

**Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the
proposed Grid Connection for the Camden I Wind
Energy Facility (up to 210MW), west of Camden,
Mpumalanga Province**

Site Visit Report (Phase 2)

For

Beyond Heritage

26 May 2022

Prof Marion Bamford
Palaeobotanist
P Bag 652, WITS 2050
Johannesburg, South Africa
Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za

Expertise of Specialist

The Palaeontologist Consultant: Prof Marion Bamford

Qualifications: PhD (Wits Univ, 1990); FRSSAf, ASSAf

Experience: 33 years research; 25 years PIA studies

Declaration of Independence

This report has been compiled by Professor Marion Bamford, of the University of the Witwatersrand, sub-contracted by Beyond Heritage, Modimolle, South Africa. The views expressed in this report are entirely those of the author and no other interest was displayed during the decision making process for the Project.

Specialist: Prof Marion Bamford

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Bamford', with a horizontal line underneath it.

Signature:

Executive Summary

Camden Green Energy RF (Pty) Ltd is proposing the development of the proposed Camden I Wind Energy Facility (up to 210MW), which is part of the larger Camden Renewable Energy Cluster project. This facility will require a Grid Connection and this will be on portions of the following farms: Klipbank 295, Adrianople 296, Welgelegen 322 and Klipbank 295. There are four alternative routes.

WSP has been appointed as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake the requisite Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the Project. Beyond Heritage was appointed to assess the potential impact to heritage resources by the Project and Marion Bamford was sub-contracted to do the palaeontological impact assessment. This report is for the site visit assessment.

To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit (Phase 2) Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development.

The proposed turbine sites predominantly lie on the potentially fossiliferous Vryheid Formation (Ecca Group, Karoo Supergroup) that could preserve fossil plants of the Vryheid Formation. A short section of the route lies on the non-fossiliferous Jurassic dolerite. The site visit and walk through confirmed that there were NO Fossils present on the land surface. It is not known what lies below the ground surface, therefore, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the contractor, developer, environmental officer or other designated responsible person once excavations for foundations and infrastructure have commenced. Since the impact will be low, as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

All routes have sections on the Vryheid Formation but Alternative 2 (yellow line) is mostly on non-fossiliferous dolerite. This would be the preferred alternative as far as the palaeontology is concerned. There are no No-Go areas.

Palaeontological Impact	Result
Pre-mitigation (loss of fossils)	Low
Post-mitigation (recovery of fossils)	Very low (+ve)
Rehabilitate and restore	

Table of Contents

Expertise of Specialist	2
Declaration of Independence	2
1. Background	5
2. Methods and Terms of Reference.....	9
3. Geology and Palaeontology.....	9
i. Project location and geological context	9
ii. Palaeontological context.....	11
iii. Site visit observations	12
4. Impact assessment.....	13
5. Assumptions and uncertainties.....	15
6. Recommendation.....	16
7. References	16
8. Chance Find Protocol	16
9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils	17
10. Appendix B – Details of specialist.....	19
Figures 1-2: Aerial and regional maps of the project area	7
Figure 3: Locality Map of the project footprint	7
Figure 4: Geological map of the area around the project site.....	10
Figure 5: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the project	12
Figure 6: Site visit photographs.....	13

1. Background

The proposed Camden I Wind Energy Facility (WEF) is part of the larger Camden Renewable Energy Cluster project to the west of Camden, Mpumalanga Province. A grid connection is required for the Camden I WEF and there are four alternative routes. These are planned for Portions of the Farms Klipbank 295, Adrianople 296, Welgelegen 322 and Klipbank 295 (Figures 1-3).

The proposed Camden Renewable Energy Cluster of projects is being developed in the context of the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy's (DMRE) Integrated Resource Plan, and the Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Procurement Programme (REIPPP), with further potential for private off-take by nearby mining and industrial operations.

The Cluster comprises eight (8) distinct projects, namely:

- i. Camden I Wind Energy Facility (up to 210MW).
- ii. Camden I Wind Grid Connection (up to 132kV).**
- iii. Camden up to 400kV Grid Connection and Collector substation.
- iv. Camden I Solar 100MW.
- v. Camden I Solar up to 132kV Grid Connection.
- vi. Camden Green Hydrogen and Ammonia Facility, including grid connection infrastructure.
- vii. Camden II Wind Energy Facility (up to 210MW).
- viii. Camden II Wind Energy Facility up to 132kV Grid Connection.

This report is the palaeontological impact for the Grid Connection for the Camden I Wind Energy Facility and infrastructure.

Enertrag South Africa is a subsidiary of the German-based Enertrag AG, a hydrogen and renewable energy developer founded in 1992. Enertrag South Africa (hereafter "ENERTRAG SA") was established in 2017, with the intention to investigate and develop renewable energy projects in South Africa. The transition from coal-based energy supply to renewables in the Country is inevitable, as coal resources are becoming depleted, coal-based power stations reach the end of their economic life and considering international obligations and commitments to reduced emissions. This Complex serves as the first step to this transition.

The Camden I Wind Energy Facility, to be known as the Camden I Wind Energy Facility (RF) Propriety Limited, in the Msukaligwa Local Municipality of the Gert Sibande District Municipality, will be on the land parcels as listed above.

It is proposed that Camden I will connect to the nearby Camden Collector substation (which in turn will connect to the Camden Power Station), through an up to 132kV powerline (either single or double circuit) between the grid connection substation portion (immediately adjacent the Camden I on-site IPP substation portion) and that of the Camden Collector substation. The powerline will be approximately 14km in length, depending on the authorized location of the collector substation. The onsite grid connection substation will consist of high voltage substation yard to allow for multiple

(up to) 132kV feeder bays and transformers, control building, telecommunication infrastructure, access roads, etc. The area for the onsite substation will be up to 1.5ha. The up to 132kV powerline and substation will have a 250m corridor. This application includes the necessary up to 132kV voltage electrical components required for connection at the Collector Substation.

The affected farms for the Grid Connection are:

- Portions 0 and 3 of Farm Klipbank 295
- Portions 0, 1 and 3 of Farm Adrianople 296
- Portions 1 and 2 of Farm Welgelegen 322
- Portion 3 of Farm Klipbank 295

There are four alternatives for the grid connection route as illustrated in Figures 1-2.




Figure 1: Aerial Map of the proposed Grid Connection for the Camden I WEF with the four alternatives as indicated in the legend.




Figure 2: Regional Map of the proposed four alternative routes proposed for the Grid Connection for the Camden I Wind Energy Facility.




Figure 3: Locality map for the Grid Connection for the Camden I WEF with four alternative routes.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the proposed Grid connection for the Camden I Wind Energy Facility. To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit and walkthrough (Phase 2) Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development and is reported herein.

Table 1: Specialist report requirements in terms of Appendix 6 of the EIA Regulations (amended 2017)

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
ai	Details of the specialist who prepared the report	Appendix B
aii	The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Appendix B
b	A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page 2
c	An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
ci	An indication of the quality and age of the base data used for the specialist report: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map accessed – date of this report	Yes
cii	A description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change	Section 5
d	The date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	N/A
e	A description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process	Section 2
f	The specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the activity and its associated structures and infrastructure	Section 4
g	An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	N/A
h	A map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	N/A
i	A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 5
j	A description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives, on the environment	Section 4
k	Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 8, Appendix A

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
l	Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A
m	Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 8, Appendix A
ni	A reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised	Section 6
nii	If the opinion is that the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Sections 6, 8
o	A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A
p	A summary and copies if any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A
q	Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A

2. Methods and Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this study were to undertake a PIA and provide feasible management measures to comply with the requirements of SAHRA.

The methods employed to address the ToR included:

1. Consultation of geological maps, literature, palaeontological databases, published and unpublished records to determine the likelihood of fossils occurring in the affected areas. Sources included records housed at the Evolutionary Studies Institute at the University of the Witwatersrand and SAHRA databases;
2. Where necessary, site visits by a qualified palaeontologist to locate any fossils and assess their importance, as is the case here;
3. Where appropriate, collection of unique or rare fossils with the necessary permits for storage and curation at an appropriate facility (*not applicable to this assessment*); and
4. Determination of fossils' representivity or scientific importance to decide if the fossils can be destroyed or a representative sample collected (*not applicable to this assessment*).

3. Geology and Palaeontology

i. Project location and geological context

The site lies in the northern part of the Karoo basin where the older Karoo Supergroup strata are exposed. Along the rivers and streams much younger reworked sands and

alluvium overly the older strata. Extrusive dolerite of Jurassic age is abundant (Figure 4).




Figure 4: Geological map of the area around the Camden Renewable Energy Cluster with the Camden I WEF area shown within the oval outline. Abbreviations of the rock types are explained in Table 2. Map enlarged from the Geological Survey 1: 250 000 map 2630 Mbabane.

Table 2: Explanation of symbols for the geological map and approximate ages (Johnson et al., 2006). SG = Supergroup; Fm = Formation; Ma = million years; grey shading = formations impacted by the project.

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Q	Quaternary	Alluvium, sand, calcrete	Neogene, ca 2.5 Ma to present
Jd	Jurassic dykes	Dolerite dykes, intrusive	Jurassic, approx. 180 Ma
Pv	Vryheid Fm, Ecca Group, Karoo SG	Shales, siltstone, sandstone, coal seams	Early Permian

The Karoo Supergroup rocks cover a very large proportion of South Africa and extend from the northeast (east of Pretoria) to the southwest and across to almost the KwaZulu Natal south coast. It is bounded along the southern margin by the Cape Fold Belt and along the northern margin by the much older Transvaal Supergroup rocks. Representing some 120 million years (300 – 183Ma), the Karoo Supergroup rocks have preserved a diversity of fossil plants, insects, vertebrates and invertebrates.

During the Carboniferous Period South Africa was part of the huge continental landmass known as Gondwanaland and it was positioned over the South Pole. As a result, there were several ice sheets that formed and melted, and covered most of South Africa. Gradual melting of the ice as the continental mass moved northwards and the earth warmed, formed fine-grained sediments in the large inland sea. These are the oldest rocks in the system and are exposed around the outer part of the ancient Karoo Basin, and are known as the Dwyka Group (Johnson et al., 2006).

Overlying the Dwyka Group rocks are rocks of the Ecca Group that are Early Permian in age. There are eleven formations recognised in this group but they do not all extend throughout the Karoo Basin. In the Free State, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu Natal, from the base upwards are the Pietermaritzburg Formation, **Vryheid Formation** and the Volksrust Formation. All of these sediments have varying proportions of sandstones, mudstones, shales and siltstones and represent shallow to deep water settings, deltas, rivers, streams and overbank depositional environments.

Overlying the Ecca Group are the rocks of the Beaufort Group that has been divided into the lower Adelaide Subgroup for the Upper Permian strata, and the Tarkastad Subgroup for the Early to Middle Triassic strata. As with the older Karoo sediments, the formations vary across the Karoo Basin.

Large exposures of Jurassic dolerite dykes occur throughout the area. These intruded through the Karoo sediments around 183 million years ago at about the same time as the Drakensberg basaltic eruption.

Along the rivers and streams much younger transported sediments have been deposited. They were sourced from older weathered strata upstream (Partridge et al., 2006).

ii. Palaeontological context

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 5. The site for development is in the Vryheid Formation (red; very highly sensitive) and the non-fossiliferous Jurassic dolerite (grey). The latter is an intrusive igneous rock and does not preserve fossils, in fact, dykes can destroy any fossils that were in the rocks through which they have intruded.

The Vryheid Formation is potentially very rich in fossils of the *Glossopteris* flora. This flora includes *Glossopteris* leaves, seeds, roots, stems and reproductive structures, as well as other plants such as lycopods, sphenophytes, ferns, cordaitaleans and early gymnosperms (Plumstead, 1969; Anderson and Anderson, 1985; Bamford, 2004). Coal seams were formed from peats comprising these plants that were altered by heat and pressure to make coal. The coal itself, however, does not preserve any recognisable plant structure, but the shales associated with the seams can preserve recognisable impressions of the ancient plants (Plumstead, 1969).




Figure 5: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the proposed grid connection for the Camden I WEF within the yellow oval. Background colours indicate the following degrees of sensitivity: red = very highly sensitive; orange/yellow = high; green = moderate; blue = low; grey = insignificant/zero.

iii. Site visit observations

A site visit and walk down along the proposed routes for the Camden I WEF facility in April showed that there were no fossils visible on the surface. The whole area has been cultivated for decades and the land is fairly flat with no rocky or shale outcrops and no fossils (Figure 6). The south-eastern route (yellow lines in maps) is more along dolerite than on the Vryheid Formation so it would have less impact on the fossil heritage.

No fossils were seen on the Vryheid Formation as the soils are deep and well-formed.



Camden I Wind Grid & Eskom

Figure 6: Photographs of the site visit for the Grid Connection routes for the Camden WEF I facility. A - typical view of well established cultivated lands along the roads and route. B - one exposure of the soils and erosion down towards a stream. No rocky outcrops and no fossils were seen.

4. Impact assessment

The assessment of impacts and mitigation evaluates the likely extent and significance of the potential impacts on identified receptors and resources against defined assessment criteria, to develop and describe measures that will be taken to avoid, minimise or compensate for any adverse environmental impacts, to enhance positive impacts, and to report the significance of residual impacts that occur following mitigation.

The key objectives of the risk assessment methodology are to identify any additional potential environmental issues and associated impacts likely to arise from the proposed project, and to propose a significance ranking. Issues / aspects will be reviewed and ranked against a series of significance criteria to identify and record interactions between activities and aspects, and resources and receptors to provide a detailed

discussion of impacts. The assessment considers direct¹, indirect², secondary³ as well as cumulative⁴ impacts.

A standard risk assessment methodology is used for the ranking of the identified environmental impacts pre-and post-mitigation (i.e. residual impact). The significance of environmental aspects is determined and ranked by considering the criteria⁵ presented in **Table** .

Table 3: Impact Assessment Criteria and Scoring System

CRITERIA	SCORE 1	SCORE 2	SCORE 3	SCORE 4	SCORE 5
Impact Magnitude (M) The degree of alteration of the affected environmental receptor	Very low: No impact on processes	Low: Slight impact on processes	Medium: Processes continue but in a modified way	High: Processes temporarily cease	Very High: Permanent cessation of processes
Impact Extent (E) The geographical extent of the impact on a given environmental receptor	Site: Site only	Local: Inside activity area	Regional: Outside activity area	National: National scope or level	International: Across borders or boundaries
Impact Reversibility (R) The ability of the environmental receptor to rehabilitate or restore after the activity has caused environmental change	Reversible: Recovery without rehabilitation		Recoverable: Recovery with rehabilitation		Irreversible: Not possible despite action
Impact Duration (D) The length of permanence of the impact on the environmental receptor	Immediate: On impact	Short term: 0-5 years	Medium term: 5-15 years	Long term: Project life	Permanent: Indefinite
Probability of Occurrence (P) The likelihood of an impact occurring in the absence of pertinent environmental management measures or mitigation	Improbable	Low Probability	Probable	Highly Probability	Definite
Significance (S) is determined by combining the above criteria in the following formula:	$[S = (E + D + R + M) \times P]$ $\text{Significance} = (\text{Extent} + \text{Duration} + \text{Reversibility} + \text{Magnitude}) \times \text{Probability}$				

¹ Impacts that arise directly from activities that form an integral part of the Project.

² Impacts that arise indirectly from activities not explicitly forming part of the Project.

³ Secondary or induced impacts caused by a change in the Project environment.

⁴ Impacts are those impacts arising from the combination of multiple impacts from existing projects, the Project and/or future projects.

⁵ The definitions given are for guidance only, and not all the definitions will apply to all the environmental receptors and resources being assessed. Impact significance was assessed with and without mitigation measures in place.

CRITERIA	SCORE 1	SCORE 2	SCORE 3	SCORE 4	SCORE 5
IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE RATING					
Total Score	4 to 15	16 to 30	31 to 60	61 to 80	81 to 100
Environmental Significance Rating (Negative (-))	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
Environmental Significance Rating (Positive (+))	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High

Impact Mitigation

If fossils occur in the footprint of any section of the project, the route for the grid connection (overhead powerline pole foundations/below ground piping), the hydrogen and ammonia facilities, access roads or infrastructure, they can be removed (details in Section 8, Fossil Chance Find Protocol), and the project can continue. If no fossils are found then no mitigation is required.

Once fossils have been removed there will be not further impact on the palaeontological heritage. Therefore the impact is only applicable to the construction phase. The operation and de-commissioning phases will NOT impact the palaeontology.

If fossils are recovered, removed and placed in a recognised institution such as a museum or university palaeontology collection this will be a positive impact because the fossils will be available for research. Otherwise they would have remained unknown to science.

Summary of the Palaeontological Impact of the proposed Camden I WEF associated grid connection.

Palaeontological Impact	M	E	R	D	P	S	Result
Pre-mitigation (loss of fossils)	2	1	3	4	2	20	Low
Post-mitigation (recovery of fossils)	1	1	3	1	6	6	Very low (+ve)
Rehabilitate and restore							

5. Assumptions and uncertainties

Based on the geology of the area and the palaeontological record as we know it, it can be assumed that the formation and layout of the dolomites, sandstones, shales and sands are typical for the country and do contain fossil plant, insect, invertebrate and vertebrate material. The site visit and walk through confirmed that there are no fossils present on the land surface. It is not known if there are any fossils below the land surface. The sands of the Quaternary period and the Jurassic dolerite would not preserve fossils.

6. Recommendation

Based on the fossil record but confirmed by the site visit and walk through, there are NO FOSSILS of the *Glossopteris* flora even though fossils have been recorded from rocks of a similar age and type in South Africa. It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be preserved in the overlying soils and sands of the Quaternary. There is a very small chance that fossils may occur below the ground surface in the shales of the Vryheid Formation (Ecca Group, Karoo Supergroup) so a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. If fossils are found by the environmental officer, or other responsible person once excavations and drilling for foundations and amenities have commenced, then they should be rescued and a palaeontologist called to assess and collect a representative sample. All routes are acceptable as far as the palaeontology is concerned, but Alternative 2 (yellow) has a shorter distance on the Vryheid Formation so would be preferred.

7. References

Anderson, J.M., Anderson, H.M., 1985. Palaeoflora of Southern Africa: Prodrum of South African megafloras, Devonian to Lower Cretaceous. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam. 423 pp.

Bamford, M.K. 2004. Diversity of the woody vegetation of Gondwanan southern Africa. *Gondwana Research* 7, 153-164.

Johnson, M.R., van Vuuren, C.J., Visser, J.N.J., Cole, D.I., Wickens, H.deV., Christie, A.D.M., Roberts, D.L., Brandl, G., 2006. Sedimentary rocks of the Karoo Supergroup. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). *The Geology of South Africa*. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. Pp 461 – 499.

Plumstead, E.P., 1969. Three thousand million years of plant life in Africa. *Geological Society of southern Africa, Annexure to Volume LXXII*. 72pp + 25 plates.

8. Chance Find Protocol

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

1. The following procedure is only required if fossils are seen on the surface and when drilling/excavations commence.
2. When excavations begin the rocks and must be given a cursory inspection by the environmental officer or designated person. Any fossiliferous material (trace fossils, fossils of plants, insects, bone or coalified material) should be put aside in a suitably protected place. This way the project activities will not be interrupted.

3. Photographs of similar fossils must be provided to the developer to assist in recognizing the fossil plants, vertebrates, invertebrates or trace fossils in the shales and mudstones (for example see Figure 6). This information will be built into the EMP's training and awareness plan and procedures.
4. Photographs of the putative fossils can be sent to the palaeontologist for a preliminary assessment.
5. If there is any possible fossil material found by the developer/environmental officer then the qualified palaeontologist sub-contracted for this project, should visit the site to inspect the selected material and check the dumps where feasible.
6. Fossil plants or vertebrates that are considered to be of good quality or scientific interest by the palaeontologist must be removed, catalogued and housed in a suitable institution where they can be made available for further study. Before the fossils are removed from the site a SAHRA permit must be obtained. Annual reports must be submitted to SAHRA as required by the relevant permits.
7. If no good fossil material is recovered then no site inspections by the palaeontologist will be necessary. A final report by the palaeontologist must be sent to SAHRA once the project has been completed and only if there are fossils.
8. If no fossils are found and the excavations have finished then no further monitoring is required.

9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils from the Vryheid Formation



Figure 6: Photographs of fossil plants of the *Glossopteris* flora from the Vryheid Formation. Bottom right shows bones partially exposed, in the field.

10. Appendix B – Details of specialist

Marion Bamford (PhD) **Short CV for PIAs – Jan 2022**

i) Personal details

Present employment: Professor; Director of the Evolutionary Studies Institute.
Member Management Committee of the NRF/DST Centre of
Excellence Palaeosciences, University of the Witwatersrand,
Johannesburg, South Africa

Telephone : +27 11 717 6690
Fax : +27 11 717 6694
Cell : 082 555 6937
E-mail : marion.bamford@wits.ac.za ;
marionbamford12@gmail.com

ii) Academic qualifications

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:

1980-1982: BSc, majors in Botany and Microbiology. Graduated April 1983.

1983: BSc Honours, Botany and Palaeobotany. Graduated April 1984.

1984-1986: MSc in Palaeobotany. Graduated with Distinction, November 1986.

1986-1989: PhD in Palaeobotany. Graduated in June 1990.

iii) Professional qualifications

Wood Anatomy Training (overseas as nothing was available in South Africa):

1994 - Service d'Anatomie des Bois, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren,
Belgium, by Roger Dechamps

1997 - Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France, by Dr Jean-Claude Koeniguer

1997 - Université Claude Bernard, Lyon, France by Prof Georges Barale, Dr Jean-Pierre
Gros, and Dr Marc Philippe

iv) Membership of professional bodies/associations

Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa

Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards

Academy of Sciences of South Africa - Member: Oct 2014 onwards

International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991

International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+

Botanical Society of South Africa

South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016

SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+

PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative

ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+

INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

vii) Supervision of Higher Degrees

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	11	0
Masters	14	1
PhD	11	6
Postdoctoral fellows	12	2

viii) Undergraduate teaching

Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year

Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 25 students per year

Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology;

Micropalaeontology – average 12 - 20 students per year.

ix) Editing and reviewing

Editor: *Palaeontologia africana*: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor

Guest Editor: *Quaternary International*: 2005 volume

Member of Board of Review: *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*: 2010 –

Associate Editor: *Cretaceous Research*: 2018-2020

Associate Editor: *Royal Society Open*: 2021 -

Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 25 local and international journals

x) Palaeontological Impact Assessments

Selected from recent project only – list not complete:

- Mala Mala 2017 for Henwood
- Modimolle 2017 for Green Vision
- Klipoortjie and Finaalspan 2017 for Delta BEC
- Ledjadja borrow pits 2018 for Digby Wells
- Lungile poultry farm 2018 for CTS
- Olienhout Dam 2018 for JP Celliers
- Isondlo and Kwasobabili 2018 for GCS
- Kanakies Gypsum 2018 for Cabanga
- Nababeep Copper mine 2018
- Glencore-Mbali pipeline 2018 for Digby Wells
- Remhoogte PR 2019 for A&HAS
- Bospoort Agriculture 2019 for Kudzala
- Overlooked Quarry 2019 for Cabanga
- Richards Bay Powerline 2019 for NGT
- Eilandia dam 2019 for ACO
- Eastlands Residential 2019 for HCAC
- Fairview MR 2019 for Cabanga
- Graspan project 2019 for HCAC
- Lielifontein N&D 2019 for Enviropro
- Skeerpoort Farm Mast 2020 for HCAC
- Vulindlela Eco village 2020 for 1World
- KwaZamakhule Township 2020 for Kudzala
- Sunset Copper 2020 for Digby Wells
- McCarthy-Salene 2020 for Prescali
- VLNR Lodge 2020 for HCAC
- Madadeni mixed use 2020 for Enviropro

- Frankfort-Windfield Eskom Powerline 2020 for 1World
- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe
- Glosam Mine 2021 for AHSA

Xi) Research Output

Publications by M K Bamford up to January 2022 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 160 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 10 book chapters.

Scopus h-index = 30; Google Scholar h-index = 36; i10-index = 95

Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.