



**SISHEN IRON ORE MINE: HIGH ENERGY FUEL (HEF) PLANT AND
RAILWAY SIDING, JOHN TAOLO GAETSEWE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY,
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

Archaeological Impact Assessment

August 2014

Prepared for: SIOC (Pty) Ltd
Document version 2.0 (Final)
Compiled by N. Kruger



Proudly Supporting
TOUCHING AFRICA

Prepared by



ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA) OF DEMARCATED SURFACE PORTIONS ON THE FARMS SACHA 468 AND WOON 469 FOR THE PROPOSED HIGH ENERGY FUEL PLANT AND RAILWAY SIDING, SISHEN IRON ORE MINE, JOHN TAOLO GAETSEWE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

August 2014

Document Version 2 (Final)

Conducted on behalf of:

Sishen Iron Ore Company
AGES Gauteng

Compiled by:

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

Reviewed by:

Catherine De Camara (AGES Gauteng Environmental)

GAUTENG PROVINCE: The Village Office Park (Block E), 309 Glenwood Road, Pretoria 0081, Postnet no 74, Private Bag X07, Arcadia, 0007 Tel: +27-12 751 2160 Fax: +27 (0) 86 607 2406 www.ages-group.com

*Offices: Eastern Cape Gauteng Limpopo Province Namibia North-West Province Western Cape Zimbabwe
AGES Board of Directors: SJ Pretorius JA Myburgh JJP Vivier JH Botha H Pretorius THG Ngoepe SM Haasbroek R Crosby
JC Vivier FN de Jager CJH Smit AS Potgieter AGES Gauteng Directors: JJP Vivier JC Vivier E van Zyl M Grobler*



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 the Sishen Iron Ore Company, 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 the Sishen Iron Ore Company 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 Sishen High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure Project 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: 25 August 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study of surface portions of the farms Sacha 468 and Woon 469, subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the Sishen Iron Ore Company High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure project. 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 in order to consider the conservation priority of sites located in the area.

A number of archaeological and historical studies have been conducted in the Kathu area. These studies all infer a significantly rich and diverse archaeological landscape. Similarly, 3 areas of archaeological or heritage potential were located during the AIA survey of the project area covering approximately 150ha.

Palaeontology:

Since the palaeontological sensitivity of rock units within the study area is generally low the impact significance of the proposed mining activities as far as fossil heritage is concerned, is likely to be small. However, a Palaeontological Impact Assessment should be considered 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.

Stone Age:

The abundance of locally available raw material implies a prominent Stone Age presence and specifically Earlier Stone Age (ESA) and Middle Stone Age (MSA) artefacts occur widely in the general landscape. Similarly, MSA occurrences were documented at three localities in the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure project area. However, the sites are of limited scientific value due to the low density of formal tools and the general loss of context for the artefacts. The sites occur away from the proposed HEF plant and railway link site but within the blasting safety buffer for the HEF facility, and it is recommended that the sites be monitored if any development activates takes place in the vicinity of the sites, in order to limit possible impact on previously undetected heritage remains. 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:

The farm Woon was proclaimed in 1908 with the remains of the Historical Period Woon farmstead occurring just outside the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure project area. Unfortunately, the farmstead buildings and features are severely dilapidated rendering the site limited in heritage significance. Even though the farmstead occurs outside the proposed HEF plant, railway link and the blasting safety buffer, site monitoring of these structures are recommended if any activity pertaining to the development occur in this area. If the site were to be impacted on by the mining development, destruction permits should be obtained from the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA).

Graves:

No grave or burials were observed in the survey area

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 Northern Cape 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 than 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	13
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>	24
4 RESULTS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY	25
4.1 THE STONE AGE.....	26
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.....	31
5.1 THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA	31
5.1.1 <i>The Stone Ages</i>	31
5.1.2 <i>The Iron Age Farmer Period</i>	32
5.1.3 <i>Historical and Colonial Times and Recent History</i>	33
5.2 DISCUSSION: THE KATHU HERITAGE LANDSCAPE	33
5.2.1 <i>Palaeontology and Early History</i>	33
5.2.2 <i>The Early and Middle stone Ages in the Northern Cape</i>	34
5.2.3 <i>Significant Stone Age Sites in the Kathu area</i>	34
6 RESULTS: STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	36
6.1 HERITAGE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION	36
6.2 CATEGORIES OF SIGNIFICANCE	37
6.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE RATINGS	39

6.3.1	<i>General assessment of impacts on resources</i>	39
6.3.2	<i>Direct impact rating</i>	40
6.3.3	<i>Management actions</i>	41
6.4	SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT RATING	42
6.4.1	<i>Site SA01, Site SA02, Site SA03</i>	42
6.4.2	<i>Site HP01</i>	44
6.5	DISCUSSION: EVALUATION OF RESULTS	46
7	RECOMMENDATIONS	49
8	GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONDITIONS	50
9	BIBLIOGRAPHY	51

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Map representation of the prosed infrastructure scope for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project.....	13
Figure 2-1: 1:50 000 Map representation of the location of the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project (2722DB).	18
Figure 2-2: General surroundings in the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project area at the time of the survey (September 2013).	19
.....	20
Figure 2-3: Aerial imagery providing a regional context for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project.....	20
Figure 3-1: View of the existing Transnet railway line at the site of the proposed HEF rail link connection.....	22
Figure 3-2: View of general surroundings in the study area, looking south.....	23
Figure 3-3: View of a small salt pan in the study area, looking west.....	23
Figure 3-4: View of the proposed HEF plant site, looking east towards the Sishen Mine.....	24
Figure 4-1: Map indicating the locations of heritage sensitive sites discussed in the text.	25
Figure 4-2: View of Site SA01 along the outer fringes of a small salt pan	26
Figure 4-3: Lithics on fine grained stone from Site SA01.	27
Figure 4-4: Secondary retouch visible on side and end scrapers from Site SA03.....	27
Figure 4-5: Typical fine grained MSA lithics from MSA scatters in the Gamagara area.....	28
Figure 4-6: Lithics from Site SA02. Note single side scrapes (photo left), weathered point (photo right, left) and a blade (photo right, right).	28
Figure 4-7: The dilapidated mud brick walls of the Woon farmhouse.	29
Figure 4-8: The original title deed for the farm Woon circa 1908.	30
Figure 5-1: Early Stone Age (Acheul) handaxe from the Kathu Pan site (http://www.museumsonc.co.za).	35
Figure 5-2: Middle Stone Age hafted points, similar to those documented at the Kathu Pan site (http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html).	35
Figure 5-3: Flaked MSA lithics on jasper from the farm Lylyveld, documented by Beaumont (2009).	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Chronological Periods across southern Africa	31
Table 2: Heritage Site Significance Ratings.....	38
Table 3: Impact Assessment Criteria.....	39
Table 4: Direct Impact Assessment Criteria	40
Table 5: Management and Mitigation Actions	41

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Scope and Motivation

AGES Gauteng was commissioned by the Sishen Iron Ore Company for an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) study of Portions 1 and 11 of the Farm Sacha 468 and Portions of the Farm Woon 469, subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Sishen Iron Ore Company High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure project in the John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality of the 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 scope of the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure project entails the following infrastructure elements (see Figure 1-1):

- A High Energy Fuel (HEF) manufacturing facility consisting of the HEF plant; a bulk storage facility for Ammonium Nitrate Calcium Nitrate; a bulk storage facility for oil and fuel; a facility for product storage (Thiouria, Sulphamic acid, Sodium nitrate, E23); a store for spares and tyres; a bulk storage facility for manufactured HEF; a laboratory for quality control and a weighbridge.
- A bulk PPAN storage facility.
- An explosives magazine facility.
- An administration building supporting the facilities.
- Ablution and change house facility.
- A wash bay facility.
- Calibration facility for explosives trucks.
- Railway link for offloading PPAN.

Incorporated in the scope of work is a 500m blasting safety buffer included as part of this study subject to the Explosives Act 15 of 2003 regulations. In addition, the project scope also provides for the establishment of boreholes to monitor ground water quality.




Figure 1-1: Map representation of the proposed infrastructure scope for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project.

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:

- *Assess findings in the previous Heritage and Archaeological Impact Assessment Studies.*
- *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 study area occurs on north-western outskirts of the Sishen Iron Ore Mine on surface portions of the farms Woon and Sacha in the John Taolo Gaetsewe district of the Northern Cape Province, generally at **S27.696079° E22.951197°**.

The town of Kathu occurs north-east of the study area. The Sishen Iron Ore Mine Complex is situated more or less 5km south-west of the town of Kathu and approximately 180km north-east of the Northern Cape town of Upington.




Figure 2-1: 1:50 000 Map representation of the location of the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project (2722DB).

2.2 Area Description: Receiving Environment

The Northern Cape area around Kathu and the Sishen Iron Ore Mine receives around 200-400 mm of rain in the summer months. The local vegetation is classified as Karroid Bushveld where a transition occurs between trees in a mixed grassveld, typical to the Bushveld complex, to a Karoo landscape with more open grasslands and succulents (Acocks 1988). The geology of the region is underlain by rocks older than 1000 million years and the overburden consists mainly of geologically recent Kalahari sand, which in turn is un-fossiliferous. Some quartzites also occur on area on the landscape. Previous studies in the area indicated that the area is underlain more specifically by Proterozoic-aged rocks belonging to the Asbestos Hills Subgroup of the Transvaal Supergroup (Beaumont 2009). The Gamagara River, a major non-perennial waterway transects the landscape south and west of the Sishen Iron Ore Mine. A number of small natural pans are scattered across the landscape.



Figure 2-2: General surroundings in the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project area at the time of the survey (September 2013).

2.3 Site Description

As noted previously, the study area for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project occurs on the north-western outskirts of the Sishen Iron Ore Mine on Portions 1 and 11 of the farm Sacha 468, and surface portions of the farm Woon 469.

The project area is situated directly west of the old Transnet railway line which has recently been rerouted to run parallel to the Gamagara River to the west of the Sishen Iron Ore Mine. A number of small Endorheic depressions or Salt pans, the largest of which is Springbok Pan, occur in the general vicinity of the Study area.

The Kathu Pan Archaeological Site (See Section 5.2) is situated approximately 5km north-east of the study area (See Figure 2-3) and other archaeological occurrences have been documented at a number of locales in the landscape immediately surrounding the proposed Sishen High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure Project (See Kruger 2012, Van Der Ryst 2012).




Figure 2-3: Aerial imagery providing a regional context for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project.

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 Kathu 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. 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 areas to be potentially impacted by the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project was conducted in September 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.

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

In single cases, consultation with employees of the mine provided information on the general history of the area, possible locations of heritage resources and brief commentaries on the recent history of the area.

3.2 Limitations

3.2.1 Access

The farms Woon and Sacha are accessed via a dirt road connecting to regional road between Kathu and Deben. Access control is applied to all the farms relevant to this assessment but no restrictions were encountered during site visits as the author of this report was accompanied by an official from the SIOM. Here, farm service roads provided access to all portions of these farms, and all areas relevant to the study were easily reachable.

3.2.2 Visibility

The surrounding vegetation in the Sishen 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 (September 2013) was moderate to high since the old rail route has been adversely altered (see Figures 3-1 to 3-4). In single cases during the survey sub-surface inspection was possible. Where applied, this revealed no archaeological deposits.



Figure 3-1: View of the existing Transnet railway line at the site of the proposed HEF rail link connection.




Figure 3-2: View of general surroundings in the study area, looking south.



Figure 3-3: View of a small salt pan in the study area, looking west.



Figure 3-4: View of the proposed HEF plant site, looking east towards the Sishen Mine.

3.2.3 Limitations and Constraints

The pedestrian site survey for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project 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. No major constraints were encountered during the site survey.

However, even though it might be assumed that survey findings are representative of the heritage landscape of the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project, 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 locations of heritage sensitive sites discussed in the text.

4.1 The Stone Age

- Site AGES-HEF-SA01 (S27.69176 E22.94596)
- Site AGES-HEF-SA02 (S27.69658 E22.95414)
- Site AGES-HEF-SA03 (S27.69852 E22.94908)

A small number of Middle Stone Age (MSA) occurrences were observed at three localities in the study area. Two of these Stone Age sites occur in association with salt pans, one site specifically near Springbok Pan. The artefact scatters are mostly constituted out of debris flakes but single formal stone tools such as side scrapers, points and blades produced on fine grained specularite, jaspilite and banded iron stone, were recorded. Some of the tools display secondary retouch. Similar Stone Age scatters occur frequently in this area along the banks of the Gamagara River and around water pans and these sites has been the subject of detailed archaeological research studies¹ (see Section 5.2). The locations of Stone Age scatters in the Sishen area correspond 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.

It should be noted that Site AGES-HEF-SA03 occurs in close vicinity of a Stone Age scatter identified during an Archaeological Impact Assessment² for the adjacent Sishen Western Waste Dumps Development (Site SA01 in the SWWD AIA) and it is assumed that these two sites form part of the same Stone Age occurrence. Since the feature has therefore been included in Phase 2 mitigation procedures emanating from that SWWD AIA study, it is excluded from further impact assessment in this Report.



Figure 4-2: View of Site SA01 along the outer fringes of a small salt pan

¹E.g. Kruger, N. 2012, Beaumont, P. 2009, Van Der Ryst 2012.

² Kruger, N. 2012. Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) of demarcated surface areas on the farms Gamagara 541, Onverwacht 540 (Fritz 540 Portion 1) and Nootgedacht 469 (Woon 469), Sishen Iron Ore Company, kgalagadi district municipality, Northern Cape Province. Pretoria: AGES

The deposition pattern and stratigraphy as observed at these sites 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 calcrete formation. Typologically, the artefacts can tentatively attribute to the Middle Stone Ages when compared to similar recorded assemblages in the area (e.g. Beaumont & Morris 1990). The sites are of limited significance due to the low density of formal tools, as well as the general loss of artefact context and shifting of artefacts due to natural processes.



Figure 4-3: Lithics on fine grained stone from Site SA01.



Figure 4-4: Secondary retouch visible on side and end scrapers from Site SA03




Figure 4-5: Typical fine grained MSA lithics from MSA scatters in the Gamagara area.




Figure 4-6: Lithics from Site SA02. Note single side scrapes (photo left), weathered point (photo right, left) and a blade (photo right, right).



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

- Site AGES-HEF-HP01 (S27.68998 E22.95362)

The dilapidated ruins of the old Woon farmstead occur to the north-east of the study area. At the site, a single section of mud brick wall, farmstead implements, a concrete dam and a wind mill remains. The farm Woon was proclaimed in 1908 (see Figure 4-8) and it could be assumed that the farmstead dates to this period. Even though the farmstead and associated features are therefore older than 60 years, the site is probably of limited significance due to the general poor preservation of structures and features.



Figure 4-7: The dilapidated mud brick walls of the Woon farmhouse.

4.4 Graves

No graves / burials were observed in the survey area.





Figure 4-8: The original title deed for the farm Woon circa 1908.

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 20 000 BC – present	Pleistocene / Holocene	<i>Homo sapiens sapiens</i> including San people	Typically small to minute stone tools such as arrow 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 kill 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 encompass 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 Discussion: The Kathu Heritage Landscape

The history of the Northern Cape Province is reflected in a rich archaeological landscape, mostly dominated by Stone Age occurrences. Numerous sites, documenting Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age habitation occur across the province, 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 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 this 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.

5.2.1 Palaeontology and Early History

As previously noted, the Kathu area is underlain by rocks older than 1000 million years, which makes them too

old to contain hard-bodied fossils (Beaumont 2009). This overburden consists mainly of un-fossiliferous Kalahari sand, which is relatively recent in geological age. An indurated calcareous layer frequently occurs at the interface of the sandy overburden and the rock beneath. This layer may contain fossil remains in more suitable localities, although none have been reported from such contexts in this area.

5.2.2 The Early and Middle stone Ages in the Northern Cape

The landscape around the town of Kathu is rich in archaeological material dating to Earlier and Middle Stone Ages. These are subject to on-going archaeological research Sites such as Wonderwerk Cave, Kathu Pan and Kathu Townlands 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 (e.g. see Beaumont 2008, 2009; Morris 2006; Morris 2007; Dreyer 2007). In addition, a large amount of Middle and Later Stone Age sites have been documented across the landscape on calcrete lined pans and road cuttings.

5.2.3 Significant Stone Age Sites in the Kathu area

Archaeological sites in the vicinity of the Sishen Iron Ore Mine are not randomly scattered within the landscape and they occur either near water or close to local source of two highly-prized raw materials, specularite and jaspilite. Besides the Gamagara River where numerous low density artefact scatters occur, another regional water source occurs below superficial sands on the bedrock plains around Kathu, where water was contained at times that gradually filled up with stratified sediments often containing massive calcretes of Tertiary age. Large tracts are far more widespread, where archaeological traces are almost non-existent with very occasional specimens of the Later Stone Age on the sand surface and thin scatters of specimens from the Early Stone Age on calcrete below. Rock engravings previously occurred on the farms Bruce and Sishen, but as these were located in land that was to be mined, personnel of the McGregor Museum removed them prior to mining developments. At least two archaeological sites of note occur in the general landscape around the town of Kathu.

As noted earlier, significant Stone Age sites occur in and around Kathu and on adjacent farms. These are subject to on-going archaeological research, primarily by Jayne Wilkins from the University of Toronto in Ontario, who has suggested the earliest stone-tipped spears yet found occur in the Kathu area.

- Kathu Pan (See Figure 2-3)

This site, situated near the town of Kathu, is a shallow water pan about 30ha in extent. The site was extensively studied from 1974 to 1990 by Humpreys and Beaumont, amongst others. Kathu Pan is an extremely significant site as it represents the major industries of the Stone Age, more specifically two phases of the Earlier Stone Age, two phases of the Middle Stone Age, and more or less the entire Later Stone Age (Beaumont 1990). The site yielded large amounts of hand axes and faunal remains, including the concentrated remains of large mammal remains. More recently, research by Jayne Wilkins revealed a hoard of stone points, each between 4 and 9 centimeters long, that they think belonged to the earliest stone-tipped spears yet found. The stone points are the right shape and size for the job, and some have fractured tips that suggest they were used as weapons. Since stone points used on spears had been found only at sites that date back no more than 300 000 years, these discoveries in the 500 000-year-old deposits at Kathu is greatly significant. The abundance of Stone Age material at Kathu Pan can probably be attributed to the presence of a permanent water source at the pan.



Figure 5-1: Early Stone Age (Acheul) handaxe from the Kathu Pan site (<http://www.museumsonc.co.za>).



Figure 5-2: Middle Stone Age hafted points, similar to those documented at the Kathu Pan site (<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html>).

- Kathu Townlands

This Provincial Heritage Site, covering an estimated area of 250 000 m² is located away from the Kathu pan on the outskirts of the town of Kathu. The site, excavated in 1982 and 1990, primarily displays a large Earlier Stone Age horizon in deposits up to a metre below surface. This deposit dates to the Acheul phase of the Earlier Stone

Age. It is estimated that in total, the site holds more than 2 billion artefacts. This abundance of lithic debris could be ascribed to the protracted use of the high-grade banded ironstone outcrop in the area, as a raw material source (Beaumont 1990).

- Other sites around the Sishen area

Small McGregor Museum collections from the farm Lylyveld 545 comprise an Earlier Stone Age sample from along the Gamagara River and Earlier Stone Age plus Iron Age material from around specularite pits on the hillside, all collected by G & S Collins in 1967. The latter sites were destroyed by subsequent Iscor prospecting, as was another small Iron Age specularite working on a hill flanking the Gamagara River, on Demaneng 546, that they found in the same year. Another small Later Stone Age collection was documented in 1987 on southern Lylyveld 545, from the slopes around a shallow overhang, now mined away, directly south of the N14. Still intact is a low rise with many specularite pits on Mashwening 557, some 6 km to the south-east, where a test trench in 1989 yielded Ceramic Later Stone Age overlying sparse Acheulean, which included a cleaver. These studies also mention pecked engravings on off – white Gamagara Shale located on the farms Sishen 543 and Bruce 544. In addition, another Acheul quarry of similar extent to the Kathu Towlands Site occurs on the crest of Kathu Hill close to the town of Kathu.



Figure 5-3: Flaked MSA lithics on jasper from the farm Lylyveld, documented by Beaumont (2009).

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 sites of heritage potential in the Sishen High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure Project 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.

Table 3: Impact Assessment Criteria

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.

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.

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.

Duration

Here it should be indicated whether the lifespan of the impact will be:

- Short term, (needs to be defined in context)
- Medium term, (needs to be defined in context)
- Long term where the impact will persist indefinitely, possibly beyond the operational life of the activity, either because of natural processes or by human intervention; or
- Permanent where mitigation either by natural process or by human intervention 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.

Intensity

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; and

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

- High, where heritage value is altered to the extent that it will temporarily or permanently be damaged or destroyed.

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

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.

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.

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 4: 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 5: 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> <p>Avoidance</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Compensation</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 AGES-HEF-SA01, Site AGES-HEF-SA02

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	2722DB		
Farm / Settlement / Zone	Sacha 468						
Co-ordinates	AGES-HEF-SA01 AGES-HEF-SA02		S27.69176 S27.69658	E22.94596 E22.95414			
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		River Mouth	
Dam		River Bank		Slope		Plains	X
Other / Comments							
Vegetation							
Riverine forest		Bushveld		Savannah		Mountain forest	
Thornveld	X	Grassland	X	Cultivated		Other	
Age Classification							
Stone Age	X	Early Iron Age		Middle Iron Age		Later Iron Age	
Historical		Other					
Material Culture							
Midden		House Remains		Stone Walling		Stone Structures	

Granary		Grinding Stone (L)		Grinding Stone (U)		Granary Stand		
Metal		Ceramics (Potter)		Ceramics (Porcelain)		Stone (non-lithic)	X	
Metal slag		Tuyere		Fauna		Bead (Glass)		
Bead (OES / Shell)		Glass		Lithics	X	Smelting Residues		
Other:				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]								X
Generally Protected C [Low significance, no further action]								
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: 100 - 500 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			
General assessment of impacts on resource (Refer to Section 7.3.1)		Without Management*	With Management*
	Duration	Short Term	Short Term
	Intensity	Low	Low
	Probability	Improbable	Improbable
	Impact Significance	Negligible	Negligible
3.3 Direct Impact Rating			
Direct impact on resource	None (the potential development does not adversely or positively affect the heritage resource)		X
	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)		
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.		No Heritage Impact Expected.	
3.4 Recommended Management* (refer to section 7.3.3)			
Monitoring			
Comments on recommended management			
<p>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:</p> <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 			

6.4.2 Site HP01

1. SITE DESCRIPTION : The old Woon Farmstead			
1.2 General Site Description			
The ruined remains of the Woon farmstead.			
1.2 Site features / artefacts / Other			
Site Location			
Province / District	Northern Cape Province		Map Number
			2722DB
Farm / Settlement / Zone	Sishen 543		
Co-ordinates	Site HP01	S27.68998	E22.95362
Site Type			
Surface sites	X	Caves and rock shelters	
Larger open-air sites		Sealed sites (deposits)	
River deposits		Other	
Site Function			
Living / habitation		Kill	
Ceremonial		Burial	
Trading / Barter	X	Art	
Quarry / Mining / Smelting		Other	
Site Placement			
Valley floor		Hill top	Vlei/swamp
			River Mouth
Dam		River Bank	Slope
			Plains
Other / Comments	X		
Vegetation			

Riverine forest		Bushveld		Savannah		Mountain forest	
Thornveld	X	Grassland	X	Cultivated	X	Other	
Age Classification							
Stone Age		Early Iron Age		Middle Iron Age		Later Iron Age	
Historical		Other	X – recent historical				
Material Culture							
Midden		House Remains	X	Stone Walling		Stone Structures	X
Granary		Grinding Stone (L)		Grinding Stone (U)		Granary Stand	
Metal	X	Ceramics (Potter)		Ceramics (Porcelain)	X	Stone (non-lithic)	X
Metal slag		Tuyere		Fauna		Bead (Glass)	
Bead (OES / Shell)		Glass	X	Lithics		Smelting Residues	
Other:				Other:			
1.3 Site Condition							
The site integrity has been severely compromised since all structures are poorly preserved.							
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]							X
Generally Protected C [Low significance, no further action]							
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: 100 - 500 METERS				
NATURE OF IMPACT: HISTORICAL, AESTHETIC, SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC, ARCHITECTURAL & VISUAL.				
EXTENT OF IMPACT: Local				
SPECIALIST LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE IN DEGREE OF IMPACT AND SEVERITY: High				
3.2 Impact Significance and Severity				
General assessment of impacts on resource (Refer to Section 7.3.1)		Without Management*	With Management*	
	Duration	Short Term	Short Term	
	Intensity	Low	Low	
	Probability	Improbable	Improbable	
	Impact Significance	Negligible	Negligible	
3.3 Direct Impact Rating				
Direct impact on resource	None (the potential development does not adversely or positively affect the heritage resource)			X
	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)			
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.				No 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 [previously undetected 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 Sishen area, coupled with finds noted in this report suggest a rich and diverse archaeological landscape (e.g. Kathu Pan and Stone Age occurrences along the Gamagara River) and cognisance should be taken of archaeological material that might be present in surface and sub-surface deposits along drainage lines and at water pans. The following assessment impact discussion more clearly describes the extent of heritage significance and impact on resources, cognisant of this rich larger archae-historical landscape.

Stone Age occurrences in the project area at **Site AGES-HEF-SA01**, **Site AGES-HEF-SA02** occur away from the proposed HEF plant and railway link site but within the blasting safety buffer for the HEF facility and as such, the direct impact on the sites by the proposed activity is considered to be none. The sites are 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 resources is therefore considered to be NEGLIBLE and this impact rating is expected to remain unchanged by the implementation of mitigation measures (monitoring) for the sites, if / when required.**

The Historical Period ruin of the old Woon farmstead (**Site AGES-HEF-HP01**) occurs outside the proposed HEF

plant, railway link and the blasting safety buffer and the direct impact on the site by the proposed activity is considered to be none. The site is probably of medium- low heritage significance due to the poor preservation and dilapidated state of structures and features at the site. **The significance of the impact on the resources is therefore considered to be NEGLIBLE and this impact rating is expected to remain unchanged by the implementation of mitigation measures (monitoring) for the sites, if / when required.**



Table 6: Impact assessment matrix for the Sishen HEF Plant and Infrastructure Project heritage.

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 AGES-HEF-SA01 Site AGES-HEF-SA02	Pre-Construction, Construction, Operation and Closure	Loss of Heritage Resource and Attributes	1	3	1	2	6	Negligible	Monitoring	1	1	1	2	4	Negligible
Site AGES-HEF-HP01	Pre-Construction, Construction, Operation and Closure	Loss of Heritage Resource and Attributes	1	3	1	2	6	Negligible	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 Kathu is rich in pre-historical and historical remnants where ESA and MSA material occur widely around pans and other water sources. Cognisant of this historically significant landscape and the need for the conservation of its heritage resources, the following recommendations are made based on general observations in the proposed Sishen High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure Project Area:

- Since the palaeontological sensitivity of rock units within the study area is generally low the impact significance of the proposed prospecting activities as far as fossil heritage is concerned, is likely to be small. However, a Palaeontological Impact Assessment is recommended and, should fossil remains such as fossil fish, reptiles or petrified wood be exposed during construction, these objects should 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, a careful watching brief monitoring process is recommended for all stages of the project, specifically around heritage sensitive areas i.e. salt pans and historical period structures. 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
- MSA scatters on the farm Sacha (**Site AGES-HEF- SA01, Site AGES-HEF-SA02**) are of low heritage priority due to the loss of artefact context and the low density of formal tools at the localities. The sites occur away from the proposed HEF plant and railway link site but within the blasting safety buffer for the HEF facility and it is recommended that the sites be monitored if any development activates takes place in the vicinity of the sites, in order to limit possible impact on previously undetected heritage remains.
- The poorly preserved Woon farmstead (**Site AGES-HEF-HP01**) is of medium-low significance due to the dilapidated state of the site. The farmstead occurs outside the proposed HEF plant, railway link and the blasting safety buffer but site monitoring of these structures are recommended if any activity pertaining to the development occur in this area. If the site were to be impacted on by the mining development, destruction permits should be obtained from the relevant heritage resources authority (SAHRA).
- 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 will 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 mine.

In addition to these site-specific recommendations, careful cognizance 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 archaeological material in the proposed Sishen High Energy Fuel (HEF) Plant and Infrastructure Project area. In addition to heritage resources occurring here, the larger Kathu 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 a 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;

Beaumont, P. 2009. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment report on a portion of the farm Lylyveld 545 near Kathu, Kagalagadi District Municipality, Northern Cape province. McGregor Museum, Kimberley

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

Chazan, M., Wilkins, J., Morris, D. & Berna, F. 2012. Bestwood 1: a newly discovered Earlier Stone Age living surface near Kathu, Northern Cape Province, South Africa. *Antiquity* 86(331): Antiquity Gallery.

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

Kruger, N. 2012. *Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) of demarcated surface areas on the farms Gamagara 541, Onverwacht 540 (Fritz 540 Portion 1) and Nooitgedacht 469 (Woon 469) for the Sishen Western Waste Dumps Project, Sishen Iron Ore Company, Kgalagadi district municipality, Northern Cape Province*. Pretoria: AGES

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

Porat, N., Chazan, M., Grun, R., Aubert, M., Eisenmann, V., Kolska-Horwitz, L. 2009. New radiometric ages for the Fauresmith industry from Kathu Pan, Southern Africa: Implications for the Earlier to Middle Stone Age Transition. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37: 269-283

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 & Küsel, 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 der Ryst, M.M & Küsel, S. 2013. Phase 2 Report on Middle Stone Age localities on the farm Woon, Sishen, Northern Cape Province. Pretoria: Habitat Landscape Architects.

Wadley, L. 2001. What is cultural modernity. A general view and a South African perspective from Rose Cottage. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 11(2):201-221.

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://www.newscientist.com/article/dn22508-first-stonetipped-spear-thrown-earlier-than-thought.html>

Accessed 2013-10-25