcher	Chat	<i>Melaenornis</i>	<i>infuscatus</i>
37	Flycatcher	Fiscal	<i>Melaenornis</i>	<i>silens</i>
38	Goose	Egyptian	<i>Alopochen</i>	<i>aegyptiaca</i>
39	Goshawk	Pale Chanting	<i>Melierax</i>	<i>canorus</i>
40	Heron	Black-headed	<i>Ardea</i>	<i>melanocephala</i>
41	Hoopoe	African	<i>Upupa</i>	<i>africana</i>
42	Kestrel	Greater	<i>Falco</i>	<i>rupicoloides</i>
43	Kestrel	Rock	<i>Falco</i>	<i>rupicolus</i>
44	Kite	Yellow-billed	<i>Milvus</i>	<i>aegyptius</i>
45	Korhaan	Karoo	<i>Eupodotis</i>	<i>vigorsii</i>
46	Lapwing	Blacksmith	<i>Vanellus</i>	<i>armatus</i>
47	Lapwing	Crowned	<i>Vanellus</i>	<i>coronatus</i>
48	Lark	Karoo Long-billed	<i>Certhilauda</i>	<i>subcoronata</i>
49	Lark	Large-billed	<i>Galerida</i>	<i>magnirostris</i>
50	Lark	Red	<i>Calendulauda</i>	<i>burra</i>
51	Lark	Red-capped	<i>Calandrella</i>	<i>cinerea</i>
52	Lark	Sclater's	<i>Spizocorys</i>	<i>sclateri</i>
53	Lark	Spike-heeled	<i>Chersomanes</i>	<i>albofasciata</i>
54	Martin	Rock	<i>Ptyonoprogne</i>	<i>fuligula</i>
55	Mousebird	Red-faced	<i>Urocolius</i>	<i>indicus</i>
56	Mousebird	White-backed	<i>Colius</i>	<i>colius</i>
57	Pigeon	Speckled	<i>Columba</i>	<i>guinea</i>
58	Pipit	African	<i>Anthus</i>	<i>cinnamomeus</i>
59	Plover	Kittlitz's	<i>Charadrius</i>	<i>pecuarius</i>
60	Plover	Three-banded	<i>Charadrius</i>	<i>tricoloris</i>
61	Prinia	Karoo	<i>Prinia</i>	<i>maculosa</i>
62	Sandgrouse	Namaqua	<i>Pterocles</i>	<i>namaqua</i>
63	Scrub Robin	Karoo	<i>Cercotrichas</i>	<i>coryphoeus</i>
64	Shelduck	South African	<i>Tadorna</i>	<i>cana</i>
65	Sparrow	Cape	<i>Passer</i>	<i>melanurus</i>
66	Sparrow	House	<i>Passer</i>	<i>domesticus</i>
67	Sparrow-Lark	Black-eared	<i>Eremopterix</i>	<i>australis</i>
68	Sparrow-Lark	Grey-backed	<i>Eremopterix</i>	<i>verticalis</i>
69	Starling	Pale-winged	<i>Onychognathus</i>	<i>nabouroup</i>

70	Starling	Pied	<i>Lamprotornis</i>	<i>bicolor</i>
71	Stilt	Black-winged	<i>Himantopus</i>	<i>himantopus</i>
72	Sunbird	Dusky	<i>Cinnyris</i>	<i>fuscus</i>
73	Sunbird	Malachite	<i>Nectarinia</i>	<i>famosa</i>
74	Swallow	Barn	<i>Hirundo</i>	<i>rustica</i>
75	Swallow	Greater Striped	<i>Cecropis</i>	<i>cucullata</i>
76	Swift	Little	<i>Apus</i>	<i>affinis</i>
77	Swift	White-rumped	<i>Apus</i>	<i>caffer</i>
78	Teal	Cape	<i>Anas</i>	<i>capensis</i>
79	Thick-knee	Spotted	<i>Burhinus</i>	<i>capensis</i>
80	Thrush	Karoo	<i>Turdus</i>	<i>smithi</i>
81	Tit	Cape Penduline	<i>Anthoscopus</i>	<i>minutus</i>
82	Tit	Grey	<i>Melaniparus</i>	<i>afer</i>
83	Wagtail	Cape	<i>Motacilla</i>	<i>capensis</i>
84	Warbler	African Reed	<i>Acrocephalus</i>	<i>baeticatus</i>
85	Warbler	Chestnut-vented	<i>Curruca</i>	<i>subcoerulea</i>
86	Warbler	Layard's	<i>Curruca</i>	<i>layardi</i>
87	Warbler	Namaqua	<i>Phragmacia</i>	<i>substriata</i>
88	Warbler	Rufous-eared	<i>Malcorus</i>	<i>pectoralis</i>
89	Waxbill	Common	<i>Estrilda</i>	<i>astrild</i>
90	Weaver	Cape	<i>Ploceus</i>	<i>capensis</i>
91	Weaver	Southern Masked	<i>Ploceus</i>	<i>velatus</i>
92	Wheatear	Capped	<i>Oenanthe</i>	<i>pileata</i>
93	Wheatear	Mountain	<i>Myrmecocichla</i>	<i>monticola</i>

10.2 APPENDIX 2: OBSERVED AVIFAUNA SPECIES LIST

10.3 APPENDIX 2: OBSERVED AVIFAUNA SPECIES LIST

Common Name	Scientific Name	Date	Transect Type	Transect Number	Season 1	Season 2
Ludwig's Bustard	<i>Neotis ludwigii</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Pale Chanting Goshawk	<i>Melierax canorus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Cape Turtle Dove	<i>Streptopelia capicola</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Pirit Batis	<i>Batis pririt</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Yellow Canary	<i>Crithagra flaviventris</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Ant-eating Chat	<i>Myrmecocichla formicivora</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Spike-heeled Lark	<i>Chersomanes albofasciata</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Namaqua Sandgrouse	<i>Pterocles namaqua</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Rufous-eared Warbler	<i>Malcorus pectoralis</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Red Lark	<i>Calendulauda burra</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Bokmakierie	<i>Telophorus zeylonus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Pied Crow	<i>Corvus albus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Grey-backed Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix verticalis</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Greater Kestrel	<i>Falco rupicoloides</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Ant-eating Chat	<i>Myrmecocichla formicivora</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Cape Sparrow	<i>Passer melanurus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Pied Crow	<i>Corvus albus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Karoo Long-billed Lark	<i>Certhilauda subcoronata</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Large-billed Lark	<i>Galerida magirostris</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Cape Bunting	<i>Emberiza capensis</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Mountain Wheatear	<i>Myrmecocichla monticola</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Karoo Chat	<i>Emarginata schlegelii</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Cape Bunting	<i>Emberiza capensis</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Rock Kestrel	<i>Falco rupicolus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter

Yellow Canary	<i>Crithagra flaviventris</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Karoo Korhaan	<i>Eupodotis vigorsii</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Rock Martin	<i>Ptyonoprogne fuligula</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Acacia Pied Barbet	<i>Tricholaema leucomelas</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Lark-like Bunting	<i>Emberiza impetuani</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Double-banded Courser	<i>Rhinoptilus africanus</i>	2022/07/02	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Dusky Sunbird	<i>Cinnyris fuscus</i>	2022/07/04	Drive	4	Jul-22	Winter
Tractrac Chat	<i>Emarginata tractrac</i>	2022/07/04	Drive	4	Jul-22	Winter
Chat Flycatcher	<i>Melaenomis infuscatus</i>	2022/07/04	Drive	4	Jul-22	Winter
Cape Penduline Tit	<i>Anthoscopus minutus</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	4	Jul-22	Winter
White-throated Canary	<i>Crithagra albogularis</i>	2022/07/04	Drive	1	Jul-22	Winter
Red-faced Mousebird	<i>Urocolius indicus</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	7	Jul-22	Winter
Karoo Eremomela	<i>Eremomela gregalis</i>	2022/07/04	Drive	2	Jul-22	Winter
Black-eared Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix australis</i>	2022/07/04	Drive	2	Jul-22	Winter
Malachite Sunbird	<i>Nectarinia famosa</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
Layard's Tit-Babbler	<i>Curruca layardi</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
Karoo Prinia	<i>Prinia maculosa</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
Lark-like Bunting	<i>Emberiza impetuani</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
Dusky Sunbird	<i>Cinnyris fuscus</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
White-throated Canary	<i>Crithagra albogularis</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
Karoo Scrub Robin	<i>Cercotrichas coryphoeus</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
African Red-eyed Bulbul	<i>Pycnonotus nigricans</i>	2022/07/04	Walk	1	Jul-22	Winter
Namaqua Sandgrouse	<i>Pterocles namaqua</i>	2022/07/05	Random		Jul-22	Winter
Booted Eagle	<i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>	2022/10/02	Random		Oct-22	Spring
European Bee-eater	<i>Merops apiaster</i>	2022/10/01	Random		Oct-22	Spring
Pale Chanting Goshawk	<i>Melierax canorus</i>	2022/10/01	Random		Oct-22	Spring
Common Quail	<i>Coturnix coturnix</i>	2022/10/01	Drive	2	Oct-22	Spring
Black-headed Canary	<i>Serinus alario</i>	2022/10/02	Drive	3	Oct-22	Spring
Rock Martin	<i>Ptyonoprogne fuligula</i>	2022/10/03	Drive	4	Oct-22	Spring

Pearl-breasted Swallow	<i>Hirundo dimidiata</i>	2022/10/03	Drive	4	Oct-22	Spring
Laughing Dove	<i>Spilopelia senegalensis</i>	2022/10/03	Drive	4	Oct-22	Spring
Sickle-winged Chat	<i>Emarginata sinuata</i>	2022/10/03	Drive	4	Oct-22	Spring
Cape Penduline Tit	<i>Anthoscopus minutus</i>	2022/10/03	Drive	4	Oct-22	Spring
Namaqua Dove	<i>Oena capensis</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
Black-chested Prinia	<i>Prinia flavicans</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
Cape Sparrow	<i>Passer melanurus</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
Southern Fiscal	<i>Lanius collaris</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
Ring-necked Dove	<i>Streptopelia capicola</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
African Red-eyed Bulbul	<i>Pycnonotus nigricans</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
Grey Tit	<i>Melaniparus afer</i>	2022/10/01	Walk	1	Oct-22	Spring
Cape Bunting	<i>Emberiza capensis</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	6	Dec-22	Summer
Martial Eagle	<i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	6	Dec-22	Summer
Mountain Wheatear	<i>Myrmecocichla monticola</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	6	Dec-22	Summer
Karoo Chat	<i>Emarginata schlegelii</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	6	Dec-22	Summer
Lark-like Bunting	<i>Emberiza impetuani</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	6	Dec-22	Summer
Black-chested Snake Eagle	<i>Circaetus pectoralis</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	7	Dec-22	Summer
Dusky Sunbird	<i>Cinnyris fuscus</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	7	Dec-22	Summer
Spike-heeled Lark	<i>Chersomanes albofasciata</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	7	Dec-22	Summer
White-throated Canary	<i>Crithagra albogularis</i>	2022/12/16	Walk	7	Dec-22	Summer
Karoo Scrub Robin	<i>Cercotrichas coryphoeus</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	7	Dec-22	Summer
Tractrac Chat	<i>Emarginata tractrac</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
African Red-eyed Bulbul	<i>Pycnonotus nigricans</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
Black-eared Sparrow-Lark	<i>Black-eared Sparrow-Lark</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
Namaqua Sandgrouse	<i>Pterocles namaqua</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
Tractrac Chat	<i>Emarginata tractrac</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
Grey-backed Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix verticalis</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
Booted Eagle	<i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer
European Bee-eater	<i>Merops apiaster</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	2	Dec-22	Summer

Pale Chanting Goshawk	<i>Melierax canorus</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	4	Dec-22	Summer
Common Quail	<i>Coturnix coturnix</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	4	Dec-22	Summer
Pale Chanting Goshawk	<i>Melierax canorus</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	4	Dec-22	Summer
Grey-backed Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix verticalis</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	4	Dec-22	Summer
Greater Kestrel	<i>Falco rupicoloides</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	4	Dec-22	Summer
Spike-heeled Lark	<i>Chersomanes albofasciata</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	4	Dec-22	Summer
Black-headed Canary	<i>Serinus alario</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	3	Dec-22	Summer
White-throated Canary	<i>Crithagra albogularis</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	3	Dec-22	Summer
Karoo Long-billed Lark	<i>Certhilauda subcoronata</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	3	Dec-22	Summer
Spike-heeled Lark	<i>Chersomanes albofasciata</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	3	Dec-22	Summer
Grey-backed Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix verticalis</i>	2022/12/18	Walk	3	Dec-22	Summer
Grey-backed Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix verticalis</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Greater Kestrel	<i>Falco rupicoloides</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Spike-heeled Lark	<i>Chersomanes albofasciata</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Namaqua Sandgrouse	<i>Pterocles namaqua</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Karoo Long-billed Lark	<i>Certhilauda subcoronata</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Rock Martin	<i>Ptyonoprogne fuligula</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Pearl-breasted Swallow	<i>Hirundo dimidiata</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Karoo Long-billed Lark	<i>Certhilauda subcoronata</i>	2022/12/18	Drive	1	Dec-22	Summer
Grey-backed Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix verticalis</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer
Black-eared Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix australis</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer
Ant-eating Chat	<i>Myrmecocichla formicivora</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer
Black-eared Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix australis</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer
Black-eared Sparrow-Lark	<i>Eremopterix australis</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer
Karoo Long-billed Lark	<i>Certhilauda subcoronata</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer
Double-banded Courser	<i>Rhinoptilus africanus</i>	2022/12/18	Random		Dec-22	Summer