

Prepared by



ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA) OF A DEMARCATED SURFACE PORTION ON THE FARM MACHOROGAN 106 FOR THE PROPOSED ANJUTONE PHOTOVOLTAIC POWER PLANT AND POWER LINE DEVELOPMENT, FRANCES BAARD DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

November 2013

Document Version 1 (Draft)

Conducted on behalf of:

Anjutone (Pty) Ltd
AGES Gauteng

Compiled by:

Nelius Kruger (BA, BA Hons. Archaeology Pret.)

Reviewed by:

Daniele Ventura

Although Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd accepts no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd and its directors, managers, agents and employees against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This document contains confidential and proprietary information equally shared between Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd. and Anjutone (Pty) Ltd, and is protected by copyright in favour of these companies and may not be reproduced, or used without the written consent of these companies, which has been obtained beforehand. This document is prepared exclusively for Anjutone (Pty) Ltd and is subject to all confidentiality, copyright and trade secrets, rules, intellectual property law and practices of South Africa.

Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd promotes the conservation of sensitive archaeological and heritage resources and therefore uncompromisingly adheres to relevant Heritage Legislation (National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 as amended, Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance no. 7 of 1925, Excavations Ordinance no. 12 of 1980). In order to ensure best practices and ethics in the examination, conservation and mitigation of archaeological and heritage resources, Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd follows the Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment as set out by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and the CRM section of the Association for South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).

DECLARATION

I, Nelius Le Roux Kruger, declare that –

- I act as the independent specialist;
- I am conducting any work and activity relating to the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the client;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have the required expertise in conducting the specialist report and I will comply with legislation, including the relevant Heritage Legislation (National Heritage Resources Act no. 25 of 1999, Human Tissue Act 65 of 1983 as amended, Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance no. 7 of 1925, Excavations Ordinance no. 12 of 1980), the Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment (SAHRA and the CRM section of ASAPA), regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I have not, 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 declaration are true and correct.



SIGNATURE OF SPECIALIST

Company: Africa Geo-Environmental Services Gauteng (Pty) Ltd.

Date: 30 November 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study on Portion 3 of the farm Machorogan 106, subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plant and Power Line Development in the Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The report includes background information on the area's archaeology, its representation in southern Africa, and the history of the larger area under investigation, survey methodology and results as well as heritage legislation and conservation policies. A copy of the report will be supplied to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and recommendations contained in this document will be reviewed.

The Northern Cape Province is unique in terms of its Stone Age archaeological wealth and the greater Kimberley region and the Ghaap Plateau encompasses a wealth of Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age representations and sites containing rock art are scattered in high concentrations across the landscape. As such, a large number of archaeological and historical studies have been conducted in the Kimberley area. However, the landscape directly surrounding the Machorogan property seems to have been sparsely populated by humans in the past, possibly as a result of the general scarcity of sustainable water sources as well as the absence of hills or outcrops for shelter. One site of archaeological potential was located during the AIA survey of the project footprint area covering approximately **250ha** on Machorogan.

Stone Age:

Low density Middle and Later Stone Age occurrences were documented at a small water pan in the proposed footprint area for the PV development (**Site MGS01: S28.190713°E24.378665°**). However, the site is of low scientific value due to the low density of artefacts and the general loss of context for the artefacts. Even though the impact on the site by the proposed activity is anticipated to be direct and permanent, the significance of the impact on the resource is considered to be low and this impact can be limited to a negligible impact by the implementation of mitigation measures (monitoring) for the sites, if / when required. As such, a careful watching brief monitoring process is recommended for development activities. Should any previously undetected surface of subsurface paleontological or archaeological material be exposed during development activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately.

Iron Age (Farmer Period):

No Iron Age (Farmer Period) occurrences were observed in the survey area.

Historical/ Colonial Period:

No Historical/Colonial Period occurrences were observed in the survey area.

Graves:

No grave or burials were observed in the survey area

Since heritage resources of low significance have been documented in the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line footprint area, a low impact on such resources is anticipated. However, it is recommended that the construction process be monitored around the area where heritage resources have been documented (Site MGS01) in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains. In the opinion of the author of this Archaeological Impact Assessment Report, the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development on Portion 1 of the farm Machorogan 106 may proceed from a culture resources management perspective.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment should be considered where bedrock is to be impacted on and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or vitrified wood be exposed during construction, these objects should be carefully safeguarded and the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA) should be notified immediately so that the appropriate action can be taken by a professional palaeontologist.

It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. Here, care should be taken around rock faces and outcrops in the larger landscape, as rock art is known to occur on these outcrops. Water sources such as salt pans, drainage lines and rivers should also be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible Stone Age deposits. The possible existence of Historical Period resources deriving from the area's more recent history should also be considered. Ultimately, it is essential that the archaeological and cultural heritage of the Northwest Province be respected.

NOTATIONS AND TERMS

Absolute dating:

Absolute dating provides specific dates or range of dates expressed in years.

Archaeology:

The study of the human past through its material remains.

Archaeological record:

The archaeological record minimally includes all the material remains documented by archaeologists. More comprehensive definitions also include the record of culture history and everything written about the past by archaeologists.

Artefact:

Entities whose characteristics result or partially result from human activity. The shape and other characteristics of the artefact are not altered by removal of the surroundings in which they are discovered. In the southern African context examples of artefacts include potsherds, iron objects, stone tools, beads and hut remains.

Assemblage:

A group of artefacts recurring together at a particular time and place, and representing the sum of human activities.

¹⁴C or radiocarbon dating:

The ¹⁴C method determines the absolute age of organic material by studying the radioactivity of carbon. It is reliable for objects not older 70 000 years by means of isotopic enrichment. The method becomes increasingly inaccurate for samples younger than ±250 years.

Ceramic Facies:

In terms of the cultural representation of ceramics, a facies is denoted by a specific branch of a larger ceramic tradition. A number of ceramic facies thus constitute a ceramic tradition.

Ceramic Tradition:

In terms of the cultural representation of ceramics, a series of ceramic units constitutes as ceramic tradition.

Context:

An artefact's context usually consists of its immediate *matrix*, its *provenience* and its *association* with other artefacts. When found in *primary context*, the original artefact or structure was undisturbed by natural or human factors until excavation and if in *secondary context*, disturbance or displacement by later ecological action or human activities occurred.

Culture:

A contested term, "culture" could minimally be defined as the learned and shared things that people have, do and think.

Cultural Heritage Resource:

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

Cultural landscape:

A cultural landscape refers to a distinctive geographic area with cultural significance.

Cultural Resource Management (CRM):

A system of measures for safeguarding the archaeological heritage of a given area, generally applied within the framework of legislation designed to safeguard the past.

Ecofact:

Non artefactual material remains that has cultural relevance which provides information about past human activities. Examples would include remains or evidence of domesticated animals or plant species.

Excavation:

The principal method of data acquisition in archaeology, involving the systematic uncovering of archaeological remains through the removal of the deposits of soil and the other material covering and accompanying it.

Feature:

Non-portable artefacts, in other words artefacts that cannot be removed from their surroundings without destroying or altering their original form. Hearths, roads, and storage pits are examples of archaeological features

GIS:

Geographic Information Systems are computer software that allows layering of various types of data to produce complex maps; useful for predicting site location and for representing the analysis of collected data within sites and across regions.

Historical archaeology:

Primarily that aspect of archaeology which is complementary to history based on the study of written sources. In the South African context it concerns the recovery and interpretation of relics left in the ground in the course of Europe's discovery of South Africa, as well as the movements of the indigenous groups during, and after the "Great Scattering" of Bantu-speaking groups – known as the *mfecane* or *difaqane*.

Impact: A description of the effect of an aspect of the development on a specified component of the biophysical, social or economic environment within a defined time and space.

Iron Age:

Also known as "Farmer Period", the "Iron Age" is an archaeological term used to define a period associated with domesticated livestock and grains, metal working and ceramic manufacture.

Lithic:

Stone tools or waste from stone tool manufacturing found on archaeological sites.

Management / Management Actions:

Actions – including planning and design changes - that enhance benefits associated with a proposed development, or that avoid, mitigate, restore, rehabilitate or compensate for the negative impacts.

Matrix:

The material in which an artefact is situated (sediments such as sand, ashy soil, mud, water, etcetera). The matrix may be of natural origin or human-made.

Megalith:

A large stone, often found in association with others and forming an alignment or monument, such as large stone statues.

Midden:

Refuse that accumulates in a concentrated heap.

Microlith:

A small stone tool, typically knapped of flint or chert, usually about three centimetres long or less.

Monolith:

A geological feature such as a large rock, consisting of a single massive stone or rock, or a single piece of rock placed as, or within, a monument or site.

Oral Histories:

The historical narratives, stories and traditions passed from generation to generation by word of mouth.

Phase 1 CRM Assessment:

An Impact Assessment which identifies archaeological and heritage sites, assesses their significance and comments on the impact of a given development on the sites. Recommendations for site mitigation or conservation are also made during this phase.

Phase 2 CRM Study:

In-depth studies which could include major archaeological excavations, detailed site surveys and mapping / plans of sites, including historical / architectural structures and features. Alternatively, the sampling of sites by collecting material, small test pit excavations or auger sampling is required. Mitigation / Rescue involves planning the protection of significant sites or sampling through excavation or

collection (in terms of a permit) at sites that may be lost as a result of a given development.

Phase 3 CRM Measure:

A Heritage Site Management Plan (for heritage conservation), is required in rare cases where the site is so important that development will not be allowed and sometimes developers are encouraged to enhance the value of the sites retained on their properties with appropriate interpretive material or displays.

Prehistoric archaeology:

That aspect of archaeology which concerns itself with the development of humans and their culture before the invention of writing. In South Africa, prehistoric archaeology comprises the study of the Early Stone Age, the Middle Stone Age and the greater part of the Later Stone Age and the Iron Age.

Probabilistic Sampling:

A sampling strategy that is not biased by any person's judgment or opinion. Also known as statistical sampling, it includes systematic, random and stratified sampling strategies.

Provenience

Provenience is the three-dimensional (horizontal and vertical) position in which artefacts are found. Fundamental to ascertaining the provenience of an artefact is *association*, the co-occurrence of an artefact with other archaeological remains; and *superposition*, the principle whereby artefacts in lower levels of a matrix were deposited before the artefacts found in the layers above them, and are therefore older.

Random Sampling:

A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby randomly selected sample blocks in an area are surveyed. These are fixed by drawing coordinates of the sample blocks from a table of random numbers.

Relative dating:

The process whereby the relative antiquity of sites and objects are determined by putting them in sequential order but not assigning specific dates.

Remote Sensing:

The small or large-scale acquisition of information of an object or phenomenon, by the use of either recording or real-time sensing device(s) that is not in physical or intimate contact with the object (such as by way of aircraft, spacecraft or satellite). Here, ground-based geophysical methods such as Ground Penetrating Radar and Magnetometry are often used for archaeological imaging.

Rock Art Research:

Rock art can be "decoded" in order to inform about cultural attributes of prehistoric societies, such as dress-code, hunting and food gathering, social behaviour, religious practice, gender issues and political issues.

Scoping Assessment:

The process of determining the spatial and temporal boundaries (i.e. extent) and key issues to be addressed in an impact assessment. The main purpose is to focus the impact assessment on a manageable number of important questions on which decision making is expected to focus and to ensure that only key issues and reasonable alternatives are examined. The outcome of the scoping process is a Scoping Report that includes issues raised during the scoping process, appropriate responses and, where required, terms of reference for specialist involvement.

Sensitive:

Often refers to graves and burial sites although not necessarily a heritage place, as well as ideologically significant sites such as ritual / religious places. *Sensitive* may also refer to an entire landscape / area known for its significant heritage remains.

Site (Archaeological):

A distinct spatial clustering of artefacts, features, structures, and organic and environmental remains, as the residue of human activity. These include surface sites, caves and rock shelters, larger open-air sites, sealed sites (deposits) and river deposits. Common functions of archaeological sites include living or habitation sites, kill sites, ceremonial sites, burial sites, trading, quarry, and art sites,

Slag:

The material residue of smelting processes from metalworking.

Stone Age:

An archaeological term used to define a period of stone tool use and manufacture.

Stratigraphy:

This principle examines and describes the observable layers of sediments and the arrangement of strata in deposits

Stratified Sampling:

A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby a study area is divided into appropriate zones – often based on the probable location of archaeological areas, after which each zone is sampled at random.

Systematic Sampling:

A probabilistic sampling strategy whereby a grid of sample blocks is set up over the survey area and each of these blocks is equally spaced and searched.

Tradition:

Artefact types, assemblages of tools, architectural styles, economic practices or art styles that last longer than a phase and even a horizon are describe by the term *tradition*. A common example of this is the early Iron Age tradition of Southern Africa that originated \pm 200 AD and came to an end at about 900 AD.

Trigger: A particular characteristic of either the receiving environment or the proposed project which indicates that there is likely to be an *issue* and/or potentially significant *impact* associated with that proposed development that may require specialist input. Legal requirements of existing and future legislation may also trigger the need for specialist involvement.

Tuyère:

A ceramic blow-tube used in the process of iron smelting / reduction.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
AGES	Africa Geo Environmental Services Gauteng Pty Ltd
ASAPA	Association for South African Professional Archaeologists
AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
BP	Before Present
BCE	Before Common Era
CRM	Culture Resources Management
EIA	Early Iron Age (also Early Farmer Period)
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EFP	Early Farmer Period (also Early Iron Age)
ESA	Earlier Stone Age
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
K2/Map	K2/Mapungubwe Period
LFP	Later Farmer Period (also Later Iron Age)
LIA	Later Iron Age (also Later Farmer Period)
LSA	Later Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age (also Early later Farmer Period)
MRA	Mining Right Area
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act No.25 of 1999, Section 35
PFS	Pre-Feasibility Study
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities
SAFA	Society for Africanist Archaeologists
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Association
YCE	Years before Common Era (Present)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
1 BACKGROUND.....	12
1.1 SCOPE AND MOTIVATION.....	12
1.2 PROJECT DIRECTION	12
1.3 PROJECT BRIEF.....	12
1.4 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	14
1.5 CRM: LEGISLATION, CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT.....	14
1.5.1 <i>Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites</i>	14
1.5.2 <i>Background to HIA and AIA Studies</i>	16
2 REGIONAL CONTEXT	17
2.1 AREA LOCATION	17
2.2 AREA DESCRIPTION: RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT	19
2.3 SITE DESCRIPTION.....	19
3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY	21
3.1 SOURCES OF INFORMATION.....	21
3.1.1 <i>Desktop Study</i>	21
3.1.2 <i>Aerial Representations and Survey</i>	21
3.1.3 <i>Field Survey</i>	21
3.1.4 <i>General Public Liaison</i>	22
3.2 LIMITATIONS.....	22
3.2.1 <i>Access</i>	22
3.2.2 <i>Visibility</i>	22
3.2.3 <i>Limitations and Constraints</i>	25
4 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY	27
4.1 THE STONE AGE.....	28
4.2 THE IRON AGE FARMER PERIOD	29
4.3 HISTORICAL / COLONIAL PERIOD AND RECENT TIMES.....	29
4.4 GRAVES.....	29
5 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT.....	29
5.1 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA	29
5.1.1 <i>The Stone Ages</i>	30
5.1.2 <i>The Iron Age Farmer Period</i>	30
5.1.3 <i>Historical and Colonial Times and Recent History</i>	32
5.2 THE NORTHERN CAPE LANDSCAPE AND KIMBERLEY	32
5.2.1 <i>Previous Heritage Studies</i>	32
<i>Discussion: The Heritage Landscape</i>	35
5.2.2 <i>around Kimberley</i>	35
- <i>Early History and the Stone Ages</i>	35
- <i>A landscape of Rock Art</i>	36
- <i>The Iron Age Farmer Period</i>	37
- <i>The Colonial Period</i>	37
6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	39
6.1 HERITAGE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION.....	39

6.2	CATEGORIES OF SIGNIFICANCE	39
6.3	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS	41
6.3.1	<i>General assessment of impacts on resources</i>	41
6.3.2	<i>Direct impact rating</i>	43
6.3.3	<i>Management actions</i>	44
6.4	SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	45
6.4.1	<i>Site MGS01</i>	45
6.5	DISCUSSION: EVALUATION OF RESULTS	47
7	RECOMMENDATIONS	50
8	GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS	50
9	BIBLIOGRAPHY	52

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Map representation of the proposed footprint area for the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development.	13
Figure 2-1: 1:50 000 Map representation of the location of the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development location (2824AB). The farm Machorogan is indicated in red outline and the proposed project footprint in shaded green.....	18
Figure 2-2: General surroundings on the farm Machorogan in the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development area at the time of the field survey (November 2013). Note surface limestone scatters,	19
Figure 2-3: Aerial imagery providing a regional context for the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line footprint area.....	20
Figure 3-1: Captured screen contents of real time mobile aerial orientation representations employed during the field survey, current field location indicated by blue marker.....	22
Figure 3-2: View of the study area towards the north-west, looking east.....	23
Figure 3-3: View of the study area towards the south.....	23
Figure 3-4: View of grassy plains in a central portion of the study area.....	24
Figure 3-5: View of a dry small water pan in the study area.....	24
Figure 3-6: A drainage line to the south-west of the study area.	25
Figure 3-7: View of general surroundings in an area demarcated for the access road to the proposed Solar Farm area.....	25
Figure 4-1: Map indicating the location of heritage sensitive areas and sites discussed in the text.....	27
Figure 4-2 Lithics on fine grained jasperlite from Site MGS01. Note secondary retouch on the side scraper in the middle.	28
Figure 4-3: View of Site MGS01 along a small water pan.....	29
Figure 5-1: Intrusive breccia containing a Late Stone Age industry. Note the high density of lithics.	35
Figure 5-2: Rock engravings at the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Site.....	36
Figure 5-3: The original title deed for the farm Machorogan c. 1905.....	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Chronological Periods across southern Africa	29
Table 2: Heritage Site Significance Ratings.....	40
Table 3: Impact Assessment Criteria.....	41
Table 4: Direct Impact Assessment Criteria	44
Table 5: Management and Mitigation Actions	44

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Scope and Motivation

AGES Gauteng was commissioned by Anjutone (Pty) Ltd for an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study of Portion 3 of the farm Machorogan 106, subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development in the Dikgatlong Local Municipality, Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The rationale of this AIA is to determine the presence of heritage resources such as archaeological and historical sites and features, graves and places of religious and cultural significance in previously unstudied areas; to consider the impact of the proposed project on such heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the cultural resources management measures that may be required at affected sites / features.

1.2 Project Direction

AGES's expertise ensures that all projects be conducted to the highest international ethical and professional standards. As archaeological specialist for AGES, Mr Neels Kruger acted as field director for the project; responsible for the assimilation of all information, the compilation of the final consolidated AIA report and recommendations in terms of heritage resources on the demarcated project areas. Mr Kruger is an accredited archaeologist and Culture Resources Management (CRM) practitioner with the Association of South African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA), a member of the Society for Africanist Archaeologists (SAFA) and the Pan African Archaeological Association (PAA) as well as a Master's Degree candidate in archaeology at the University of Pretoria.

1.3 Project Brief

The Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plant, known as the Anjutone 2 Solar Park is proposed on surface portions of the farm Machorogan extending over approximately 250ha. In addition, an access road of 1.1km connecting to the R370 regional road is proposed for the development (see Figure 1-1).

The Solar Park will have a maximum generating capacity up to 75 MW. The Solar Park will deliver the electrical energy to the Eskom's "ULCO-Ganspan" 132 kV power line (preferred connection solution). The Eskom power line will loop in and out of the 132 kV busbar of the new on-site substation, via two new sections carrying 132 kV.

Ultimately, the function of the solar plant will be to add new capacity for the generation of renewable electrical energy to the national electricity supply in compliance with the Independent Power Producers (IPP) Procurement Programme and in order to meet the "sustainable growth" of the Northwest Province.




Figure 1-1: Map representation of the proposed footprint area for the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development.

1.4 Terms of Reference

Heritage specialist input into the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is essential to ensure that through the management of change, developments still conserve our heritage resources. Heritage specialist input in EIA processes can play a positive role in the development process by enriching an understanding of the past and its contribution to the present. It is also a legal requirement for certain development categories which may have an impact on heritage resources (Refer to Section 1.5.2.).

Thus, EIAs should always include an assessment of Heritage Resources. The heritage component of the EIA is provided for in the **National Environmental Management Act, (Act 107 of 1998)** and endorsed by section 38 of the **National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA - Act 25 of 1999)**. In addition, the NHRA protects all structures and features older than 60 years (see Section 34 of the Act), archaeological sites and material (see Section 35 of the Act) and graves as well as burial sites (see Section 36 of the Act). The objective of this legislation is to enable and to facilitate developers to employ measures to limit the potentially negative effects that the development could have on heritage resources.

Based hereon, this project functioned according to the following **terms of reference** for heritage specialist input:

- *Provide a detailed description of all archaeological artefacts, structures (including graves) and settlements which may be affected, if any.*
- *Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources within the area.*
- *Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance.*
- *Assess any possible impact on the archaeological and historical remains within the area emanating from the proposed development activities.*
- *Propose possible heritage management measures provided that such action is necessitated by the development.*
- *Liaise and consult with the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).*

1.5 CRM: Legislation, Conservation and Heritage Management

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage Resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

1.5.1 Legislation regarding archaeology and heritage sites

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and their provincial offices aim to conserve and control the management, research, alteration and destruction of cultural resources of South Africa. It is therefore vitally important to adhere to heritage resource legislation at all times.

a. **National Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999, section 35**

According to the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 a historical site is any identifiable building or part thereof, marker, milestone, gravestone, landmark or tell older than 60 years. This clause is commonly known as the "60-years clause". Buildings are amongst the most enduring features of human occupation, and this definition

therefore includes all buildings older than 60 years, modern architecture as well as ruins, fortifications and Iron Age settlements. "Tell" refers to the evidence of human existence which is no longer above ground level, such as building foundations and buried remains of settlements (including artefacts).

The Act identifies heritage objects as:

- objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa including archaeological and palaeontological objects, meteorites and rare geological specimens
- visual art objects
- military objects
- numismatic objects
- objects of cultural and historical significance
- objects to which oral traditions are attached and which are associated with living heritage
- objects of scientific or technological interest
- any other prescribed category

With regards to activities and work on archaeological and heritage sites this Act states that:

"No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority." (34. [1] 1999:58)

and

"No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;*
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;*
- (c) trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or*
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites. (35. [4] 1999:58)."*

and

"No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources agency-

- (a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;*
- (b) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority;*

- (c) *bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals (36. [3] 1999:60)."*

b. Human Tissue Act of 1983 and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies of 1925

Graves 60 years or older are heritage resources and fall under the jurisdiction of both the National Heritage Resources Act and the Human Tissues Act of 1983. However, graves younger than 60 years are specifically protected by the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and the Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies (Ordinance 7 of 1925) as well as any local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws. Such burial places also fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments. Approval for the exhumation and re-burial must be obtained from the relevant Provincial MEC as well as the relevant Local Authorities.

1.5.2 Background to HIA and AIA Studies

South Africa's unique and non-renewable archaeological and palaeontological heritage sites are 'generally' protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999, section 35) and may not be disturbed at all without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority. Heritage sites are frequently threatened by development projects and both the environmental and heritage legislation require impact assessments (HIAs & AIAs) that identify all heritage resources in areas to be developed. Particularly, these assessments are required to make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact of the sites. HIAs and AIAs should be done by qualified professionals with adequate knowledge to (a) identify all heritage resources including archaeological and palaeontological sites that might occur in areas to be developed and (b) make recommendations for protection or mitigation of the impact on the sites.

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999, section 38) provides guidelines for Cultural Resources Management and prospective developments:

"38. (1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as:

- (a) *the construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;*
- (b) *the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;*
- (c) *any development or other activity which will change the character of a site:*
 - (i) *exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or*
 - (ii) *involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or*
 - (iii) *involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or*
 - (iv) *the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;*
- (d) *the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or*
- (e) *any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority,*

must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources

authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.”

And:

“The responsible heritage resources authority must specify the information to be provided in a report required in terms of subsection (2)(a): Provided that the following must be included:

- (a) The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;
- (b) an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in section 6(2) or prescribed under section 7;
- (c) an assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;
- (d) an evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;
- (e) the results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;
- (f) if heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and
- (g) plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development (38. [3] 1999:64).”

Consequently, section 35 of the Act requires Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) or Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) to be done for such developments in order for all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetic, architectural, historic, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance to be protected. Thus any assessment should make provision for the protection of all these heritage components, including archaeology, shipwrecks, battlefields, graves, and structures older than 60 years, living heritage, historical settlements, landscapes, geological sites, palaeontological sites and objects.

2 REGIONAL CONTEXT

2.1 Area Location

The Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development area is located on Portion 3 of the farm Machorogan 106, generally at **S28.193606° E24.380238° (1:50 000 Map Reference 2824AB)**. The farm is situated in the Dikgatlong Local Municipality, Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. The project area is situated 70 kilometres northwest of the town of Kimberley on the R370 regional road which connects to the towns of Delportshoop and Jan Kempdorp (see Figure 2-1).




Figure 2-1: 1:50 000 Map representation of the location of the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development location (2824AB). The farm Machorogan is indicated in red outline and the proposed project footprint in shaded green.

2.2 Area Description: Receiving Environment¹

The development site lies within the Savanna biome which is the largest biome in Southern Africa. It is characterized by a grassy ground layer and a distinct upper layer of woody plants (trees and shrubs). The environmental factors delimiting the biome are complex and include altitude, rainfall, geology and soil types, with rainfall being the major delimiting factor. Fire and grazing also keep the grassy layer dominant. The most recent classification of the area by Mucina & Rutherford shows that the northern mountainous section of the site is classified as Ghaap Plateau Vaalbosveld, while the remainder of the site is classified as Schmidtsdrif Thornveld. The landscape features of the Schmidtsdrif Thornveld vegetation type are mostly a closed shrubby thornveld dominated by *Acacia mellifera* and *A. tortilis*. Apart from grasses, bulbous and annual herbaceous plant species are also prominent. The vegetation is sometimes very disturbed due to overgrazing. Surface limestone of Tertiary to Recent age and fine and coarse-grained dolomite, chert and dolomitic limestone with prominent interbedded chert, limestone and banded ironstone (Ghaap Plateau Formation, Campbell Group) Soils associated with the site are mostly shallow Mispah or Glenrosa soil forms associated with dolomitic limestone, chert or calcrete.



Figure 2-2: General surroundings on the farm Machorogan in the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development area at the time of the field survey (November 2013). Note surface limestone scatters,

2.3 Site Description

The footprint area of the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development is situated on a portion of the farm Machorogan which is delimited by the Eskom " ULCO-Ganspan 1 "power line to the north-west and the R370 road to the south-east. The footprint will cover a surface area of up to 250ha of the total farm area of 850ha. A few dry water pans and drainage lines occur in the area and the majority of the footprint area is lettered with surface limestone occurrences.

The site is well suited for the installation of a photovoltaic power plant, primarily since it is flat and radiation conditions are favourable; allowing for a high rate of electric energy production. The current land-use of the proposed development site is grazing by livestock and game. Neighbouring farms are being used for livestock grazing and game farming, with some isolated crop cultivation further away from the site in the deeper soils

¹ See HENNING 2013, AN ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT ON THE ECOLOGY (FLORA AND FAUNA) FOR THE FOR THE PROPOSED RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION PROJECT ON PORTION 3 OF THE FARM MACHOROGAN 106.

adjacent to the rivers where water is available for irrigation.




Figure 2-3: Aerial imagery providing a regional context for the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line footprint area

3 METHOD OF ENQUIRY

3.1 Sources of Information

Data from detailed desktop, aerial and field studies were employed in order to sample surface areas systematically and to ensure a high probability of heritage site recording.

3.1.1 Desktop Study

A desktop study was prepared in order to contextualize the proposed project within a larger historical milieu. The study focused on relevant previous studies, archaeological and archival sources, aerial photographs, historical maps and local histories, all pertaining to the Kimberley area and the larger landscape of this section of the Northern Cape Province.

3.1.2 Aerial Representations and Survey

Aerial photography is often employed to locate and study archaeological sites, particularly where larger scale area surveys are performed. This method was applied to great success in the pedestrian survey at for the project where contour lines of elevations, depressions, variation in vegetation, soil marks and landmarks were examined. Specific attention was given to shadow sites (shadows of walls or earthworks which are visible early or late in the day), crop mark sites (crop mark sites are visible because disturbances beneath crops cause variations in their height, vigour and type) and soil marks (e.g. differently coloured or textured soil (soil marks) might indicate ploughed-out burial mounds). Attention was also given to moisture differences, as prolonged dampening of soil as a result of precipitation frequently occurs over walls or embankments (see Figure 2-3). By superimposing high frequency aerial photographs with images generated with Google Earth, potential sensitive areas were subsequently identified, geo-referenced and transferred to a handheld GPS device. In addition, based on existing knowledge of the local heritage landscape, the corridor was divided into smaller survey zones centred around areas of higher site catchment probability (where human activity was likely to occur in prehistoric and historic times e.g. around water sources, near soils fit for agriculture, on ridges). These survey zones were then transferred to a handheld GPS device. These areas served as referenced points from where further vehicular and pedestrian surveys were carried out.

3.1.3 Field Survey

Archaeological survey implies the systematic procedure of the identification of archaeological sites. An archaeological survey of the footprint proposed for the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development was conducted in November 2013. The process encompassed a systematic field survey in accordance with standard archaeological practice by which heritage resources are observed and documented. In order to sample surface areas systematically and to ensure a high probability of site recording the corridor was systematically surveyed on foot and by motor vehicle, GPS reference points were visited and random spot checks were made (see detail in previous section). Using a Garmin E-trex Legend GPS objects and structures of archaeological / heritage value were recorded and photographed with a Canon 450D Digital camera. Real time aerial orientation, by means of a mobile Google Earth application was also employed to investigate possible disturbed areas during the survey.




Figure 3-1: Captured screen contents of real time mobile aerial orientation representations employed during the field survey, current field location indicated by blue marker.

As most archaeological material occur in single or multiple stratified layers beneath the soil surface, special attention was given to disturbances, both man-made such as roads and clearings, as well as those made by natural agents such as burrowing animals and erosion.

3.1.4 General Public Liaison

Correspondence with the owner of Machorogan provided information on the general history of the area, possible locations of heritage resources and brief commentaries on the recent history of the farm. He pointed to the fact that, according to his knowledge, no heritage resources was present on the farm portion subject to this AIA Study.

3.2 Limitations

3.2.1 Access

Portion 3 of the farm Machorogan is accessed via a number of farm roads through Portion 5 to the north, which in turn connects to the R370 regional road from the town of Delportshoop. Access control is applied to the farm portion relevant to this assessment but no restrictions were encountered during the site visit as the author of this report was accompanied by the owner of the farm. Here, a small farm service road provided vehicular access to most areas within the demarcated footprint area.

3.2.2 Visibility

The surrounding vegetation in the Kimberley area is mostly comprised out of mixed grasslands and scattered trees with the occurrence of semi-arid succulents in places. The general visibility at the time of the AIA survey (November 2013) was moderate to high as a result of a prolonged dry season affecting surface vegetation cover. In addition, certain sections on the property seem to have been altered by past agriculture activities (see Figures 3-1 to 3-5). In single cases during the survey sub-surface inspection was possible. Where applied, this revealed

no archaeological deposits.



Figure 3-2: View of the study area towards the north-west, looking east.



Figure 3-3: View of the study area towards the south.



Figure 3-4: View of grassy plains in a central portion of the study area.



Figure 3-5: View of a dry small water pan in the study area.



Figure 3-6: A drainage line to the south-west of the study area.



Figure 3-7: View of general surroundings in an area demarcated for the access road to the proposed Solar Farm area.

3.2.3 Limitations and Constraints

The pedestrian site survey for the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development AIA primarily focused around areas tentatively identified as sensitive and of high heritage probability (i.e. those noted during the aerial survey) as well as areas of high human settlement catchment.

- **Survey Time and Extent:** At the request of the property owner, the author of this report was accompanied by the owner during the site survey and this restricted free movement in the area. This also resulted in time restrictions in terms of the site survey, which proved to be a constraint due to the relatively large surface extent of the footprint area. Therefore, pedestrian site surveys focused around areas tentatively identified as sensitive (i.e. along drainage lines and those noted during the aerial survey) during aerial surveys.

Even though it might be assumed that survey findings are representative of the heritage landscape of the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development, it should be stated that the possibility exists that individual sites could be missed due to the localised nature of some heritage remains as well as the possible presence of sub-surface archaeology. Therefore, maintaining due cognisance of the integrity and accuracy of the archaeological survey, it should be stated that the heritage resources identified during the study do not necessarily represent all the heritage resources present in the project area. The subterranean nature of some archaeological sites, dense vegetation cover and visibility constraints sometimes distort heritage representations and any additional heritage resources located during consequent development phases must be reported to the Heritage Resources Authority or an archaeological specialist.

4 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY




Figure 4-1: Map indicating the location of heritage sensitive areas and sites discussed in the text

4.1 The Stone Age

A single Stone Age site was identified in areas directly associated with the proposed footprint for the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development. The site was arbitrarily coded “MGS” (“Machorogan Stone Age”). It is highly likely that further Middle and Later Stone Age scatters will occur in the area, specifically along drainage lines and water sources

- **Site MGS01 S28.190713°E24.378665°**

Individual Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Later Stone Age (LSA) occurrences in low densities were observed in association with a small water pan in a central portion of the study area. The density of the scatter was arbitrarily estimated by placing a one-meter drawing frame, sub-divided into quadrants, on a randomly-selected area displaying higher amounts of surface lithics. By plotting the counts of all lithic elements present in the 1x1 metre square relative density per m² was established and rated on a scale of low (<10), medium (10-20) and high (>20). This method has been adapted as expedient and non-invasive sampling technique that is particularly useful in value assessment of lithic occurrences during Phase 1 AIA's (see Van Der Ryst 2012). The artefacts are mostly constituted out of debris flakes but single formals stone tools such as side scrapers, produced on fine grained specularite and jaspilite were recorded. Some of the tools display secondary retouch. Similar Stone Age scatters occur frequently in this area towards the Ghaap Plateau and around water pans and drainage lines (see Section 5.2). The location of this Stone Age occurrence thus corresponds with a general regional Stone Age site distribution pattern where archaeological sites in the landscape occur near water sources close to local sources of rare raw materials in lithic manufacture. The deposition pattern and stratigraphy as observed at this site and elsewhere in erosion gullies and around pans imply that the lithic scatters in this landscape occur mainly as a single horizon within a shallow superficial limestone formation. Typologically, the artefacts can tentatively attribute to the Middle and Later Stone Ages when compared to similar recorded assemblages in the area and the larger landscape (e.g. Beaumont & Morris 1990). The site is of limited significance due to the general loss of artefact context and the low density of formal tools.



Figure 4-2 Lithics on fine grained jasperite from Site MGS01. Note secondary retouch on the side scraper in the middle.



Figure 4-3: View of Site MGS01 along a small water pan.

4.2 The Iron Age Farmer Period

No Iron Age (Farmer Period) occurrences were observed in the survey area.

4.3 Historical / Colonial Period and recent times

No Historical / Colonial Period occurrences were observed in the survey area.

4.4 Graves

No graves or burial sites were observed in the survey area.

5 ARCHAEO-HISTORICAL CONTEXT

5.1 The archaeology of Southern Africa

Archaeology in southern Africa is typically divided into two main fields of study, the **Stone Age** and the **Iron Age** or **Farmer Period**. The following table provides a concise outline of the chronological sequence of periods, events, cultural groups and material expressions in Southern African pre-history and history.

Table 1 Chronological Periods across southern Africa

Period	Epoch	Associated cultural groups	Typical Material Expressions
Early Stone Age 2.5m – 250 000 YCE	Pleistocene	Early Hominins: <i>Australopithecines</i> <i>Homo habilis</i> <i>Homo erectus</i>	Typically large stone tools such as hand axes, choppers and cleavers.
Middle Stone Age 250 000 – 25 000 YCE	Pleistocene	First <i>Homo sapiens</i> species	Typically smaller stone tools such as scrapers, blades and points.
Late Stone Age	Pleistocene /	<i>Homo sapiens sapiens</i>	Typically small to minute stone tools such as arrow

20 000 BC – present	Holocene	including San people	heads, points and bladelets.
Early Iron Age / Early Farmer Period 300 – 900 AD	Holocene	First Bantu-speaking groups	Typically distinct ceramics, bead ware, iron objects, grinding stones.
Middle Iron Age (Mapungubwe / K2) / early Later Farmer Period 900 – 1350 AD	Holocene	Bantu-speaking groups, ancestors of present-day groups	Typically distinct ceramics, bead ware and iron / gold / copper objects, trade goods and grinding stones.
Late Iron Age / Later Farmer Period 1400 AD -1850 AD	Holocene	Various Bantu-speaking groups including Venda, Thonga, Sotho-Tswana and Zulu	Distinct ceramics, grinding stones, iron objects, trade objects, remains of iron smelting activities including iron smelting furnace, iron slag and residue as well as iron ore.
Historical / Colonial Period ±1850 AD – present	Holocene	Various Bantu-speaking groups as well as European farmers, settlers and explorers	Remains of historical structures e.g. homesteads, missionary schools etc. as well as, glass, porcelain, metal and ceramics.

5.1.1 The Stone Ages

- The Earlier Stone Age (ESA)

Earlier Stone Age deposits typically occur on the flood-plains of perennial rivers and may date to between 2 million and 250 000 years ago. These ESA open sites sometimes contain stone tool scatters and manufacturing debris ranging from pebble tool choppers to core tools such as handaxes and cleavers. These stone tools were made by the earliest hominins. These groups seldom actively hunted and relied heavily on the opportunistic scavenging of meat from carnivore fill sites.

- The Middle Stone Age (MSA)

The majority of Middle Stone Age (MSA) sites occur on flood plains and sometimes in caves and rock shelters. Sites usually consist of large concentrations of knapped stone flakes such as scrapers, points and blades and associated manufacturing debris. Tools may have been hafted but organic materials, such as those used in hafting, seldom remain preserved in the archaeological record. Limited drive-hunting activities are also associated with the MSA.

- The Later Stone Age (LSA)

Sites dating to the Later Stone Age (LSA) are better preserved in rock shelters, although open sites with scatters of mainly stone tools can occur. Well-protected deposits in shelters allow for stable conditions that result in the preservation of organic materials such as wood, bone, hearths, ostrich eggshell beads and even bedding material. By using San (Bushman) ethnographic data a better understanding of this period is possible. South African rock art is also associated with the LSA.

5.1.2 The Iron Age Farmer Period

- Early Iron Age (Early Farming Communities)

The Early Iron Age (also Early Farmer Period) marks the movement of Bantu speaking farming communities into South Africa at around 200 A.D. These groups were agro-pastoralists that settled in the vicinity of water in order to provide subsistence for their cattle and crops. Artefact evidence from Early Farmer Period sites is mostly found in the form of ceramic assemblages and the origins and archaeological identities of this period are largely based upon ceramic typologies and sequences, where diagnostic pottery assemblages can be used to infer group identities and to trace movements across the landscape. Early Farmer Period ceramic traditions are classified by some scholars into different “streams” or trends in pot types and decoration that, over time emerged in southern Africa. These “streams” are identified as the Kwale Branch (east), the Nkope Branch (central) and the

Kalundu Branch (west). More specifically, in the northern regions of South Africa at least three settlement phases have been distinguished for prehistoric Bantu-speaking agropastoralists. The first phase of the Early Iron Age, known as Happy Rest (named after the site where the ceramics were first identified), is representative of the Western Stream of migrations, and dates to AD 400 - AD 600. The second phase of Diamant is dated to AD 600 - AD 900 and was first recognized at the eponymous site of Diamant in the western Waterberg. The third phase, characterised by herringbone-decorated pottery of the Eiland tradition, is regarded as the final expression of the Early Iron Age (EIA) and occurs over large parts of the North West Province, Northern Province, Gauteng and Mpumalanga. This phase has been dated to about AD 900 - AD 1200. Early Farmer Period ceramics typically display features such as large and prominent inverted rims, large neck areas and fine elaborate decorations. The Early Iron Age continued up to the end of the first millennium AD.

- **Middle Iron Age / K2 Mapungubwe Period (early Later Farming Communities)**

The onset of the middle Iron Age dates back to ± 900 AD, a period more commonly known as the Mapungubwe / K2 phase. These names refer to the well known archaeological sites that are today the pinnacle of South Africa's Iron Age heritage. The inhabitants of K2 and Mapungubwe, situated on the banks of the Limpopo, were agriculturalists and pastoralists and were engaged in extensive trade activities with local and foreign traders. Although the identity of this Bantu-speaking group remains a point of contestation, the Mapungubwe people were the first state-organized society southern Africa has known. A considerable amount of golden objects, ivory, beads (glass and gold), trade goods and clay figurines as well as large amounts of potsherds were found at these sites and also appear in sites dating back to this phase of the Iron Age. Ceramics of this tradition take the form of beakers with upright sides and decorations around the base (K2) and shallow-shouldered bowls with decorations as well as globular pots with long necks. (Mapungubwe). The site of Mapungubwe was deserted at around 1250 AD and this also marks the relative conclusion of this phase of the Iron Age.

- **Later Iron Age (Later Farming Communities)**

The late Iron Age of southern Africa marks the grouping of Bantu speaking groups into different cultural units. It also signals one of the most influential events of the second millennium AD in southern Africa, the difaqane. The difaqane (also known as "the scattering") brought about a dramatic and sudden ending to centuries of stable society in southern Africa. Reasons for this change was essentially the first penetration of the southern African interior by Portuguese traders, military conquests by various Bantu speaking groups primarily the ambitious Zulu King Shaka and the beginning of industrial developments in South Africa. Different cultural groups were scattered over large areas of the interior. These groups conveyed with them their customs that in the archaeological record manifest in ceramics, beads and other artefacts. This means that distinct pottery typologies can be found in the different late Iron Age groups of South Africa.

- **Bantu Speaking Groups in the South African interior**

It should be noted that terms such as "Nguni", "Sotho", "Venda" and others refer to broad and comprehensive language groups that demonstrated similarities in their origins and language. It does not imply that these Nguni / Sotho groups were homogeneous and static; they rather moved through the landscape and influenced each other in continuous processes marked by cultural fluidity.

Ethnographers generally divide major Bantu-speaking groups of southern Africa into two broad linguistic groups, the Nguni and the Sotho with smaller subdivisions under these two main groups. Nguni groups were found in the eastern parts of the interior of South Africa and can be divided into the northern Nguni and the southern Nguni. The various Zulu and Swazi groups were generally associated with the northern Nguni whereas the southern Nguni comprised the Xhosa, Mpondo, Thembu and Mpondomise groups. The same geographically based

divisions exist among Sotho groups where, under the western Sotho (or Tswana), groups such as the Rolong, Hurutshe, Kwena, Fokeng and Kgatla are found. The northern Sotho included the Pedi and amalgamation of smaller groups united to become the southern Sotho group or the Basutho. Other smaller language groups such as the Venda, Lemba and Tshonga Shangana transpired outside these major entities but as time progressed they were, however to lesser or greater extent influenced and absorbed by neighbouring groups.

5.1.3 Historical and Colonial Times and Recent History

The Historical period in southern Africa encompasses the course of Europe's discovery of South Africa and the spreading of European settlements along the East Coast and subsequently into the interior. In addition, the formation stages of this period are marked by the large scale movements of various Bantu-speaking groups in the interior of South Africa, which profoundly influenced the course of European settlement. Finally, the final retreat of the San and Khoekhoen groups into their present-day living areas also occurred in the Historical period in southern Africa.

5.2 The Northern Cape Landscape and Kimberley

The history of the Northern Cape Province is reflected in a rich archaeological landscape, mostly dominated by Stone Age and Colonial Period occurrences. Numerous sites, documenting Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age habitation occur across the landscape, mostly in open air locales or in sediments alongside rivers or pans. In addition, a wealth of Later Stone Age rock art sites, most of which are in the form of rock engravings are to be found in the larger landscape. These sites occur on hilltops, slopes, rock outcrops and occasionally in river beds. Sites dating to the Iron Age occur in the north eastern part of the Northwest Province but environmental factors delegated that the spread of Iron Age farming westwards from the 17th century was constrained mainly to the area east of the Langeberg Mountains. However, evidence of an Iron Age presence as far as the Upington area in the eighteenth century occurs in the larger landscape area. Moving into recent times, the archaeological record reflects the development of a rich colonial frontier, characterised by, amongst others, a complex industrial archaeological landscape such as mining developments at Kimberley, which herald the modern era in South African history. Finally, the Northern Cape Province saw a number of war conflicts, particularly the Anglo Boer War (or the South African War) left behind the remnants of battlefields, skirmishes and concentration camps.

5.2.1 Previous Heritage Studies

A large number of heritage studies have been conducted in the larger Kimberley area. Most of these studies have emanated from Impact Assessment measures for EIA purposes commissioned by the private sector. Some of the studies include:

- Beaumont, P.B. 2002. Archaeological Report: Construction of a Temporary Bridge across the Vaal River at Windsorton, Erf 1, for Floodplain (Island) Diamond Reclamation.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2005a. Archaeological Impact Assessment of a Portion of the Remnant of Farm 225, near Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2005b. Archaeological Impact Assessment of a Portion of the Delportshoop Commonage, Northern Cape.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2006. Phase 1 Heritage Assessment Report on Portion 4 of the Farm Slypklip North 32, Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2007a. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on Parts of Portion 2 and the Remainder of the Farm Holsdam 229 near Barkly West, Frances Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.

- Beaumont, P.B. 2007b. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on the Farm Eureka 200 near Kimberley, Francis Baard District Municipality, Northern Cape Province.
- Beaumont, P.B. 2008. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on the Proposed Northgate Housing development on Portions of the Original Farm Roode Pan 70, near Kimberley in the Sol Plaatjie Municipality of the Northern Cape Province.
- Dreyer, C.2003. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Pipeline Installed at Hanover, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2005a. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farm Riverside 208, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2005b. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farms Melkvei 221 and Longlands 231, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2005c. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Development on Erven 687 and 711, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2006a. First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Developments at the Big Hole, Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2006b. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farm Winter's Rush (Longlands 350), Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2006c. Archaeological and Historical Investigation of the Proposed Diamond Mining Activities at the Farm Holpan 161, Barkly West, Northern Cape.
- Dreyer, C. 2008. Archaeological and Culture Historical Assessment of the proposed Residential Developments at Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Henderson, Z.L. 2003. Archaeological Survey of Van Aswegenshoek 134.
- Morris, D. 2001. Report on Historical Rubbish Midden at Kamfersdam.
- Morris, D. 2002. Report on an Inspection of Cemeteries at Sydney-on-Vaal.
- Morris, D. 2003a. Archaeological Survey of the Farm Koodoosberg No 141.
- Morris, D. 2003b. Archaeological Impact Assessment Rietputs 15, Windsorton.
- Morris, D. 2005a. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of the so-called 'Kemo Dump' (National Site Number 2824DB039) on Remainder of Erf 5024, Erf 6376 and Erf 5058, Vooruitzicht 81, Kimberley, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2005b. Site Visit to Inspect Cultural Material on the Mine Debris Dumps adjacent to the Kimberley Mine at the Site of the Proposed Hotel.
- Morris, D. 2005c. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment for De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd (Contract 0616-AC-244-05) to evaluate Heritage Resources on properties as Indicated.
- Morris, D. 2005d. Archaeological Impact Assessment of Abrahams Fontein near Plooyburg, Northern Cape
- Morris, D. 2005e. Archaeological Impact Assessment at Taaibosch Fontein near Plooyburg, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2005f. Archaeological Impact Assessment on the Claim of Mr. Medwyn Jacobs, Erf 86, near Barkley West.
- Morris, D. 2005g. Archaeological Impact Assessment on Windsorton, Erf 1, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2006a. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of a Proposed Clay Quarry at Roodepan 70, Kimberley, Northern Cape, NC30/5/1/3/3/2/1/358EM.
- Morris, D.2006b. Site Visit to Inspect an Area of Proposed Debris Washing along Kenilworth Road, on Erven 14741, in the Magisterial District of Kimberley.
- Morris, D. 2006c. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of Proposed Prospecting on Uitkyk 106, Locks Verdriet 105 and Brakpan 107, West of Kimberley, Northern Cape.

- Morris, D. 2006d. Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment on Portion 20 Mosesberg, near Schmidtsdrift, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2006e. Archaeological Impact Assessment on the Claim of Mr. Setlhabi at Waldeck's Plant, Pniel, near Barkley West, Northern Cape.
- Morris, D. 2007. Archaeological Impact Assessment at Longlands 350 near Barkly West, Northern Cape: Collective Application List of E. Nyanyiwa.
- Nel, J. (Archaic Heritage Project Management). 2008. Final Report: Heritage Resources Scoping and Preliminary Assessment. Transnet Freight Line EIA, Eastern Cape and Northern Cape.
- Nelson, C. 2007. Upgrading of the TR502 Road, Barkly West Magisterial District, Northern Cape Province.
- Rossouw, L. 2006. A Preliminary Evaluation of Archaeological and Palaeontological Impact with regard to the Application for Prospecting Rights on the Farms Doornfontein 12, Grasbult 5, Schoolplaats 3, Schoolplaats Annex 4 and Pontdrift 2 in the Warrenton District, Northern Cape.
- Rossouw, L. (National Museum, Bloemfontein). 2008. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of Farm Fourteen Streams, Warrenton District, Northern Cape Province.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005a. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: Portion 1 of Roode Pan 146, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005b. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: Portions of Paardeberg 154, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005c. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: (Portions of) Leeuwpoort 161, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005d. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: (Portions of) Paardeberg 12, Paardeberg-East, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005e. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: Rooipoort – (Portions of) Klipfontein 99, Berg Plaats 100, Vogelstruispan 98, Vogelstruispan 101 and Zand Plaas 102, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2005f. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment: (Southern Portion of) Camp 3, Erf 1, Windsorton, Barkly West District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2006a. Stamper Claim on a Portion of the Farm Longlands, Barkly West, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2006c. Cultural Resources Management Impact Assessment: A 400ha Portion of Van Zoelen's Laagte 158, Windsorton District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. . 2007a. Archaeological Site Inspection – Mining Impact on Two Graveyard Sites, Schmidtsdrift Mining Area, Boomplaats 21, Schmidtsdrift District, Northern Cape, South Africa
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2007b. Proposed Phase 2 Archaeological Mitigation and Management for the Residential Development, Remainder of Portion 1 of the Farm van Zoelen's Laagte 158, Windsorton, Barkly-West District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. . 2007c. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment – Sewer Purification Plant, Ikutseng Township, Warrenton, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Ryneveld, K. . 2007d. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment: Portion of the farm Platfontein 68, Kimberley District, Northern Cape, South Africa.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2008. Heritage Impact Survey Report for the Development of Visitor Facilities in the Makala National Park, Northern Cape Province.
- Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2011. Heritage impact assessment for the proposed development of photovoltaic power plants on five different locations in Northwest and Northern Cape Provinces.

5.2.2 Discussion: The Heritage Landscape around Kimberley

- Early History and the Stone Ages

The Northern Cape has traces of various types of archaeological sites inclusive of fossil, prehistoric and historical sites. Of palaeontological and Stone Age significance is a major fossil-bearing and archaeological complex of karstic deposits at Groot Kloof in the escarpment of the Ghaap Plateau, around 100 km southwest of Taung. The region is known for open fluvial and lacustrine sites sampling Lower and Middle Pleistocene tool types and the long, but discontinuous sequence of Wonderwerk Cave. Small pockets of Later Stone Age artefact-bearing breccia and rock art also occur. The significance of Groot Kloof is underscored by current debate about the emergence of modern humans in which the appearance of modern behaviour is posited to have occurred in this and other regions (Curnoe et al. 2005).




Figure 5-1: Intrusive breccia containing a Late Stone Age industry. Note the high density of lithics.

The Stone Age archaeological wealth of the Northern Cape is unequalled by any of the other provinces in South Africa. Stone Age sites are not randomly scattered within the landscape and they occur either near water sources or close to local sources of two highly-prized raw materials, specularite and jaspilite. As such, tools dating to all phases of the Stone Age are mostly found in the vicinity of larger watercourses. Surveys around Kimberley have documented Acheullian industries and continuity between Earlier Stone Age (ESA) and Middle Stone Age (MSA) lithic technologies in the same area. Excavations at other well-known sites in the wider region attest to further ESA and MSA occupation, some of which have yielded significant Stone Age assemblages that all inform on our general understanding of the technological sequences of the Stone Age in the Northern Cape and the Northwest (e.g. see Beaumont 2008, 2009; Morris 2006; Morris 2007; Dreyer 2007). Within the greater Kimberley region ESA and MSA sites with long research histories include Doornlaagte, Pniel, Canteen Koppie and Rooidam (Beaumont & Morris 1990). Open air ESA and MSA sites are often associated with raw material outcrops, dolines, playas (palaeo-lakes) and palaeo-river channels.

In addition low density ESA, MSA and Later Stone Age (LSA) occurrences remain regular phenomena characterizing the cultural landscape of the region. LSA use of the more immediate region is most prominently evidenced by the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Center and adjoining Rock Art site (see later reference) . Here, a number of lithic artefacts with spatial distribution indicative of separate residential and knapping areas occur around the hill.

- A landscape of Rock Art

Rock engravings are mostly found in the interior plateau of South Africa for example in Kimberley and the Karoo. Evidence exists of rock art paintings occurring in caves and shelters at the Wonderwerk Caves, Kuruman Hills, Ghaap Escarpment and scattered sites in the Karoo. Rock engravings have also been identified at Driekopseiland that is positioned in the close vicinity of Kimberley Town. Driekopseiland is evident of more than ninety percent of geometric engraving sites (Morris 1988). Geometrics have been identified at the Kuruman valley and the middle Orange area (Morris 1988). Engravings tend to be found at rock walls, low outcrops, or clusters of surface stone.



Figure 5-2: Rock engravings at the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Site.

The Wildebeest Kuil 1 Rock Art site, a declared Provincial Heritage Site (2008), is characterized by a fairly prominent hill surrounded by a number of 'kuils' or non-perennial water holes and wetlands. The hill itself is host to more than 400 petroglyphs, including both naturalistic and abstract engravings, in fine-line and pecked technique. LSA deposits are scattered about the immediate terrain with deposits closer to the hill indicative of residential outlines and activity or knapping areas. Extensive LSA use of the landscape is evidenced by even more engravings on the glacial pavements of the farm Nooitgedacht, just north of Platfontein. Further afield the Driekopseiland site, one of the most prolific engraving sites in the country is host to more than 3,600 images, engraved into the glaciated andesite of the Riet River's banks (Morris 1990a). Closer to the Vaal River, at the Bushmans' Fountain site, Klipfontein, more than 4,500 engravings have been recorded across the approximate 9ha site (Morris 1990b). The many petroglyph sites across the Northern Cape signal an aesthetic and spiritual expression of a modern LSA cognition. The LSA

archaeological record is directly associated with San history, dating conservatively back to around 40-27kya, whilst the Khoe is reported to have entered the country around 2kya (Mitchell 2002). Both groups are known to have traded with Later Iron Age communities and Colonial settlers.

- The Iron Age Farmer Period

In this portion of South Africa, Iron Age communities only spread to the north eastern and western part of the Northwest Province in the 17th century due to environmental factors. These settlers were Tswana-speakers such as the Tlhaping, Hurutshe, Fokeng, Kgatla and Rolong (Breutz 1959). Evidence of Later Iron Age (LIA) early farmers occur in the close vicinity of Kuruman. The early farmers came in contact with LSA Khoisan groups where most of these LSA peoples were incorporated in the LIA communities, a period represented at the Blinkklipkop specularite mine close to Postmasburg

- The Colonial Period

The 18th century was defined as a period of conflict when the Griqua, Korana and white settlers were competing for the availability of land. This period is also known for the occurrence of the Mfecane or the so called Difaqane that resulted in a time period of instability that started in the middle 1820's. The conflict time period related to the Mfecane or Difaqane was the result of the influx of the then displaced people. The continuous conflict resulted in tribal groups migrating to hilltop areas in the need of finding safe environments. From early Colonial times interest in the Northern Cape was firmly vested in its mineral wealth; early settlers speculated about mountains rich in copper towards the north-west. However, the landscape was permanently transformed after Erasmus Jacobs discovered a 'brilliant pebble' on the farm De Kalk near Hopetown in 1866. The 'pebble' was sold to Schalk van Niekerk, who again sold it, only to turn out to be the 21.25 carat world famous '*Eureka*' diamond. Three years later van Niekerk sold another diamond from the De Kalk region, this time to become known as the '*Star of South Africa*', resold on the London market for .25,000. In 1871 an even larger diamond was found on the slopes of Colesberg Kopje, on the farm Vooruitzicht, belonging to the De Beers brothers and so the 'New Rush' was started resulting in a literal stampede to the area; more than 3,000 men working almost 800 claims. Soon the Colesberg hillock lowered into the Kimberley Mine (the Big Hole). From mid-July 1871 to 1914 more than 50,000 miners amassed on the area to labor on the mines. Soon thereafter in 1873 'New Rush' was renamed Kimberley, at the time the 2nd largest town in South Africa. But riots and unrest started when it became known that the intension was to proclaim Griqualand-West as Crown Colony in 1877. Early Kimberley soon turned into a metropolis, with a number of historic buildings still evidencing its heyday – days when streets were lined with prospectors, miners and prostitutes, a massive migrant African labor population from as far as the Transkei, today's Mpumalanga and Limpopo provinces and Mozambique, labor from as far afield as China. The Anglo-Boer War saw Kimberley besieged by the *Boers* on the 14th of October 1899, with British forces suffering heavy losses. The siege was lifted in 1900 but the war continued until May 1902, by when the British had built a large concentration camp for *Boer* women and children.

The farm Machorogan was established in the Barkley West division in 1906.




Figure 5-3: The original title deed for the farm Machorogan c. 1905.

6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING

6.1 Heritage resources management and conservation

Archaeological sites, as previously defined in the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) are places in the landscape where people have lived in the past – generally more than 60 years ago – and have left traces of their presence behind. In South Africa, archaeological sites include hominid fossil sites, places where people of the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age lived in open sites, river gravels, rock shelters and caves, Iron Age sites, graves, and a variety of historical sites and structures in rural areas, towns and cities. Palaeontological sites are those with fossil remains of plants and animals where people were not involved in the accumulation of the deposits. The basic principle of cultural heritage conservation is that archaeological and other heritage sites are valuable, scarce and *non-renewable*. Many such sites are unfortunately lost on a daily basis through development for housing, roads and infrastructure and once archaeological sites are damaged, they cannot be re-created as site integrity and authenticity is permanently lost. Archaeological sites have the potential to contribute to our understanding of the history of the region and of our country and continent. By preserving links with our past, we may not be able to revive lost cultural traditions, but it enables us to appreciate the role they have played in the history of our country.

6.2 Categories of significance

Rating the significance of archaeological sites, and consequently grading the potential impact on the resources is linked to the significance of the site itself. The significance of an archaeological site is based on the amount of deposit, the integrity of the context, the kind of deposit and the potential to help answer present research questions. Historical structures are defined by Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, while other historical and cultural significant sites, places and features, are generally determined by community preferences. The guidelines as provided by the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) in Section 3, with special reference to subsection 3 are used when determining the cultural significance or other special value of archaeological or historical sites. In addition, ICOMOS (the Australian Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites) highlights four cultural attributes, which are valuable to any given culture:

- *Aesthetic value:*

Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric, the general atmosphere associated with the place and its uses and also the aesthetic values commonly assessed in the analysis of landscapes and townscape.

- *Historic value:*

Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society and therefore to a large extent underlies all of the attributes discussed here. Usually a place has historical value because of some kind of influence by an event, person, phase or activity.

- *Scientific value:*

The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.

- *Social value:*

Social value includes the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a certain group.

It is important for heritage specialist input in the EIA process to take into account the heritage management structure set up by the NHR Act. It makes provision for a 3-tier system of management including the South Africa

Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) at a national level, Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities (PHRAs) at a provincial and the local authority. The Act makes provision for two types or forms of protection of heritage resources; i.e. formally protected and generally protected sites:

Formally protected sites:

- Grade 1 or national heritage sites, which are managed by SAHRA
- Grade 2 or provincial heritage sites, which are managed by the provincial HRA.
- Grade 3 or local heritage sites.

Generally protected sites:

- Human burials older than 60 years.
- Archaeological and palaeontological sites.
- Shipwrecks and associated remains older than 70 years.
- Structures older than 60 years.

With reference to the evaluation of sites, the certainty of prediction is definite, unless stated otherwise and if the significance of the site is rated high, the significance of the impact will also result in a high rating. The same rule applies if the significance rating of the site is low. The significance of archaeological sites is generally ranked into the following categories.

Table 2: Heritage Site Significance Ratings

Significance	Rating Action
No significance: sites that do not require mitigation.	None
Low significance: sites, which may require mitigation.	2a. Recording and documentation (Phase 1) of site; no further action required 2b. Controlled sampling (shovel test pits, augering), mapping and documentation (Phase 2 investigation); permit required for sampling and destruction
Medium significance: sites, which require mitigation.	3. Excavation of representative sample, C14 dating, mapping and documentation (Phase 2 investigation); permit required for sampling and destruction [including 2a & 2b]
High significance: sites, where disturbance should be avoided.	4a. Nomination for listing on Heritage Register (National, Provincial or Local) (Phase 2 & 3 investigation); site management plan; permit required if utilised for education or tourism
High significance: Graves and burial places	4b. Locate demonstrable descendants through social consulting; obtain permits from applicable legislation, ordinances and regional by-laws; exhumation and reinterment [including 2a, 2b & 3]

Furthermore, the significance of archaeological sites was based on six main criteria:

- Site integrity (i.e. primary vs. secondary context),
- Amount of deposit, range of features (e.g., stonewalling, stone tools and enclosures),
- Density of scatter (dispersed scatter),
- Social value,
- Uniqueness, and
- Potential to answer current and future research questions.

A fundamental aspect in assessing the significance and protection status of a heritage resource is often whether or not the sustainable social and economic benefits of a proposed development outweigh the

conservation issues at stake. When, for whatever reason the protection of a heritage site is not deemed necessary or practical, its research potential must be assessed and mitigated in order to gain data / information, which would otherwise be lost.

6.3 Potential Impacts and Significance Ratings³

The following section provides a background to the identification and assessment of possible impacts and alternatives, as well as a range of risk situations and scenarios commonly associated with heritage resources management. The section ultimately provides a guideline (Section 6.3.1, Section 6.3.2 & Section 6.3.3) for the rating of impacts and recommendation of management actions for the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development Area.

6.3.1 General assessment of impacts on resources

Generally, the value and significance of archaeological and other heritage sites might be impacted on by any activity that would result immediately or in the future in the destruction, damage, excavation, alteration, removal or collection from its original position, any archaeological material or object (as indicated in the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999)). Thus, the destructive impacts that are possible in terms of heritage resources would tend to be direct, once-off events occurring during the initial construction period. However, in the long run, the proximity of operations in any given area could result in secondary indirect impacts. The EIA process therefore specifies impact assessment criteria which can be utilised from the perspective of a heritage specialist study which elucidates the overall extent of impacts.

A. HERITAGE SPECIFIC DIRECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Nature of the impact

This is an assessment of the nature of the impact of the activity on a heritage resource, with some indication of its positive and/or negative effect/s. It is strongly informed by the statement of resource significance. In other words, the nature of the impact may be historical, aesthetic, social, scientific, linguistic or architectural, intrinsic, associational or contextual (visual or non-visual). In many cases, the nature of the impact will include more than one value.

Confidence

This should relate to the level of confidence that the specialist has in establishing the nature and degree of impacts. It relates to the level and reliability of information, the nature and degree of consultation with I&AP's and the dynamic of the broader socio-political context.

- High, where the information is comprehensive and accurate, where there has been a high degree of Consultation and the socio-political context is relatively stable.
- Medium, where the information is sufficient but is based mainly on secondary sources, where there has been a limited targeted consultation and socio-political context is fluid.
- Low, where the information is poor, a high degree of contestation is evident and there is a state of socio-political flux.

³ Based on: Winter, S. & Baumann, N. 2005. *Guideline for involving heritage specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1.*

Impact Significance

The significance of impacts can be determined through a synthesis of the aspects produced in terms of the nature and degree of heritage significance and the nature, duration, intensity, extent, probability and confidence of impacts and can be described as:

- Low; where it would have a negligible effect on heritage and on the decision
- Medium, where it would have a moderate effect on heritage and should influence the decision.
- High, where it would have, or there would be a high risk of, a big effect on heritage. Impacts of high significance should have a major influence on the decision;
- Very high, where it would have, or there would be high risk of, an irreversible and possibly irreplaceable negative impact on heritage. Impacts of very high significance should be a central factor in decision-making.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (PLOMP 2004)
--

An impact can be defined as any change in the physical-chemical, biological, cultural and/or socio-economic environmental system that can be attributed to human activities related to alternatives under study for meeting a project need. The significance of the impacts will be determined through a synthesis of the criteria below (Plomp, 2004):

Probability

This should describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring indicated as:

- Improbable, where the possibility of the impact to materialize is very low either because of design or historic experience;
- Probable, where there is a distinct possibility that the impact will occur;
- Highly probable, where it is most likely that the impact will occur; or
- Definite, where the impact will definitely occur regardless of any mitigation measures

Duration

The lifetime of the impact:

- Short term: The impact will either disappear with mitigation or will be mitigated through natural processes in a time span shorter than any of the phases.
- Medium term: The impact will last up to the end of the phases, where after it will be negated.
- Long term: The impact will last for the entire operational phase of the project but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter.
- Permanent: Impact that will be non-transitory. Mitigation either by man or natural processes will not occur in such a way or in such a time span that the impact can be considered transient.

Of relevance to the duration of an impact are the following considerations:

- Reversibility of the impact; and
- Renewability of the heritage resource.

Scale / Extent

Here it should be indicated whether the impact will be experienced:

- On a site scale, i.e. extend only as far as the activity;
- Within the immediate context of a heritage resource;
- On a local scale, e.g. town or suburb
- On a metropolitan or regional scale; or
- On a national/international scale.

Magnitude / Severity

Here it should be established whether the impact should be indicated as:

- Low, where the impact affects the resource in such a way that its heritage value is not affected;
- Medium, where the affected resource is altered but its heritage value continues to exist albeit in a modified way;
- High, where heritage value is altered to the extent that it will temporarily or permanently be damaged or destroyed.

Significance (of the heritage resource)

This is a statement of the nature and degree of significance of the heritage resource being affected by the activity. From a heritage management perspective it is useful to distinguish between whether the significance is embedded in the physical fabric or in associations with events or persons or in the experience of a place; i.e. its visual and non-visual qualities. This statement is a primary informant to the nature and degree of significance of an impact and thus needs to be thoroughly considered. Consideration needs to be given to the significance of a heritage resource at different scales (i.e. site specific, local, regional, national or international) and the relationship between the heritage resource, its setting and its associations.

- Negligible: The impact is non-existent or unsubstantial and is of no or little importance to any stakeholder and can be ignored.
- Low: The impact is limited in extent, has low to medium intensity; whatever its probability of occurrence is, the impact will not have a material effect on the decision and is likely to require management intervention with increased costs.
- Moderate: The impact is of importance to one or more stakeholders, and its intensity will be medium or high; therefore, the impact may materially affect the decision, and management intervention will be required.
- The impact could render development options controversial or the project unacceptable if it cannot be reduced to acceptable levels; and/or the cost of management intervention will be a significant factor in mitigation.

6.3.2 Direct impact rating

Direct or primary effects on heritage resources occur at the same time and in the same space as the activity, e.g. loss of historical fabric through demolition work. **Indirect effects or secondary effects** on heritage resources occur later in time or at a different place from the causal activity, or as a result of a complex pathway, e.g. restriction of access to a heritage resource resulting in the gradual erosion of its significance, which is dependent on ritual patterns of access. The following table provides an outline as to the relationship between the significance of a heritage context, the intensity of development and the significance of heritage impacts to be expected.

Table 3: Direct Impact Assessment Criteria

HERITAGE CONTEXT	TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT			
	CATEGORY A	CATEGORY B	CATEGORY C	CATEGORY D
CONTEXT 1 High heritage Value	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 2 Medium to high heritage value	Minimal heritage impact expected	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected	Very high heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 3 Medium to low heritage value	Little or no heritage impact expected	Minimal heritage impact expected	Moderate heritage impact expected	High heritage impact expected
CONTEXT 4 Low to no heritage value	Little or no heritage impact expected	Little or no heritage impact expected	Minimal heritage value expected	Moderate heritage impact expected
NOTE: A DEFAULT "LITTLE OR NO HERITAGE IMPACT EXPECTED" VALUE APPLIES WHERE A HERITAGE RESOURCE OCCURS OUTSIDE THE IMPACT ZONE OF THE DEVELOPMENT.				
HERITAGE CONTEXTS	CATEGORIES OF DEVELOPMENT			
<p>Context 1: Of high intrinsic, associational and contextual heritage value within a national, provincial and local context, i.e. formally declared or potential Grade 1, 2 or 3A heritage resources</p> <p>Context 2: Of moderate to high intrinsic, associational and contextual value within a local context, i.e. potential Grade 3B heritage resources.</p> <p>Context 3: Of medium to low intrinsic, associational or contextual heritage value within a national, provincial and local context, i.e. potential Grade 3C heritage resources</p> <p>Context 4: Of little or no intrinsic, associational or contextual heritage value due to disturbed, degraded conditions or extent of irreversible damage.</p>	<p>Category A: Minimal intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No rezoning involved; within existing use rights. - No subdivision involved. - Upgrading of existing infrastructure within existing envelopes - Minor internal changes to existing structures - New building footprints limited to less than 1000m². <p>Category B: Low-key intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spot rezoning with no change to overall zoning of a site. - Linear development less than 100m - Building footprints between 1000m²-2000m² - Minor changes to external envelop of existing structures (less than 25%) - Minor changes in relation to bulk and height of immediately adjacent structures (less than 25%). <p>Category C: Moderate intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning of a site between 5000m²-10 000m². - Linear development between 100m and 300m. - Building footprints between 2000m² and 5000m² - Substantial changes to external envelop of existing structures (more than 50%) - Substantial increase in bulk and height in relation to immediately adjacent buildings (more than 50%) <p>Category D: High intensity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rezoning of a site in excess of 10 000m² - Linear development in excess of 300m. - Any development changing the character of a site exceeding 5000m² or involving the subdivision of a site into three or more erven. - Substantial increase in bulk and height in relation to immediately adjacent buildings (more than 100%) 			

6.3.3 Management actions

Recommendations for relevant heritage resources management actions are vital to the conservation of heritage resources. Recommended management actions may include the following:

Table 4: Management and Mitigation Actions

<p>No further action / Monitoring</p> <p>Where no heritage resources have been documented, heritage resources occur well outside the impact zone of any development or the primary context of the surroundings at a development footprint has been largely destroyed or altered, no further immediate action is required. Site monitoring during development, by an ECO or the heritage specialist are often added to this recommendation in order to ensure that no undetected heritage remains are destroyed.</p>
--

Avoidance

This is appropriate where any type of development occurs within a formally protected or significant or sensitive heritage context and is likely to have a high negative impact. Mitigation is not acceptable or not possible. This measure often includes the change / alteration of development planning and therefore impact zones in order not to impact on resources.

Mitigation

This is appropriate where development occurs in a context of heritage significance and where the impact is such that it can be mitigated to a degree of medium to low significance, e.g. the high to medium impact of a development on an archaeological site could be mitigated through sampling/excavation of the remains. Not all negative impacts can be mitigated.

Compensation

Compensation is generally not an appropriate heritage management action. The main function of management actions should be to conserve the resource for the benefit of future generations. Once lost it cannot be renewed. The circumstances around the potential public or heritage benefits would need to be exceptional to warrant this type of action, especially in the case of where the impact was high.

Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation is considered in heritage management terms as a intervention typically involving the adding of a new heritage layer to enable a new sustainable use. It is not appropriate when the process necessitates the removal of previous historical layers, i.e. restoration of a building or place to the previous state/period. It is an appropriate heritage management action in the following cases:

- The heritage resource is degraded or in the process of degradation and would benefit from rehabilitation.
- Where rehabilitation implies appropriate conservation interventions, i.e. adaptive reuse, repair and maintenance, consolidation and minimal loss of historical fabric.
- Where the rehabilitation process will not result in a negative impact on the intrinsic value of the resource.

Enhancement

Enhancement is appropriate where the overall heritage significance and its public appreciation value are improved. It does not imply creation of a condition that might never have occurred during the evolution of a place, e.g. the tendency to sanitize the past. This management action might result from the removal of previous layers where these layers are culturally of low significance and detract from the significance of the resource. It would be appropriate in a range of heritage contexts and applicable to a range of resources. In the case of formally protected or significant resources, appropriate enhancement action should be encouraged. Care should, however, be taken to ensure that the process does not have a negative impact on the character and context of the resource. It would thus have to be carefully monitored.

6.4 Site significance and impact rating

Refer to Section 6.3.1, Section 6.3.2 & Section 6.3.3 for background on the rating of impacts and recommendation of management actions for sites of heritage potential. Impact thresholds and management measures for the sites are further discussed in section 6.3.5.

6.4.1 Site MGS01

1. SITE DESCRIPTION : Middle Stone Age Occurrences			
1.1 General Site Description			
A number of Middle Stone Age (MSA) lithic occurrences, scattered in medium to low concentrations.			
1.2 Site features / artefacts / Other			
Site Location			
Province / District	Northern Cape Province	Map Number	2824AB
Farm / Settlement / Zone	Machoroogan 106		
Co-ordinates	Site MGS01	S28.190713°	E24.378665°
Site Type			
Surface sites	X	Caves and rock shelters	
Larger open-air sites		Sealed sites (deposits)	
River deposits		Other	
Site Function			
Living / habitation	X	Kill	

Ceremonial		Burial	
Trading / Barter		Art	
Quarry / Mining / Smelting		Other	
Site Placement			
Valley floor		Hill top	
		Vlei/swamp	
Dam		River Bank	
		Slope	
Other / Comments		Plains	X
Vegetation			
Riverine forest		Bushveld	
		Savannah	
Thornveld	X	Grassland	X
		Cultivated	
		Other	
Age Classification			
Stone Age	X	Early Iron Age	
		Middle Iron Age	
Historical		Other	
		Later Iron Age	
Material Culture			
Midden		House Remains	
		Stone Walling	
Granary		Grinding Stone (L)	
		Grinding Stone (U)	
Metal		Ceramics (Potter)	
		Ceramics (Porcelain)	
Metal slag		Tuyere	
		Fauna	
Bead (OES / Shell)		Glass	
		Lithics	X
Other:		Smelting Residues	
		Other:	
1.3 Site Condition			
The site integrity has been severely compromised as context might have been lost due to artefact displacement.			
2. SITE EVALUATION			
2.1 Heritage Value (NHRA, section 2 [3])			
	High	Medium	Low
It has importance to the community or pattern of South Africa's history or pre-colonial history.			X
It possesses unique, uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage.			X
It has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural and cultural heritage.		X	
It is of importance in demonstrating the principle characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects.			X
It has importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a particular community or cultural group.			X
It has importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.		X	
It has marked or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (sense of place).			X
It has strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa.			X
It has significance through contributing towards the promotion of a local sociocultural identity and can be developed as a tourist destination.			X
It has significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.			X
It has importance to the wider understanding of temporal changes within cultural landscapes, settlement patterns and human occupation.		X	
2.2 Field Register Rating			
National/Grade 1 [should be registered, retained]			
Provincial/Grade 2 [should be registered, retained]			
Local/Grade 3A [should be registered, mitigation not advised]			
Local/Grade 3B [High significance; mitigation, partly retained]			

Generally Protected A [High/Medium significance, mitigation]				
Generally protected B [Medium significance, to be recorded]				
Generally Protected C [Low significance, no further action]				X
2.3 Sphere of Significance		High	Medium	Low
International				
National				
Provincial				
Local				X
Specific community				
3. IMPACT RATING AND MITIGATION				
3.1 Impact assessment				
APPROXIMATE DISTANCE FROM DEVELOPMENT: 0 - 100 METERS				
NATURE OF IMPACT: HISTORICAL, SCIENTIFIC				
EXTENT OF IMPACT: Local				
SPECIALIST LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE IN DEGREE OF IMPACT AND SEVERITY: High				
3.2 Impact Significance and Severity				
		Without Management*	With Management*	
General assessment of impacts on resource (Refer to Section 7.3.1)		Duration	Permanent	Short Term
		Intensity	Low	Low
		Probability	Definite	Improbable
		Impact Significance	Low	Negligible
3.3 Direct Impact Rating				
Direct impact on resource	None (the potential development does not adversely or positively affect the heritage resource)			
	Peripheral / Indirect (the heritage resource or its setting is located in proximity to the footprint of the potential development)			
	Destruction / Direct (the heritage resource or site is physically located within the footprint of the potential development)			X
Direct impact rating (Refer to Section 7.3.2) Note that a default "no impact expected" value applies where a heritage resource occurs outside the impact matrix or applicable conservation buffers of the development.				Moderate Heritage Impact Expected.
3.4 Recommended Management* (refer to section 7.3.3)				
Monitoring				
Comments on recommended management				
Monitoring: It is necessary that the sites be monitored to ensure that heritage resources are not impacted on. If further impact occurs, or is envisaged at any stage of development and operation the following will be required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documentation of sites. - Further desktop study and community consultation to more accurately ascertain context of sites. - Relevant Permitting from Heritage Resources Authority where applicable. . 				
4. APPLICABLE LEGISLATION AND LEGAL REQUIREMENTS				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Heritage Resources Act (Act no. 25 of 1999) - Local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws 				

6.5 Discussion: Evaluation of Results

Previous studies conducted in the larger Kimberley area suggest a rich and diverse archaeological landscape (e.g. the Wildebeest Kuil Rock Art Site, the Ghaap Plateau, Stone Age occurrences and Colonial Period remnants). However, areas directly adjacent to the farm Machorogan seem to have seen ephemeral human occupation but cognisance should nonetheless be taken of archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits along drainage lines and at water pans.

Stone Age occurrences along a small water pan at **Site MGS01** occurs within the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power

Plant and Power Line footprint area and the impact on the site by the proposed activity is considered to be direct and permanent, where in essence the impact might result the loss of archaeological material. However, the site is of limited scientific value due to the low density of artefacts and the general loss of context for the artefacts. **The significance of the impact on the resource is therefore considered to be LOW but the threshold of the impact can be limited to a NEGLIBLE impact by the implementation of mitigation measures (monitoring) for the sites, if / when required**

Since heritage resources of low significance have been documented in the Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line footprint area, a low impact on such resources is anticipated. In the opinion of the author of this Archaeological Impact Assessment Report, the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development on Portion 1 of the farm Machorogan 106 may proceed from a culture resources management perspective.

Table 6: Impact assessment matrix for Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development Heritage Resources (See Section 6.3.1 B) as well as weights and values below.

Site	Activity	Impact	P	D	S	M/S	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	P	D	S	M / S	Significance After Mitigation		
Pre-Construction, Construction, Operation and Closure								Pre-Construction and Construction Phase							
Site MGS01	Pre-Construction, Construction, Operation and Closure	Loss of Heritage Resource and Attributes	5	5	1	2	40	Low	Documentation & Monitoring	1	1	1	2	4	Negligible

Aspect	Description	Weight	Aspect	Description	Weight	Aspect	Description	Weight	Aspect	Description	Weight	Aspect	Description	Weight
Probability	Improbable	1	Duration	Short term	1	Scale	Local	1	Magnitude/Severity	Low	2	Significance	Sum(Duration, Scale, Magnitude) x Probability	
	Probable	2		Medium term	3		Site	2		Medium	6		Negligible	<20
	Highly Probable	4		Long term	4		Regional	3		High	8		Low	<40
	Definite	5		Permanent	5								Moderate	<60
													High	>60

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The larger landscape around Kimberley is rich in pre-historical and historical remnants but areas directly adjacent to the farm Machorogan seem to have been less densely occupied during prehistoric and historic times. Cognisant of this landscape and the need for the conservation of its heritage resources, the following recommendations are made based on general observations in the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development Area:

- A Palaeontological Impact Assessment is recommended where bedrock is to be impacted and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or petrified wood be exposed during construction, these objects should be carefully safeguarded and the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA) should be notified immediately so that the appropriate action can be taken by a professional palaeontologist.
- Considering the localised nature of heritage remains, the general monitoring of the development progress is recommended for all stages of the project. Should any subsurface palaeontological, archaeological or historical material, or burials be exposed during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately.
- A low density MSA scatter in the study area around a small water pan (**Site MGS01**) is of low heritage priority and it is recommended that the sites be monitored if any development activates takes place in the vicinity of the sites, in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage remains.
- It is essential that cognisance be taken of the larger archaeological landscape of the area in order to avoid the destruction of previously undetected heritage sites. It should be stated that it is likely that further undetected archaeological remains might occur elsewhere in the Study Area along water sources and drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted human activity in the past. Also, since Stone Age material seems to originate from below present soil surfaces in eroded areas, the larger landscape should be regarded as potentially sensitive in terms of possible subsurface deposits. Burials and historically significant structures dating to the Colonial Period occur on farms in the area and these resources should be avoided during all phases of construction and development, including the operational phases of the Solar Park.

In addition to these site-specific recommendations, careful cognisance should be taken of the following:

- Water sources such as drainage lines, fountains and pans would often have attracted human activity in the past.
- As Palaeontological remains occur where bedrock has been exposed, such geological features should be regarded as sensitive in terms of impacts on fossilized resources.

8 GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS

This AIA report serves to confirm the extent and significance of the heritage landscape of the proposed Anjutone Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development area. The larger Kimberley and Ghaap horizon encompasses rich and diverse archaeological landscapes and cognisance should be taken of heritage resources and archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits. If, during construction, any possible archaeological material culture discoveries are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist be contacted for an assessment of the find. Such material culture might include:

- Formal Earlier Stone Age stone tools such as handaxes, choppers and cleavers.

- Formal Middle Stone Age stone tools such as points, blades and scrapers.
- Formal Later Stone Age stone tools such as microlithic blades, points and scrapers.
- Lithic residues and debris such as stone cores and flakes.
- Decorated and undecorated potsherds.
- Iron objects.
- Beads made from ostrich eggshell and glass.
- Ash middens and cattle dung deposits and accumulations.
- Animal bones and faunal remains.
- Human remains/graves.
- Stone walling or any sub-surface structures.
- Historical glass, tin or ceramics.
- Fossils.

If such site were to be encountered or impacted by any proposed developments, recommendations contained in this report, as well as endorsement of mitigation measures as set out by SAHRA, the National Resources Act and the CRM section of ASAPA will be required. Please note that this report is an archaeological scoping study only and does not include or exempt other required heritage impact assessments.

It must be emphasised that the conclusions and recommendations expressed in this archaeological heritage sensitivity investigation are based on the visibility of archaeological sites/features and may not therefore, represent the area's complete archaeological legacy. Many sites/features may be covered by soil and vegetation and might only be located during sub-surface investigations. If subsurface archaeological deposits, artefacts or skeletal material were to be recovered in the area during construction activities, all activities should be suspended and the archaeological specialist should be notified immediately (**cf. NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 36 (6)**).

It must also be clear that Archaeological Specialist Reports will be assessed by the relevant heritage resources authority. The final decision rests with the heritage resources authority, which should give a permit or a formal letter of permission for the destruction of any cultural sites.

9 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beaumont, P & Morris, D. 1990. Guide to archaeological sites in the Northern Cape. McGregor Museum, Kimberley

Beaumont, P.B., 2004. Kathu Pan and Kathu Townlands/Uitkoms. In: Morris, D. & Beaumont, P.B. (Eds.), Archaeology in the Northern Cape: Some Key Sites. Southern African Association for Archaeologists Postconference Excursion, Kimberley, McGregor Museum: pp. 50–53;

Bergh, J.S. 1999. Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika: die vier noordelike provinsies. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik

Birkholtz, P. 2011. Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Pering Mining Project, Located on the Farm Pering Mine 1023 HN, Reivilo, North West Province. Pretoria: PGS

Breutz, P. L. 1959. The tribes of Vryburg district. Ethnological Publications No. 46. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Curnoe, D et al. 2005. Beyond Taung: Palaeoanthropological research at Groot Kloof, Ghaap Escarpment, Northern Cape Province, South Africa. Nyame Akuma Bulletin of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists, December 2005:64

Curnoe, D et al. 2006. Discovery of Middle Pleistocene fossil and stone tool-bearing deposits at Groot Kloof, Ghaap escarpment, Northern Cape province. South African Journal of Science **102**, May/June 2006

Deacon, J. 1996. Archaeology for Planners, Developers and Local Authorities. National Monuments Council. Publication no. P021E.

Deacon, J. 1997. Report: Workshop on Standards for the Assessment of Significance and Research Priorities for Contract Archaeology. In: Newsletter No 49, Sept 1998. Association for Southern African Archaeologists.

Hall, M. 1987. The Changing Past :Farmers, Kings & Traders in Southern Africa 200 – 1860 Cape Town, Johannesburg: David Philip

Hall, M. 1996. Archaeology Africa. Cape Town, Johannesburg: David Philip

Henning, B. 2013. An Environmental Report on the Ecology (flora and fauna) for the for the proposed Renewable Energy Generation Project on Portion 1 of the Farm Machorogan 106. Pretoria: AGES Gauteng (Pty)Ltd.

Dr. A J Humphreys. (2009 reproduced). A Prehistoric Frontier in the Northern Cape and the Western Orange Free State Archaeological Evidence in Interaction and Ideological Change.

Morris, D. 1990a. Driekopseiland. In Beaumont, P.B. & Morris, D. (eds.) Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern Cape. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

23. Morris, D. 1990b. Klipfontein: Bushman's Fountain Rock Engraving Site. In Beaumont, P.B. & Morris, D. (eds.) Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern Cape. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 2004. Tsantsabane: the Blinkklipkop specularite mine, and Doornfontein. In: Morris, D and Beaumont, P. Archaeology in the Northern Cape: some key sites. Kimberley: McGregor Museum, 54 – 60.

Morris, D. 2005. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Assessment of proposed mining areas on the farms Ploegfontein, Klipbankfontein, Welgevonden, Leeuwfontein, Wolhaarkop and Kapsteveld, west of Postmasburg, Northern Cape. Unpublished Report.

Morris, D. 2006. Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment at the claim of Mr M.M. Nyaba, Erf 687 near Barkly West, Northern Cape. Unpublished Report.

Phillipson, D.W. 1985. African Archaeology (second edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Renfrew, C & Bahn, P. 1991. Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice USA: Thames & Hudson

Sharer, A.J & Ashmore, W 1979. The Nature of Archaeological Data California: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing

Swanepoel, N. et al (Eds.) 2008. Five hundred years rediscovered. Johannesburg: Wits University Press

Soriano, S, Villa, P & Wadley, L. 2007. Blade technology and tool forms in the Middle Stone Age of South Africa: the Howiesons Poort and post-Howiesons Poort at Rose Cottage Cave. Journal of Archaeological Science 34:681-703.

Van der Ryst, M.M & Kusel, S. 2012. Phase 2 Report on Middle Stone Age localities on the farm Zandkopsdrift 357, Garies District, Northern Cape Province. Pretoria: Habitat Landscape Architects.

Van Ryneveld, K., *Richard, F. Dinku, V. & Morris, D. (Mc Gregor Museum and *University of Lund, Sweden). 2004. Announcing Wildebeest Kuil 2: Salvage at a Newly Discovered Fauresmith Site. Poster Presentation – Presented at the SA3 Conference, Kimberley, Northern Cape.

32. Van Ryneveld, K. 2009. Phase 2 Archaeological Mitigation – Middle Stone Age sequences at excavations DKE8 and DKE13, Diamond Koppie, Vogelstruispan 101, Francis Baard District, Northern Cape, South Africa (Unpublished report to De Beers Consolidated Mines)

Van Schalkwyk, J. 2011. Heritage impact assessment for the proposed development of photovoltaic power plants on five different locations in Northwest and Northern Cape Provinces. Pretoria: NCHM

Wilkins, J. & Chazan, M. 2012. Blade production ~500 thousand years ago at Kathu Pan 1, South Africa: support for a multiple origins hypothesis for early Middle Pleistocene blade technology. Journal of Archaeological Science

Human Tissue Act and Ordinance 7 of 1925, Government Gazette, Cape Town

National Resource Act No.25 of 1999, Government Gazette, Cape Town

<http://csg.dla.gov.za/index.html>

Accessed 2013-11-26