

Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed Mopane Solar Energy Facilities near Carltonville, Gauteng and North West Provinces

Mopane Solar PV 1

Site Visit Report (Phase 2)

For

Beyond Heritage

08 January 2023

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

Expertise of Specialist

The Palaeontologist Consultant: Prof Marion Bamford

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

Experience: 34 years research; 26 years PIA studies

Declaration of Independence

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

Specialist: Prof Marion Bamford

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

Signature:

Executive Summary

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the proposed development of the Mopane Solar PV 1, a part of the cluster of Energy Facilities (SEFs), west northwest of Carltonville, along the Gauteng - North West Province border. Mopane PV 1 is planned to be located on the remainder of Farm Douglasdale 95 IQ.

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

The proposed site lies on the potentially fossiliferous Malmani Subgroup (Transvaal Supergroup) that could preserve trace fossils such as stromatolites or microbialites in the dolomites. The site visit and walk through in December 2022 (summer) by the palaeontologist confirmed that weathered dolomites and cherts were fairly common in the area for the proposed solar collectors and substation. NO FOSSILS, such as stromatolites, were seen in the dolomite outcrops. Nonetheless, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMP. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the contractor, developer, environmental officer or other designated responsible person once excavations for pole foundations or solar collector and infrastructure have commenced. Since the impact will be low, as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

Table of Contents

Expertise of Specialist	2
Declaration of Independence	2
1. Background	5
2. Methods and Terms of Reference.....	9
3. Geology and Palaeontology.....	9
i. Project location and geological context	9
ii. Palaeontological context.....	11
iii. Site visit observations	12
4. Impact assessment.....	15
5. Assumptions and uncertainties.....	16
6. Recommendation.....	16
7. References	17
8. Chance Find Protocol	17
9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils	19
10. Appendix B – Details of specialist.....	20
Figure 1: Google Earth map of the project area	8
Figures 2: Google Earth map of the project footprint	8
Figure 3: Geological map of the area around the project site.....	9
Figure 4: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the project	11
Figures 5-6: Site visit photographs	13-14

1. Background

VOLTALIA SOUTH AFRICA (PTY) LTD is proposing the establishment of a renewable energy generation facility (Photovoltaic Power Plant) with associated infrastructure and structures, and power line on the Remainder of the farm Douglasdale 95 IQ, located within the JB Marks Local Municipality, Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality, North West Province.

The name of the facility will be MOPANE SOLAR PV 1.

In view of the growing electricity demand and in an effort to use renewable energy resources, Voltalia South Africa (Pty) Ltd is assessing the feasibility of energy generation facility, consisting of the construction, operation and maintenance of Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plants with a maximum generation capacity up to 100 MW, at the point of connection.

The project site is on the Remainder of the farm Douglasdale 95 IQ, located within the JB Marks Local Municipality, Dr Kenneth Kaunda District Municipality, North West Province.

The project site is located ± 7 km north west of Welverdiend along the border between Gauteng and the North West Province. The development is located 5.5km north of R501 with access from both the D859 (Preferred) and R501 (alternative). The Eskom Carmel Main Transmission Substation (MTS) is located 16.4 km south-east of the project site.

Access to the project site would be from the regional road D859 (preferred) and R501 (alternative). These roads run north and south of the project site.

The developed area (footprint) required for the proposed project will be up to 185 hectares. The final size and location of the project footprint will be assessed following the outcomes of the Public Participation Process and of the recommendations and conclusions of the Specialist Studies to be conducted during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process.

The proposed development (the Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plants and connection infrastructure) consists of the installation of the following equipment:

- Photovoltaic modules (mono-crystalline, poly-crystalline, or bi-facial modules)
- Mounting systems for the PV arrays (single-axis horizontal trackers or fixed structures) and related foundations
- Internal cabling and string boxes
- DC/AC inverters
- Medium voltage stations, hosting LV/MV power transformers
- Medium voltage receiving station(s)
- Workshops & warehouses
- One on-site high-voltage substation and one high-voltage busbar with metering and protection devices
- One on-site high-voltage substation with high-voltage power transformers, stepping up the voltage to 275kV and one high-voltage busbar with metering and protection devices

- One on-site switching station, with one high-voltage busbar with metering and protection devices
- Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), with a Maximum Export Capacity up to 100 MW and a 5-hour storage capacity up to 1250 MWh, with a footprint up to 2 ha, next to the on-site high-voltage substation, within the PV plant footprint / fenced areas
- Electrical system and UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply) devices
- Lighting system
- Grounding system
- Internal roads
- Fencing of the site and alarm and video-surveillance system
- Water access point, water supply pipelines, water treatment facilities
- Small scale patented wastewater treatment system.

During the construction phase, the site may be provided with additional activities that will be removed at the end of construction:

- Water access point, water supply pipelines, water treatment facilities
- Prefabricated buildings
- Workshops and warehouses

The proposed SEF site and the grid connection are on very highly sensitive rocks of the Malmani Subgroup that might preserve trace fossils such as stromatolites, so a site visit is required by SAHRA as part of the EIA process (<https://sahris.sahra.org/map.palaeo>).

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the Mopane Solar PV 1 project. To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit and walkthrough (Phase 2) Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development and is reported herein.

Table 1: National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014 (as amended) - Requirements for Specialist Reports (Appendix 6).

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
ai	Details of the specialist who prepared the report,	Appendix B
aii	The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Appendix B
b	A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page 2
c	An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
ci	An indication of the quality and age of the base data used for the specialist report: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map accessed – date of this report	Yes

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
cii	A description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change	Section 5
d	The date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	N/A
e	A description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process	Section 2
f	The specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the activity and its associated structures and infrastructure	Section 4
g	An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	N/A
h	A map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	N/A
i	A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 5
j	A description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives, on the environment	Section 4
k	Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 8, Appendix A
l	Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A
m	Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 8, Appendix A
ni	A reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised	Section 6
nii	If the opinion is that the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Sections 6, 8
o	A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A
p	A summary and copies of any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A
q	Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A
2	Where a government notice gazetted by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.	N/A




Figure 1: Google Earth map of the proposed development showing the Mopane SEF cluster area (yellow), and the OHPL routes (turquoise and blue), and the relevant landmarks.




Figure 2: Google Earth map for the proposed Mopane PV 1 site (green) on the remainder of Farm Douglasdale 95.

2. Methods and Terms of Reference

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

The methods employed to address the ToR included:

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

3. Geology and Palaeontology

i. Project location and geological context




Figure 3: Geological map of the area around the Farm Douglasdale 95 IQ, west of Carltonville. Abbreviations of the rock types are explained in Table 2. Map enlarged from the Geological Survey 1: 250 000 map 2626 West Rand.

Table 2: Explanation of symbols for the geological map and approximate ages (Johnson et al., 2006; Partridge et al., 2006; Zeh et al., 2020). SG = Supergroup; Fm = Formation; Ma = million years; grey shading = formations impacted by the project.

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Qs	Quaternary	Alluvium, sand, calcrete	Neogene, ca 2.5 Ma to present
Vdi	diabase	Diabase	Post-Transvaal SG
Vh	Hekpoort Fm, Pretoria Group, Transvaal SG	Andesite, agglomerate, tuff	
Vt	Timeball Hill Fm Pretoria Group, Transvaal SG	Quartzite	< 2420 Ma
Vmd	Malmani Subgroup, Chuniespoort Group, Transvaal SG	Dolomite, chert	Ca 2750 – 2650 Ma
Vbr	Black Reef Fm, Transvaal SG	Quartzite, conglomerate, shale, basalt	Ca 2650 – 2640 Ma
R-Vr	Rietgat Fm, Platberg Group, Ventersdorp SG	Amygdaloidal lava, agglomerate, tuff	Mesoarchaeon Ca 2720 Ma
Rg	Government Subgroup, West Rand Group, Witwatersrand SG	Quartzite, shale, greywacke, conglomerate	Mesoarchaeon Ca 2890 Ma

The project lies in the south western part of the Transvaal Basin where the lower rocks of the Transvaal Supergroup are exposed, in particular the dolomites of the Malmani Subgroup (Chuniespoort Group, Transvaal Supergroup; ca 2585-2480 Ma), (Figure 3).

The Late Archaean to early Proterozoic Transvaal Supergroup is preserved in three structural basins on the Kaapvaal Craton (Eriksson et al., 2006). In South Africa are the Transvaal and Griqualand West Basins, and the Kanye Basin is in southern Botswana. The Griqualand West Basin is divided into the Ghaap Plateau sub-basin and the Prieska sub-basin. Sediments in the lower parts of the basins are very similar but they differ somewhat higher up the sequences. Several tectonic events have greatly deformed the south western portion of the Griqualand West Basin between the two sub-basins

In the Transvaal Basin the Transvaal Supergroup is divided into two Groups, the lower Chuniespoort Group and the upper Pretoria Group (with ten formations; Eriksson et al., 2006). The Chuniespoort Group is divided into the basal Malmani Subgroup that comprises dolomites and limestones and is divided into five formations based on chert content, stromatolitic morphology, intercalated shales and erosion surfaces. The top of the Chuniespoort Group has the Penge Formation and the Deutschland Formation.

Making up the lower Pretoria Group are the Timeball Hill Formation and the Boshhoek Formation. The Hekpoort, Dwaalheuwel, Strubenkop and Daspoort Formations form a sequence as the middle part of the Pretoria Group, Transvaal Supergroup, and represent rocks that are over 2060 million years old. The Hekpoort Formation is a massive lava deposit and is overlain by the rest of the Transvaal Supergroup.

The Transvaal sequence has been interpreted as three major cycles of basin infill and tectonic activity with the first deep basin sediments forming the Chuniespoort Group, the second cycle deposited the lower Pretoria Group, and the sediments in this area are from the interim lowstand that preceded the third cycle. These sediments were deposited in shallow lacustrine, alluvial fan and braided stream environments (Eriksson et al., 2012).

ii. Palaeontological context

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 4. The site for development is in the very highly sensitive Malmani Subgroup (Transvaal Supergroup).




Figure 4: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the proposed Mopane PV 1 (yellow). Background colours indicate the following degrees of sensitivity: red = very highly sensitive; orange/yellow = high; green = moderate; blue = low; grey = insignificant/zero.

The Transvaal Supergroup rocks represent on a very large scale, a sequence of sediments filling the basins under conditions of lacustrine, fluvial, volcanic and glacial cycles in a tectonically active region. The predominantly carbonaceous sediments are evidence of the increase in the atmosphere of oxygen produced by algal colony photosynthesis, the so-called Great Oxygen Event (ca 2.40 – 2.32 Ga) and precursor to an environment where diverse life forms could evolve. The Neoproterozoic Transvaal Supergroup in South Africa contains the well-preserved stromatolitic Campbellrand -Malmani

carbonate platform (Griqualand West Basin – Transvaal Basin respectively), which was deposited in shallow seawater shortly before the Great Oxidation Event (GOE).

The Transvaal Supergroup comprises one of world’s earliest carbonate platform successions (Beukes, 1987; Eriksson et al., 2006; Zeh et al., 2020). In some areas there are well preserved stromatolites that are evidence of the photosynthetic activity of blue green bacteria and green algae. These microbes formed colonies in warm, shallow seas and deposited layer upon layer of minerals, often in domes or columns. The minerals are predominantly calcium carbonate, calcium sulphate, magnesium carbonate and magnesium sulphate. Only very rarely are the bacteria and algae preserved but the stromatolites are traces of their activity, hence called trace fossils. These fossils are protected by legislation, therefore the Malmani Subgroup palaeosensitivity is very high (red; Figure 4, SAHRIS).

iii. Site visit observations

The area for Mopane PV1 on Farm Douglasdale 95 was walked through. The area is on a slight slope that has been cleared of bushes and shrubs so is now covered by secondary grassland on thin soils (Figures 5-6). It has probably been used for grazing.

There are exposures of rocks in some parts, mostly chert (Figures 5; 6A) but there are examples of in situ dolomite (Figure 6B) that were examined carefully. There were pure dolomite and there were no typical layering or circular structures that would represent laminar or domal stromatolites, respectively.

The majority of the area has deeper soils and secondary grassland with only rare rocky outcrops (Figures 6C-D).



Figure 5: Site visit photographs for Mopane Solar PV1. A - B - general view of the area showing low grasslands and outcrops of dolomite and mostly chert. C-D - road shows thin reddish soils under the grasses, and scattered chert blocks. No stromatolites present.



Figure 6: Site visit photographs for Mopane Solar PV1. A – scattered blocks of chert. B – exposures of dolomite but with uniform texture and no stromatolites. C-D – deeper soils and thicker grassland. Very rare dolomite in this section. No fossils.

4. Impact assessment

An assessment of the potential impacts to possible palaeontological resources considers the criteria encapsulated in Table :

Table 4a: Criteria for assessing impacts

PART A: DEFINITION AND CRITERIA		
Criteria for ranking of the SEVERITY/NATURE of environmental impacts	H	Substantial deterioration (death, illness or injury). Recommended level will often be violated. Vigorous community action.
	M	Moderate/ measurable deterioration (discomfort). Recommended level will occasionally be violated. Widespread complaints.
	L	Minor deterioration (nuisance or minor deterioration). Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	L+	Minor improvement. Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	M+	Moderate improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. No observed reaction.
	H+	Substantial improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. Favourable publicity.
Criteria for ranking the DURATION of impacts	L	Quickly reversible. Less than the project life. Short term
	M	Reversible over time. Life of the project. Medium term
	H	Permanent. Beyond closure. Long term.
Criteria for ranking the SPATIAL SCALE of impacts	L	Localised - Within the site boundary.
	M	Fairly widespread – Beyond the site boundary. Local
	H	Widespread – Far beyond site boundary. Regional/ national
PROBABILITY (of exposure to impacts)	H	Definite/ Continuous
	M	Possible/ frequent
	L	Unlikely/ seldom

Table 4b: Impact Assessment

PART B: Assessment		
SEVERITY/NATURE	H	-
	M	-
	L	Soils do not preserve plant fossils; so far there are no records from the Malmani Subgroup of trace fossils of stromatolites in this region so it is very unlikely that fossils occur on the site. The impact would be very unlikely.
	L+	-
	M+	-

PART B: Assessment		
	H+	-
DURATION	L	-
	M	-
	H	Where manifest, the impact will be permanent.
	L	Since the only possible fossils within the area would be trace fossils such as stromatolites in the dolomites, the spatial scale will be localised within the site boundary.
SPATIAL SCALE	M	-
	H	-
	L	-
PROBABILITY	H	-
	M	-
	L	It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be found in the loose sand that will be excavated but there might be stromatolites in the dolomites. Therefore, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the eventual EMPr.

Based on the nature of the project, surface activities may impact upon the fossil heritage if preserved in the development footprint. The geological structures suggest that the rocks are the correct age and type to preserve fossils. The site visit and walk through confirmed that there were NO FOSSILS in the project footprint. Outcrops of chert and dolomite but no stromatolite were found. Since there is an extremely small chance that trace fossils from the Malmani Subgroup may occur below the soils and may be disturbed a Fossil Chance Find Protocol has been added to this report. Taking account of the defined criteria, the potential impact to fossil heritage resources is extremely low.

5. Assumptions and uncertainties

Based on the geology of the area and the palaeontological record as we know it, it can be assumed that the formation and layout of the dolomites, sandstones, shales and sands are typical for the country and only some do contain trace fossils, fossil plant, insect, invertebrate and vertebrate material. The site visit and walk through in mid December by the palaeontologist confirmed that there are NO FOSSILS in the proposed area for the solar collectors. The overlying sands and soils of the Quaternary period would not preserve fossils. It is not known if there are stromatolites below the soils.

6. Recommendation

Based on the fossil record but confirmed by the site visit and walk through there are NO FOSSILS in exposures of dolomite in the project footprint. There were mostly cherts but some dolomites occur in the proposed solar collector area. The western and central part has only a few cherts and mainly is covered with soils. No stromatolites were found on the farm although stromatolites have been recorded from some exposures of the Malmani Subgroup. This is reflected in the lack of a formation being assigned to the

area, because the type of fossils would enable the recognition of the Formations within this group. It would appear that stromatolites, oolitic and algal dolomite are generally absent from this region. It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be preserved in the overlying soils and sands of the Quaternary.

There is a very small chance that trace fossils may occur in below the ground surface in the dolomites of the Malmani Subgroup so a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. If fossils are found by the environmental officer or other responsible person once excavations and drilling have commenced, then they should be rescued and a palaeontologist called to assess and collect a representative sample.

Since there is an extremely small chance of fossils being impacted by this project, as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

7. References

Beukes, N.J., 1987. Facies relations, depositional environments and diagenesis in a major early Proterozoic stromatolitic carbonate platform to basinal sequence, Campbellrand Subgroup, Transvaal Supergroup, southern Africa. *Sedimentary Geology* 54, 1-46.

Eriksson, P.G., Altermann, W., Hartzler, F.J., 2006. The Transvaal Supergroup and its precursors. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). *The Geology of South Africa*. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. pp 237-260.

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

Zeh, A., Wilson, A.H., Gerdes, A., 2020. Zircon U-Pb-Hf isotope systematics of Transvaal Supergroup – Constraints for the geodynamic evolution of the Kaapvaal Craton and its hinterland between 2.65 and 2.06 Ga. *Precambrian Research* 345, 105760.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2020.105760>

8. Chance Find Protocol

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

1. The following procedure is only required if fossils are seen on the surface and when drilling/excavations commence.
2. When excavations begin the rocks and discard must be given a cursory inspection by the environmental officer or designated person. Any fossiliferous material (trace fossils, fossils of plants, insects, bone or coalified

material) should be put aside in a suitably protected place. This way the project activities will not be interrupted.

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

Appendix A – Examples of fossils from the Malmani Subgroup



Weathering of dolomite



Small domal stromatolites



Side view of a stromatolite



Surface view of domal stromatolites

Figure 7: Photographs of dolomite and stromatolites as seen in the field.



Figure 8: More photographs of different types of stromatolitic material.

9. Appendix B – Details of specialists

Curriculum vitae (short) - Marion Bamford PhD January 2023

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

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

ii) Academic qualifications

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:
 1980-1982: BSc, majors in Botany and Microbiology. Graduated April 1983.
 1983: BSc Honours, Botany and Palaeobotany. Graduated April 1984.
 1984-1986: MSc in Palaeobotany. Graduated with Distinction, November 1986.
 1986-1989: PhD in Palaeobotany. Graduated in June 1990.

iii) Professional qualifications

Wood Anatomy Training (overseas as nothing was available in South Africa):
 1994 - Service d'Anatomie des Bois, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgium, by Roger Dechamps
 1997 - Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France, by Dr Jean-Claude Koeniguer
 1997 - Université Claude Bernard, Lyon, France by Prof Georges Barale, Dr Jean-Pierre Gros, and Dr Marc Philippe

iv) Membership of professional bodies/associations

Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa
 Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards
 Academy of Sciences of South Africa - Member: Oct 2014 onwards
 International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991
 International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+
 Botanical Society of South Africa
 South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016
 SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+
 PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative
 ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+
 INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

v) Supervision of Higher Degrees

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	13	0
Masters	13	3
PhD	13	7
Postdoctoral fellows	14	4

vi) Undergraduate teaching

Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year
 Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 25 students per year
 Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology;
 Micropalaeontology – average 12 - 20 students per year.

vii) Editing and reviewing

Editor: *Palaeontologia africana*: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor
 Guest Editor: *Quaternary International*: 2005 volume
 Member of Board of Review: *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*: 2010 –
 Associate Editor: *Cretaceous Research*: 2018-2020
 Associate Editor: *Royal Society Open*: 2021 -

Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 30 local and international journals

viii) **Palaeontological Impact Assessments**

25 years' experience in PIA site and desktop projects

- Selected from recent projects only – list not complete:
- Skeerpoort Farm Mast 2020 for HCAC
- Vulindlela Eco village 2020 for 1World
- KwaZamakhule Township 2020 for Kudzala
- Sunset Copper 2020 for Digby Wells
- McCarthy-Salene 2020 for Prescali
- VLNR Lodge 2020 for HCAC
- Madadeni mixed use 2020 for EnviroPro
- Frankfort-Windfield Eskom Powerline 2020 for 1World
- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe
- Glosam Mine 2022 for AHSA
- Wolf-Skilpad-Grassridge OHPL 2022 for Zutari
- Iziduli and Msenge WEFs 2022 for CTS Heritage
- Hendrina North and South WEFs & SEFs 2022 for Cabanga
- Dealesville-Springhaas SEFs 2022 for GIBB Environmental
- Vhuvhili and Mukondeleli SEFs 2022 for CSIR
- Chemwes & Stilfontein SEFs 2022 for CTS Heritage
- Equestria Exts housing 2022 for Beyond Heritage
- Zeerust Salene boreholes 2022 for Prescali
- Tsakane Sewer upgrade 2022 for Tsimba
- Transnet MPP inland and coastal 2022 for ENVASS
- Ruighoek PRA 2022 for SLR Consulting (Africa)
- Namli MRA Steinkopf 2022 for Beyond Heritage

ix) **Research Output**

Publications by M K Bamford up to January 2022 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 170 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 14 book chapters.

Scopus h-index = 30; Google Scholar h-index = 39; -i10-index = 116 based on 6568 citations.

Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.