

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

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

FOR THE PROPOSED CAMDEN I GREEN HYDROGEN AND AMMONIA FACILITY, NEAR ERMELO, MPUMALANGA PROVINCE

Type of development:

Hydrogen Facility

Applicant:

Camden Green Energy RF (Pty) Ltd

Report prepared by:



Beyond Heritage

Private Bag X 1049

Suite 34

Modimolle

0510

Tel: 082 373 8491

Fax: 086 691 6461

E-Mail: jaco@heritageconsultants.co.za

Report Author:

Mr. J. van der Walt

Project Reference:

Project number 2181-10

Report date:

June 2022

APPROVAL PAGE

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Green Hydrogen and Ammonia |
| Report Title | Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Camden I Green Hydrogen and Ammonia Facility, Near Ermelo, Mpumalanga Province |
| Authority Reference Number | TBC |
| Report Status | Draft Impact Assessment Report |
| Applicant Name | Camden Green Energy RF (Pty) Ltd |

| | Name | Qualifications and Certifications | Date |
|---|---------------------|---|-------------|
| Report compilation, fieldwork and project Management | Jaco van der Walt | MA Archaeology PhD Candidate ASAPA #159 APHP # 114 | May 2022 |
| Fieldwork | Ruan van der Merwe | BA Hons Archaeology | April 2022 |
| Fieldwork | Nick Fletcher | BA Hons Archaeology | April 2022 |
| Paleontological Report | Prof Marion Bamford | PhD Palaeobotany | May 2022 |

DOCUMENT PROGRESS**Distribution List**

| Date | Report Reference Number | Document Distribution | Number of Copies |
|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 13 June 2022 | 2181-10 | WSP Group Africa (Pty) Ltd | Electronic Copy |
| | | | |
| | | I | |

Amendments on Document

| Date | Report Reference Number | Description of Amendment |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 19 July 2022 | 2181-10 | Technical Revision |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

INDEMNITY AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO THIS REPORT

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT

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

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

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

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

REPORT OUTLINE

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

Table 1. Specialist Report Requirements.

| Requirement from Appendix 6 of GN 326 EIA Regulation 2017 | Chapter |
|--|--|
| (a) Details of - (i) the specialist who prepared the report; and (ii) the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae | Section a |
| (b) Declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority | <i>Declaration of Independence</i> |
| (c) Indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared | Section 1 |
| (cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report | Section 3.4 |
| (cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change; | Section 9 |
| (d) Duration, Date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment | Section 3.4 |
| (e) Description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used | Section 3 |
| (f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of site plan identifying site alternatives; | Section 8 and 9 |
| (g) Identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers | Section 8 and 9 |
| (h) Map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers | Section 8 |
| (I) Description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge | Section 3.7 |
| (j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity including identified alternatives on the environment or activities; | Section 1.3 |
| (k) Mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr | Section 10.1 |
| (l) Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation | Section 10. 1. |
| (m) Monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation | Section 10. 5. |
| (n) Reasoned opinion - (i) as to whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised; (iA) regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and (ii) if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan | Section 10.3 |
| (o) Description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report | Section 5 |
| (p) A summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and | Refer to the EIA report |
| (q) Any other information requested by the competent authority | No other information is requested at this time |

Executive Summary

WSP Group Africa (Pty) Ltd was appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) by Camden Green Energy RF (Pty) Ltd to undertake the required Environmental Authorisation Process for the Green Hydrogen and Ammonia facility on the following properties near Ermelo in Mpumalanga Province:

| Parent Farm | Farm No | Portion No | Owner |
|------------------------------|---------|------------|---------------------------------|
| Indicative Option One | | | |
| Welgelegen | 322 | 1 | Reyneke Hendrik Jackobus Willem |
| Indicative Option Two | | | |
| Welgelegen | 322 | 2 | Reyneke Hendrik Jackobus Willem |

The project forms part of the Camden Renewable Energy Cluster and Beyond Heritage was appointed to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Project. The study area was assessed on desktop level and by a non-intrusive pedestrian field survey and key findings of the assessment include:


- The Project area is characterised by extensive cultivated fields, and livestock farming and is considered to be of low archaeological potential;
- This was confirmed during the field survey and no archaeological sites of significance were noted and finds were limited to ruins and burial sites;
- The fieldwork component was conducted as part of the assessment of the entire Camden Renewable Energy Cluster (i.e., broader study area) providing a thorough understanding of the heritage character of the area and the range of heritage resources expected;
- Two alternatives for the facility, including water pipelines and grid lines are assessed in this report. Importantly, a 250m corridor (on either side of the centre line) of the linear features (grid lines and water pipelines) were assessed, within which the infrastructure may be micro sited. All are acceptable from a heritage point of view as they will not directly impact any known heritage sites;
- This assessment recorded the range of heritage resources expected in the Project area however more sites could be recorded during the pre-construction walkthrough;
- An assessment of the paleontological significance of the area (Bamford 2022) concluded that the impact on palaeontological resources is low and the project should be authorised from a paleontological point of view.

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

Recommendations:

- Implementation of a Chance Find Procedure for the Project (as outlined in Section 10.2).
- The study area should be monitored by the ECO during construction.
- Recorded heritage features should be indicated on development plans and avoided with a 30 m buffer; and
- Prior to construction commencing, the final alignment should be subjected to a heritage walkthrough.

Declaration of Independence

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Specialist Name | Jaco van der Walt |
| Declaration of Independence | <p>I declare, as a specialist appointed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 107 of 1998) and the associated 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations (as amended), that I:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I act as an independent specialist in this application; • I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant; • I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work; • I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity; • I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation; • I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity; • I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority; • All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and • I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act. |
| Signature |  |
| Date | 26/05/2022 |

a) Expertise of the specialist

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| REPORT OUTLINE..... | 4 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 5 |
| DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE | 6 |
| A) EXPERTISE OF THE SPECIALIST..... | 6 |
| ABBREVIATIONS..... | 10 |
| GLOSSARY | 10 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE:..... | 11 |
| 1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE..... | 11 |
| 1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION | 12 |
| 1.3 ALTERNATIVES | 13 |
| 2 LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS | 20 |
| 3 METHODOLOGY | 21 |
| 3.1 LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 21 |
| 3.2 GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY AND GOOGLE EARTH MONUMENTS..... | 21 |
| 3.3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:..... | 21 |
| 3.4 SITE INVESTIGATION..... | 22 |
| 3.5 SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING..... | 24 |
| 3.6 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY..... | 25 |
| 3.7. LIMITATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS OF THE STUDY | 28 |
| 4 DESCRIPTION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT..... | 28 |
| 5 RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: | 28 |
| 6 LITERATURE / BACKGROUND STUDY: | 29 |
| 6.1 LITERATURE REVIEW (SAHRIS) | 29 |
| 7 DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT | 33 |
| 8 FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY..... | 35 |
| 8.1 HERITAGE RESOURCES..... | 35 |
| 8.2 CULTURAL LANDSCAPE..... | 36 |
| 8.3 PALEONTOLOGICAL HERITAGE | 37 |
| 9 POTENTIAL IMPACT | 38 |
| 10 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 40 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 10.1 | RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONDITION OF AUTHORISATION..... | 40 |
| 10.2 | CHANCE FIND PROCEDURES | 41 |
| 10.3 | REASONED OPINION | 42 |
| 10.4 | POTENTIAL RISK | 42 |
| 10.5 | MONITORING REQUIREMENTS | 43 |
| 10.6 | MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR INCLUSION IN THE EMPR | 44 |
| 11 | REFERENCES..... | 46 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| FIGURE 1.1. | REGIONAL SETTING OF THE PROJECT (1: 250 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP)..... | 15 |
| FIGURE 1.2. | LOCAL SETTING OF THE PROJECT (1: 50 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP)..... | 17 |
| FIGURE 1.3. | AERIAL IMAGE OF THE DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT AND SURROUNDS. | 19 |
| FIGURE 3.1. | TRACKLOG OF THE SURVEY PATH IN GREEN. | 23 |
| FIGURE 3.2. | MITIGATION SEQUENCE/HIERARCHY | 27 |
| FIGURE 6.1. | SUMMARY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL EVENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA. | 30 |
| FIGURE 7.1. | GRASS COVER AND EXISTING POWERLINES IN THE STUDY AREA. | 33 |
| FIGURE 7.2. | GENERAL VIEW OF THE STUDY AREA SHOWING THE FLAT TOPOGRAPHY. | 33 |
| FIGURE 7.3. | GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS SHOWING OPEN GRASS LAND USED FOR GRAZING. | 34 |
| FIGURE 7.4. | VIEW OF CULTIVATED FIELDS IN THE STUDY AREA. | 34 |
| FIGURE 8.1. | OBSERVATION POINTS IN RELATION THE PROJECT AREA AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE. | 35 |
| FIGURE 8.2. | EPHEMERAL STONE PACKED WALL AT CA002..... | 36 |
| FIGURE 8.3. | LOCATION OF CA002 IN RELATION TO THE POWERLINE. | 36 |
| FIGURE 8.4. | REMNANTS OF STONE PACKED WALL AT CA012..... | 36 |
| FIGURE 8.5. | PALAEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY OF THE APPROXIMATE STUDY AREA (YELLOW POLYGON) AS INDICATED ON THE SAHRA PALAEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY MAP | 37 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE 1. SPECIALIST REPORT REQUIREMENTS | 4 |
| TABLE 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION | 12 |
| TABLE 3: INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROJECT ACTIVITIES | 12 |
| TABLE 4: SITE INVESTIGATION DETAILS | 22 |
| TABLE 5. HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATINGS | 25 |
| TABLE 6. IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA | 26 |
| TABLE 7. HERITAGE REPORTS CONDUCTED IN THE GREATER STUDY AREA..... | 29 |
| TABLE 9. IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT..... | 39 |
| TABLE 10. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROJECT | 43 |
| TABLE 11. HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR EMPR IMPLEMENTATION | 44 |

ABBREVIATIONS

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

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

GLOSSARY

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

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

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

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

The Iron Age (~ AD 400 to 1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

1 Introduction and Terms of Reference:

Beyond Heritage was appointed to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed green hydrogen and ammonia facility ('Facility'), near Ermelo, Mpumalanga Province (Figure 1.1 to 1.3). The report forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report and Environmental Management Programme Report (EMPr) for the development.

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

During the survey, ruins and cemeteries were recorded in the wider area. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations and site descriptions. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in this report. SAHRA require all environmental documents, compiled in support of an Environmental Authorisation application as defined by NEMA EIA Regulations section 40 (1) and (2), to be submitted to SAHRA for commenting. Upon submission to SAHRA the project will be automatically given a case number as reference. As such the EIA report and its appendices must be submitted to the case as well as the EMPr, once it's completed by the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP).

1.1 Terms of Reference

Field study

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

Reporting

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

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

1.2 Project Description

Project components and the location of the proposed Camden 1 Grid Infrastructure are outlined under Table 2 and 3.

Table 2: Project Description

| Affected Farm Portions | Parent Farm | Farm No | Portion No |
|---|------------------------------|---------|------------|
| | Indicative Option One | | |
| | Welgelegen | 322 | 1 |
| | Indicative Option Two | | |
| | Welgelegen | 322 | 2 |
| Central co-ordinate of the development | 26°39'33.03"S 30° 4'12.43"E | | |
| Topographic Map Number | 2630 CA | | |

Table 3: Infrastructure and project activities

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Type of development | Green Hydrogen Facility |
| Size of development | Approximately 25 hectares |
| Project Components | <p>The Project consist of the following general components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water treatment. • Electrolyser. • Air separator. • Ammonia processing unit. • Liquid air energy system (LAES) for nitrogen storage. • Feedstock and product storage. • Utilities. • Gantry and loading bay. <p>Associated infrastructure further include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical infrastructure required for power supply to the facility. • Temporary and permanent laydown areas required for temporary storage and assembly of components and materials. • Access road/s to the site and internal roads between project components, with a width of up to up to 6m wide respectively. • A temporary concrete batching plant (if necessary). • Temporary staff accommodation. • Fencing and lighting. • Lightning protection. • Telecommunication infrastructure. • Stormwater channels. • Water pipelines. • Offices. • Operational control centre. • Operation and Maintenance Area / Warehouse / workshop. • Ablution facilities. • A gate house. • Control centre, offices, warehouses. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Security building. |
|--|--|

1.3 Alternatives

Two alternatives were provided for assessment as indicated in Figure 1.1 to 1.3. The extent of the area assessed allows for siting of the development to minimize impacts to heritage resources where possible.




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




Figure 1.2. Local setting of the Project (1: 50 000 topographical map).




Figure 1.3. Aerial image of the development footprint and surrounds.

2 Legislative Requirements

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

- National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Act No. 25 of 1999)
- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), Act No. 107 of 1998 - Section 23(2)(b)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Literature Review

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

3.2 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

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

3.3 Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

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

3.4 Site Investigation

The aim of the site visit was to:

- a) survey the proposed project area (including assessment corridor) to understand the heritage character of the area and to record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest;
- b) record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas;
- c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area.

Table 4: Site Investigation Details

| | Site Investigation |
|--------|---|
| Date | 19 - 26 April 2022 and 12 and 13 May |
| Season | Summer/Autumn – The time of the year and season influenced the survey. Archaeological visibility was extremely low due to waterlogged areas after heavy rainfall during the site visit, cultivated fields and dense grass cover. The development footprint was surveyed during the combined field work for the Camden Renewable Energy Cluster (i.e. broader study area) to understand the heritage character of the area and the range of heritage resources expected (Figure 3.1). Areas not covered are mostly located in cultivated fields. |




Figure 3.1. Tracklog of the survey path in green.

3.5 Site Significance and Field Rating

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

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

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

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

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

Table 5. Heritage significance and field ratings

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

3.6 Impact Assessment Methodology

The following sections on impact assessment methodology and mitigation were provided by WSP.

3.6.1 Assessment methodology

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 direct, indirect, secondary as well as cumulative 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 criteria presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Impact Assessment Criteria

| 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: | $[S = (E + D + R + M) \times P]$ $Significance = (Extent + Duration + Reversibility + Magnitude) \times Probability$ | | | | |
| 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 |

3.6.2 Impact Mitigation

The impact significance without mitigation measures will be assessed with the design controls in place. Impacts without mitigation measures in place are not representative of the proposed development’s actual extent of impact and are included to facilitate understanding of how and why mitigation measures were identified. The residual impact is what remains following the application of mitigation and management measures and is thus the final level of impact associated with the development. Residual impacts also serve as the focus of management and monitoring activities during Project implementation to verify that actual impacts are the same as those predicted in this report.

The mitigation measures chosen are based on the mitigation sequence/hierarchy which allows for consideration of five (5) different levels, which include avoid/prevent, minimise, rehabilitate/restore, offset and no-go in that order. The idea is that when project impacts are considered, the first option should be to avoid or prevent the impacts from occurring in the first place if possible, however, this is not always feasible. If this is not attainable, the impacts can be allowed, however they must be minimised as far as possible by considering reducing the footprint of the development for example so that little damage is encountered. If impacts are unavoidable, the next goal is to rehabilitate or restore the areas impacted back to their original form after project completion. Offsets are then considered if all the other measures described above fail to remedy high/significant residual negative impacts. If no offsets can be achieved on a potential impact, which results in full destruction of any ecosystem for example, the no-go option is considered so that another activity or location is considered in place of the original plan.

The mitigation sequence/hierarchy is shown in Figure 3.2 below.




Figure 3.2. Mitigation Sequence/Hierarchy

3.7. Limitations and Constraints of the study

The authors acknowledge that the brief literature review is not exhaustive on the literature of the area. Due to the nature of heritage resources and pedestrian surveys, the possibility exists that some features or artefacts may not have been discovered/recorded and the possible occurrence of graves and other cultural material cannot be excluded. This limitation is successfully mitigated with the implementation of a Chance Find Procedure, pre-construction walkthrough and monitoring of the study area by the Environmental Control Officer (ECO). This report only deals with the footprint area of the proposed development (including the assessment corridors (250m either side of the centre line) for linear features) and consisted of non-intrusive surface surveys, however assessed the broader cadastral portions for the Project and therefore is representative of the entire study area. This study did not assess the impact on medicinal plants and intangible heritage as it is assumed that these components will be highlighted through the public consultation process if relevant. It is possible that new information could come to light in future, which might change the results of this Impact Assessment.

4 Description of Socio-Economic Environment

According to Census 2011, Msukaligwa Local Municipality has a total population of 149 377 people, of which 88,1% are black African, 9,8% are white, 1,1% are Indian/Asian, and 0,6% are coloured. The other population groups make up the remaining 0,3%.

Of those aged 20 years and older, 4,5% have completed primary school, 32,7% have some secondary education, 29,3% have completed matric, 9,6% have some form of higher education, and 12,3% have no form of schooling. According to Census 2011, 41 698 are employed whereas 5 311 are discouraged work-seekers. The unemployment rate is 26,8%. There are 15 267 unemployed people. Of the youth aged 15–34, 20 261 are employed while 10 679 are unemployed. The unemployment rate for the youth is 34,5%.

5 Results of Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

5.1.1 Stakeholder Identification

Adjacent landowners and the public at large were informed of the proposed activity as part of the EIA process by the EAP. Site notices and advertisements notifying interested and affected parties were placed at strategic points and in local newspapers as part of the process. No heritage concerns have been raised thus far.

6 Literature / Background Study:

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

6.1 Literature Review (SAHRIS)

The area under investigation was not previously covered by heritage surveys and few HIA's was conducted in the immediate area. Studies conducted in the general area that were consulted is listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Heritage reports conducted in the greater study area

| Author | Year | Project | Findings |
|-----------------------|------|--|---|
| Van Schalkwyk, L. | 2006 | Heritage Impact Assessment for the Majuba-Umfolozi 765 KV Transmission Line in Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, Pietermaritzburg: eThembeni Cultural Heritage | Ancestral graves; Rock painting sites that were recorded along and below the eastern uKhahlamba escarpment; Stone Age open air sites; Stone walled settlements dating to the Late Iron Age; Battlefields of:- Majuba (1887);- Hlobane (1879); Holkrantz (1879);- Khambula (1879). |
| Fourie, W. | 2008 | Camden Power Station Rail expansion project on portions of the farm Mooiplaats 290 IT and the farm Camden Power Station 329 IT, District Ermelo, Mpumalanga | The remains of a stone ruin were identified at this location. The structure consists of two rooms. Only the foundations and rubble remain of the structure. Recent historic |
| Gaigher, S. | 2011 | First Phase Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Extension to the Camden Ash Disposal Facilities | Small graveyard (5 graves), historic farmland reservoirs, furrows, pathways. |
| Pistorius, J.C.C. | 2011 | Kusipongo Expansion Project: A Heritage Baseline Study for Proposed Adit Positions in a Project Area near the Heyshope Dam to the West of Piet Retief in the Mpumalanga Province of South Africa, KwaZulu-Natal: Environmental Resources Management (South Africa) Pty Ltd (ERM) | A single, historic informal grave with stone dressing. A single square cattle enclosure. Late Iron Age site with stone wall enclosures. historical graveyard demarcated with stone walling. A sandstone bank that may be associated with Stone Age sites. |
| Van Schalkwyk, J. | 2012 | Basic assessment and environmental management programme: Construction of a 132kV transmission Line from the Kliphoeck to Panbult Substation and Kliphoeck to Uitkoms Substation: Mpumalanga Province | Some farmsteads and other farming related features. A number of formal and informal cemeteries |
| Nel, J. & Karodia, S. | 2013 | Heritage Impact Assessment Report Kangra Coal | Historical structures and associated trees, cemeteries, sandstone outcrop with potential for Rock Art |
| Van der Walt, J. | 2015 | Camden Ash Disposal – Grave confirmation study | Four cemeteries and two historical structures as well as stone cairns. |
| Gaigher, S. | 2015 | Report on the Social Consultation Regarding the Relocation of Graves within the Proposed Development Area for the Camden Ash Disposal Facilities | Burial sites (19 graves, 7 graves 2 graves and 5 graves respectively). |
| Van Schalkwyk, J. | 2016 | Cultural Heritage Impact assessment for the planned borrow pits and quarries for the improvement of the national route N2, km 60 (Leiden) to km 87.4 (Camden), Gert Sibande District Municipality, Mpumalanga Province | Historic informal cemetery with more than 35 graves. Three old railway culverts that formed part of the original railroad alignment which was constructed in 1911. An old sheep dip constructed from concrete. |
| Matenga, E. | 2020 | Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed improvements to the existing waste reticulation system at Camden power station in Ermelo, Mpumalanga Province | None |

The Camden power station and associated small town is situated 16km south from Ermelo in Mpumalanga. The archaeological record for the greater study area consists of the Stone Age and Iron Age (Figure 6.1).

South Africa: A short chronology

Early Stone Age: 2 million - 250 000 BP. Hominins producing core and pebble tools, later stages includes handaxes and blades.

Middle Stone Age: 250 000 - 40 000 / 25 000 BP. *Homo Sapiens*. Prepared core techniques, formal tools, points, scrapers and backed artefacts. Occasionally includes bone points and ostrich eggshell fragments and grindstones.

Later Stone Age: 40 000 - 100 BP. Wide range of formal microlithic tools. Ostrich eggshell fragments, beads, rock art.

Ceramic Final Later Stone Age: 2000 BP. Wide range of formal microlithic tools, with thin-walled pottery, with some sites having faunal remains of ovicaprids.

Early Iron Age: 200 - 900 CE. Arrival of Bantu-speaking farmers who lived in sedentary settlements often located next to rivers. They kept livestock, cultivated sorghum, beans and cowpeas. Introduced metallurgy to the region and manufactured thick-walled pottery.

Middle Iron Age: 900 - 1300 CE. Confined to the modern-day Limpopo Province, and associated with early state formation, such as Mapungubwe and associated sites.

Late Iron Age: 1300 - 1840 CE. Marks the arrival of ancestral Eastern Bantu-speaking Nguni and Sotho-Tswana communities. Settlements are often located on or near hilltops for defensive purposes. The Iron Age as an archaeological period ends with the Mfecane, 1820s to 1840s CE. An event that caused major socio-political upheaval.

Historic events

1652: Dutch East India Company establishes refreshment station at modern-day Cape Town.

1658: First slave ships arrive at Table Bay.

1660 - 1793: Various armed conflicts between Khoisan and Europeans, several frontier wars between Europeans, Khoisan and Xhosa communities.

1795 - 1807: First British occupation of the Cape, the Dutch East India Company collapses, and slave trade is abolished.

1808 - 1820: Several frontier wars and first British Settlers arrive.

1820 - 1840: Onset of the Mfecane, abolishment of slavery and slaves are freed at the Cape. Dutch farmers started to migrate towards the interior of South Africa, what will become known as the 'Great Trek'.

1860 - 1880: Discovery of mineral wealth, diamonds and gold. Establishment of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek (ZAR).

1899 - 1902: The South African War.

1910 - 1945: Unification of South Africa, formation of the ANC, World War I and World War II.

BP - Before Present
CE - Common Era

Figure 6.1. Summary of archaeological and historical events in South Africa.

6.1.1 Stone Age

The Stone Age of southern Africa starts when hominins (ancestral to modern-day humans) first started to produce crude tools made with stone. The Earlier Stone Age (2 million - 200 000 years ago) is associated with hominins such as *Homo habilis* and *Homo erectus* (Dusseldorp *et al.* 2013). Mpumalanga currently does not have an extensive ESA archaeological record, at Maleoskop on the farm Rietkloof, only a few ESA artefacts have been found and stone tools consisted of choppers (Oldowan), hand axes, and cleavers (Acheulean) (Esterhuysen & Smith 2007) and some surface scatters have been recorded near Piet Retief (Nel & Karodia 2013).

Middle Stone Age artefacts represents archaic and modern humans that occupied the landscape between 300 000 to 40 000 before present. Later Stone Age occupational sequences reflect San and Khoisan communities from 40 000 years ago until recently (Dusseldorp *et al.* 2013). Although the MSA and LSA has not been extensively studied in Mpumalanga, evidence for these periods has been excavated from Bushman Rock Shelter in the Ohrigstad District (Esterhuysen & Smith 2007; Lombard *et al.* 2012) and it is known that San communities lived near Lake Chrissie as recently as the 1950s (e.g., Schlebusch *et al.* 2016). MSA and LSA surface scatters have also been investigated in the vicinity of Piet Retief, and De Wittekrans nearby Camden is a Later Stone Age archaeological rock art site complex (Nel & Karodia 2013).

6.1.2 Iron Age

The archaeology of farming communities of southern Africa encompasses three phases. The Early Iron Age (200-900 CE) represents the arrival of Bantu-speaking farmers in southern Africa. Living in sedentary settlements often located next to rivers, these farmers cultivated sorghum, beans, cowpeas, and kept livestock. The Middle Iron Age (900-1300 CE) is mostly confined to the Limpopo Valley in southern Africa with Mapungubwe Hill probably representing the earliest 'state' in this region (Huffman 2007).

The Late Iron Age (1300-1840s CE) marks the arrival and spread of ancestral Eastern Bantu-speaking Nguni and Sotho-Tswana communities into southern Africa. The location of Late Iron Age settlements is usually on or near hilltops for defensive purposes. The Late Iron Age as an archaeological period ended by 1840 CE, when the Mfecane caused major socio-political disruptions in southern Africa (Huffman 2007).

Dates from Early Iron Age sites indicated that by the beginning of the 5th century CE Bantu-speaking farmers had settled in the Mpumalanga lowveld. Subsequently, farmers continued to move into and between the lowveld and highveld of Mpumalanga. Iron Age sites such as Welgelegen Shelter, Robertsdrift and Tafelkop situated 50-100 km west of Camden dates from the 12th to the 18th century (Derricourt & Evers 1973; Esterhuysen & Smith 2007).

During the mid-17th century Europeans started to settle in modern-day Cape Town. During and after the conflict caused by the Mfecane (1820-1840), during the reign of king kaSenzangakhona Zulu, known as Shaka, Dutch-speaking farmers started to migrate to the interior regions of South Africa. A period that is marked by various skirmishes and battles between the local inhabitants, Dutch settlers and the British (Giliomee & Mbenga 2007).

6.1.3 Historical context of Camden

Camden power station was commissioned in 1967 (Gaigher 2011; Matenga 2020). However, the nearby town of Ermelo has a rich history. The earliest record for settlers in Ermelo is from 1860, when the area was under the jurisdiction of Zulu-speaking Nhlapo communities (Nhlapo 1945). The construction of the town of Ermelo was initiated by the Dutch Reform Church, which purchased the eastern part of the farm Nootgedacht on 26 May 1879. The town was officially proclaimed on 12 February 1880 by William Owen Lanyon, the Administrator of the Transvaal (Greyling 2017).

6.1.4 Battlefields and war history

Due to the proximity of Ermelo to the Nederlandsche Zuid-Afrikaansche Spoorweg-Maatskappij railway line linking Pretoria with Lourenço Marques (Maputo), the area was subject to various skirmishes during the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902. At the time there were about 100 families residing in the town and many women and children were sent to British concentration camps. In 1901, British troops burnt the town down due to their scorched earth policy, and Ermelo was rebuilt in 1903 (Moody 1977; Pretorius 2000; Van Schalkwyk 2012; Greyling 2017).

6.1.5 Graves and Burial sites

No graves are indicated by the Genealogical Society of South Africa for the study area. The Klipbank cemetery with 21 graves is indicated ~4,6 km to the south of the Project.

7 Description of the Physical Environment

The Project is situated within a rural setting dominated by an agricultural landscape 11km south of Ermelo and directly south of the Camden Power Station between the N2 and N11 highways. The landscape is slightly undulating located in a Grassland Biome and the vegetation is described as eastern highveld grassland dominated by the usual highveld grass composition, including species from the genera *Aristida*, *Digitaria*, *Eragrostis*, *Themeda* and *Tristachya*, with small, scattered rocky outcrops of wiry, sour grasses and some woody species such as *Senegalia caffra*, *Celtis africana*, *Diospyros lycioide* subsp *lycioides*, *Parinari capensis*, *Protea caffra*, *P. welwitschia* and *Englerophytum magalismontanum* (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006). Several perennial rivers that drain into the Vaal to the south of the study area traverse the Project site. Large sections of the area consist of ploughed fields that have been extensively cultivated for several years and other areas are used for grazing, existing infrastructure consist of dirt roads and a powerline. General site conditions are illustrated in Figures 7.1 to 7.4.



Figure 7.1. Grass cover and existing powerlines in the study area. .



Figure 7.2. General view of the study area showing the flat topography.



Figure 7.3. General site conditions showing open grass land used for grazing.



Figure 7.4. View of cultivated fields in the study area.

8 Findings of the Survey

8.1 Heritage Resources

This assessment focusses on the green hydrogen and ammonia facility and associated infrastructure. Fieldwork was conducted for this Project and other Projects in the immediate vicinity that are being evaluated by the proponent. Recorded observations were numbered sequentially with the prefix CA for Camden.

Heritage finds in the in the broader study area (i.e., inclusive of Camden I Solar PV and Camden I & II Wind Energy Facilities) are limited to burial sites and the demolished remains of structures in the greater area (Figure 8.1). The recorded sites in the assessed area are briefly described in Table 8 and general site conditions are indicated in Figure 8.2 – 8.4)




Figure 8.1. Observation points in relation the Project area and associated infrastructure.

| LABEL | LONGITUDE | LATITUDE | DESCRIPTION | SIGNIFICANCE |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| CA002 | 30° 04' 17.9363" E | 26° 39' 18.3757" S | The feature is situated right next to the existing powerline and includes the ephemeral traces of the possible foundation of a stone packed wall over 5 x 5 m. . | Generally Protected C (GP.C) - Low significance |
| CA012 | 30° 03' 19.0655" E | 26° 39' 54.9277" S | The site is historical and consists of the remains of three stone structures one is rectangular and is 20mx13m in size while the other is circular, 4m x4m in size while the third is 12mx9m in size. The site extends over an 80mx50m area and is situated 50m south of a dam. | GP. B - Medium significance |




Figure 8.2. Ephemeral stone packed wall at CA002.



Figure 8.3. Location of CA002 in relation to the powerline.




Figure 8.4. Remnants of stone packed wall at CA012.

8.2 Cultural Landscape

The study area is in a rural setting and characterised by cultivation and agricultural activities with a historical layering consisting of burial sites and the remnants of stone packed structures/ settlements. A more recent industrial element is introduced by the Camden Power Station commissioned in 1967 along with the development of coalmining in the broader region.

8.3 Paleontological Heritage

According to the SAHRA Paleontological map the study area is of zero to very high paleontological significance (Figure 8.4) and an independent study was conducted for this aspect. Bamford (2022) concluded that 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.



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

Figure 8.5. Paleontological sensitivity of the approximate study area (yellow polygon) as indicated on the SAHRA Palaeontological sensitivity map.

9 Potential Impact

Two ruins are recorded in the Project area (Figure 8.1). Based on the current layout, CA002 and possibly CA012 could be impacted on by the proposed project. The heritage significance of the recorded ruins at CA002 is low and CA012 is of medium significance and the sites should be indicated on development plans and avoided during construction. After mitigation the impacts on the recorded features will be low. Impacts to heritage resources without mitigation within the project footprint will be permanent and negative and occur during the construction activities. No impacts are anticipated for operation or decommissioning phases.

Cumulative impacts considered as an effect caused by the proposed action that results from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions. (Cornell Law School Information Institute, 2020). Cumulative impacts occur from the combination of effects of various impacts on heritage resources. The importance of identifying and assessing cumulative impacts is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. In the case of this project, impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable level. However, this and other projects in the area can have a negative impact on heritage sites in the area where these sites have been destroyed unknowingly.

9.1.1 Construction Phase

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

9.1.2 Operation Phase

No impacts are expected during the operation phase.

9.1.3 Decommissioning Phase

No impacts are expected during the decommissioning phase.

9.1.4 Impact Assessment for the Project (construction phase only)

Table 8. Impact assessment of the proposed project.

| Impact number | Aspect | Description | Stage | Character | Ease of Mitigation | Pre-Mitigation | | | | | | | Post-Mitigation | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------|---|--------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------------|----|----|-----|----|----|--------|-----------------|----|----|-----|----|----|--------|
| | | | | | | (M+ | E+ | R+ | D)x | P= | S | Rating | (M+ | E+ | R+ | D)x | P= | S | Rating |
| Impact 1: | Ruins | Destruction or damage to recorded ruins | Construction | Negative | moderate | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 42 | N3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 28 | N2 |
| Significance | | | | | | N3 - Moderate | | | | | | | N2 - Low | | | | | | |

10 Conclusion and recommendations

The Project area is characterised by agricultural activities (mainly grazing and cultivated fields) without any major focal points like pans or hills that would have attracted human occupation in antiquity and is considered to be of low archaeological potential. This was confirmed during the field survey and no archaeological sites of significance were noted and finds were limited to ruins (CA002, CA0012) in the impact area. The impact of the project on the recorded heritage resources can be avoided with micro siting of the project. The project and the assessed alternatives are acceptable from a heritage point of view.

According to the SAHRA Paleontological sensitivity map the study area is of zero to very high paleontological significance (Figure 8.4) and an independent study was conducted for this aspect. Bamford (2022) concluded an assessment of the paleontological significance of the area (Bamford 2022) concluded that the impact on palaeontological resources is low and the project should be authorised from a paleontological point of view. A Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr.

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

10.1 Recommendations for condition of authorisation

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

Recommendations:

- Implementation of a Chance Find Procedure for the Project (as outlined in Section 10.2).
- The study area should be monitored by the ECO during construction.
- Recorded heritage features should be indicated on development plans and avoided with a 30 m buffer;
- Prior to construction commencing, the final layout should be subjected to a heritage walkthrough.

10.2 Chance Find Procedures

10.2.1 Heritage Resources

The possibility of the occurrence of subsurface finds cannot be excluded. Therefore, if during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped, and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find and therefore chance find procedures should be put in place as part of the EMP. A short summary of chance find procedures is discussed below and monitoring guidelines for this procedure are provided in Section 10.5.

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

- If during construction, operations or closure phases of this project, any person employed by the developer, one of its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, or service provider, finds any artefact of cultural significance or heritage site, this person must cease work at the site of the find and report this find to their immediate supervisor, and through their supervisor to the senior on-site manager.
- It is the responsibility of the senior on-site Manager to make an initial assessment of the extent of the find and confirm the extent of the work stoppage in that area.
- The senior on-site Manager will inform the ECO of the chance find and its immediate impact on construction activities. The ECO will then contact a professional archaeologist for an assessment of the finds who will notify the SAHRA.

10.2.2 Monitoring Programme for Paleontology – 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 contractors to assist in recognizing the fossil plants, vertebrates, invertebrates or trace fossils in the shales and mudstones. This information will be built into the EMP's training and awareness plan and procedures.
4. Photographs of the putative fossils can be sent to the palaeontologist for a preliminary assessment.
5. If there is any possible fossil material found by the contractor(s)/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. If required 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 construction has been completed and only if there are fossils.
8. If no fossils are found and the excavations have finished, then no further monitoring is required.

10.3 Reasoned Opinion

The overall impact of the project is considered to be very low and will not adversely affect the cultural resources of the area. Residual impacts can be managed to an acceptable level through implementation of the recommendations made in this report. The socio-economic benefits also outweigh the possible impacts of the development if the correct mitigation measures are implemented for the Project.

10.4 Potential risk

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

10.5 Monitoring Requirements

Periodical monitoring can be conducted by the Environmental Control Officers (ECO). The ECO or other responsible persons should be trained along the following lines:

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

Table 9. Monitoring requirements for the project

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

10.6 Management Measures for inclusion in the EMPr

Table 10. Heritage Management Plan for EMPr implementation

| Area | Mitigation measures | Phase | Timeframe | Responsible party for implementation | Target | Performance indicators (Monitoring tool) |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| General project area | Implement Chance Find Procedure in case possible heritage finds are uncovered | Construction | Throughout the construction phase | EPC Contractor | Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35, 36 and 38 of NHRA | ECO Checklist/Report |
| General project area | Monitoring by the ECO. | Construction | Throughout the construction phase | Applicant EAP | Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35, 36 and 38 of NHRA | ECO Checklist/Report |
| Recorded Heritage resources | Avoid with a 30m bufferzone | Pre Construction and Construction | Throughout the construction phase | Applicant EAP | Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35, 36 and 38 of NHRA | ECO Checklist/Report |
| Final layout | Heritage walkdown | Pre-Construction | Pre-Construction | Applicant/EAP to appoint qualified archaeologist | Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35, 36 and 38 of NHRA | Heritage Statement report |

11 References

Archaeological database, University of the Witwatersrand.

Bamford, M. K. 2022. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed Grid Connection for the Camden I Wind Energy Facility (up to 200MW), west of Camden, Mpumalanga Province

Derricourt, R.M & Michael Evers, T.M.1973. Robertsdrift, an Iron Age site and settlement on the banks of the Vaal and Klip rivers near Standerton, South-Eastern Transvaal. *African Studies* 32:183-193.

Dusseldorp, G. Lombard, M. & Wurz, S. 2013. Pleistocene homo and the updated stone age sequence of South Africa. *South African Journal of Science* 109:1-7.

Esterhuysen, A. & Smith, J. 2007. The Archaeology of Mpumalanga. In: Delius, P. (ed.) *Mpumalanga History and Heritage: Recapturing the Past, Defining the Future* pp: 7-18. KwaZulu-Natal: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Gaigher, S. 2011. First Phase Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Extension to the Camden Ash Disposal Facilities.

Giliomee, H., Mbenga, B. 2007. *New history of South Africa*. Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers.

Greyling, C. 2017. From Apartheid to Democracy: The Emergence of Ultraconservatives in Ermelo 1960-1994. Unpublished MA thesis. University of the Witwatersrand.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age: The archaeology of pre-colonial farming societies in southern Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Lombard, M., Wadley, L., Deacon, J., Wurz, S. Parsons, I. Moleboheng, M. Swart, J. & Mitchell, P.J. 2012. South African and Lesotho Stone Age sequence updated. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 67: 120-144.

Matenga, E. 2020. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed improvements to the existing waste reticulation system at Camden power station in Ermelo, Mpumalanga Province.

Moody, C. 1977. The Russian Red Cross in the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902: the report of a Russian doctor translated by C. Moody. *Historia* 22: 112-129.

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. The vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SANBI, Pretoria.

National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999)

Nel, J. & Karodia, S. 2013. Heritage Impact Assessment Report, Kangra Coal.

Nhlapo, J. M. 1945. The story of AmaNhlapo. *African Studies* 4: 97-101.

Pretorius, F. 2000. The Second Anglo-Boer War: An Overview. *Scientia Militaria: South African Journal of Military Studies* 30: 111-125.

SAHRA. 2007. Minimum Standards: Archaeological And Palaeontological Components Of Impact Assessment Reports.

Schlebusch, C.M. Prins, F. Lombard, M. Jakobsson, M. & Soodyall, H. 2016. The disappearing San of south-eastern Africa and their genetic affinities. *Human Genetics* 135: 1365-1373.

Van Schalkwyk, J. 2016. Cultural Heritage Impact assessment for the planned borrow pits and quarries for the improvement of the national route N2, km 60 (Leiden) to km 87.4 (Camden), Gert Sibande District Municipality, Mpumalanga Province.

Electronic Sources:

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/1508.7> Cited 12 January 2021