



Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd

**PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HERITAGE
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PROSPECTING RIGHT
AND ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL
AUTHORISATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT
LICENCE (WML) FOR THE PROPOSED
PROSPECTING (WITH BULK SAMPLING) FOR
ALLUVIAL DIAMONDS (DA), KIMBERLITIC
DIAMONDS (DK), GRAVEL (GRAV), SAND
GENERAL (QY) AND POTENTIAL ACCOMPANYING
TRACE GOLD (AU) ORE ON A PORTION OF FARM
MIER 585 IN THE DAWID KRUIPER LOCAL
MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**



DOCUMENT SYNOPSIS (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)

Item	Description
Proposed development and location	Prospecting Right and Associated Environmental Authorisation and Waste Management Licence (WML) for the Proposed Prospecting (With Bulk Sampling) for Alluvial Diamonds (Da), Kimberlitic Diamonds (Dk), Gravel (Grav), Sand General (Qy) and Potential Accompanying Trace Gold (Au) Ore on a Portion of Farm Mier 585 in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality, Northern Cape Province
Purpose of the study	The Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment for the Prospecting Right Application in Northern Cape Province
Coordinates	See Figure 3
Municipalities	Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality, ZF Mgcawu District Municipality (
Predominant land use of surrounding area	The current landuse on the affected properties is agriculture. It is expected that due to the low rainfall and high temperatures and evapotranspiration, the agriculture potential of the area is low. There is a residential area (Rietfontein) located less than 1km from the proposed prospecting area.
Applicant	Temla 13 (Pty) Ltd 6213 End St, Postmasburg Northern Cape 8420
DMR	NC30/5/1/1/2/13169 PR
EAP	NDI Geological Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd 38 Ophelia Street, Kimberley, 8301 Cell: 082 760 8420, Tel: 053 842 0687, Fax: 086 538 1069 atshidzaho@gmail.com , ndi@ndigeoservices.co.za
Heritage Practitioner	Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd Cell: 071 685 9247 Email: trust@issolutions.co.za
Authors	Trust Miilo
Date of Report	10 April 2023

The purpose of this report is to inform and guide the applicant and contractors about the possible impacts that the proposed prospecting with bulk sampling may have on heritage resources (if any) located in the study area. In addition, this heritage report must also inform the South African heritage authorities (SAHRA) about the presence, absence and significance of heritage resources located within a portion of Farm Mier 585 in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality, Northern Cape Province earmarked for prospecting. Temla 13 requires a prospecting right in terms of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (Act No. 22 of 2002) (MPRDA). Before the prospecting right will be granted, Temla 13 must undertake an EA and WML application process in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and National Environmental Management: Waste Act, 2008 (Act 59 of 2008) (NEM: WA). The competent authority for the environmental authorisation process is the Northern Cape Department of Mineral Resources (DMR). This report is submitted in terms of Section 38 (8) of the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999 as part of the Prospecting Right Application. The purpose of this study is to identify, record and if necessary, salvage the irreplaceable heritage resources that may be impacted upon by the proposed prospecting. In compliance with Section 38 (8) of the NHRA, NDI Geological Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd retained Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd on behalf of Temla 13 (Pty) Ltd to conduct a Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment (AIA/HIA) for the Prospecting Right Application. Desktop studies, drive-throughs and consultations with the landowners were conducted in order to identify heritage sites within the proposed prospecting site. The proposed prospecting site has been altered by mainly agriculture activities in the area. The study recorded one burial site located near Rietfontein. The Northern Cape is known for occurrence of archaeological and historical sites; however, the study identified isolated lithic tools exposed by erosion. In terms of the built environment the study recorded a farm structure which was confirmed to be younger than 60 years and not protected in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA. It should be noted that archaeological remains and unmarked graves may exist in the area and when encountered during prospecting, work must be stopped forth-with, and the finds must be reported to the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA) or the heritage practitioner. This report must be submitted to the SAHRA for review in terms of Section 38 (4) of the NHRA.

The report makes the following observations:

- The findings of this report have been informed by desktop review and consultations with landowners and impact assessment reporting which include recommendations to guide heritage authorities in making decisions with regards to the proposed prospecting.

- The immediate project area is predominantly stock farming.
- Some sections of the proposed prospecting right site are severely degraded from previous and current land use activities.
- The study recorded a one village cemetery within the proposed prospecting site.

The report sets out the potential impacts of the proposed prospecting on heritage matters and recommends appropriate safeguard and mitigation measures that are designed to reduce the impacts where appropriate.

The Report makes the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that SAHRA endorse the report as having satisfied the requirements of Section 38 (8) of the NHRA requirements.
2. It is recommended that SAHRA make a decision in terms of Section 38 (4) of the NHRA to approve the proposed Prospecting Right Application on condition that the identified burial site is treated as a NO-GO Area during prospecting and a 100m buffer zone must be provided for in terms of SAHRA Regulations of 2020.
3. The identified burial site must be mapped and marked during prospecting to avoid any accidental damage during prospecting.
4. From a heritage perspective supported by the findings of this study, the Prospecting Right Application is supported. However, the prospecting with bulk sampling should be approved under observation that prospecting does not extend beyond the area considered in this report/affect the identified heritage sites.
5. Should chance archaeological materials or human remains be exposed during prospecting on any section of the site, work should cease on the affected area and the discovery must be reported to the heritage authorities immediately so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. The overriding objective, where remedial action is warranted, is to minimize disruption in prospecting scheduling while recovering archaeological and any affected cultural heritage data as stipulated by the NHRA regulations.
6. Subject to the recommendations herein made and the implementation of the mitigation measures and adoption of the project EMP, there are no significant cultural heritage resources barriers to the Prospecting Right Application. SAHRA may approve the Prospecting Right Application as planned with special commendations to implement the recommendations here in made.

This report concludes that the impacts of the proposed prospecting on the cultural environmental values are not likely to be significant on the entire site if the EMP includes recommended safeguard and mitigation measures identified in this report.

NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING THIS REPORT

This is a specialist report' and is compiled in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998), as amended, and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

In terms of Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act of 1998 specialists involved in Impact Assessment processes must declare their independence.

I, **Trust Mlilo**, do hereby declare that I am financially and otherwise independent of the client and their consultants, and that all opinions expressed in this document are substantially my own, notwithstanding the fact that I have received fair remuneration from the client for preparation of this report.

Expertise:

Trust Mlilo, PhD *cand* (Wits), MA. (Archaeology), BA Hons, PDGE and BA & (Univ. of Pretoria) ASAPA (Professional affiliation member) and more than 15 years of experience in archaeological and heritage impact assessment and management. Mlilo is an accredited member of the Association for Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA), Amafa akwaZulu Natali and Eastern Cape Heritage Resources Agency (ECPHRA). He has conducted more than hundred AIA/HIA Studies, heritage mitigation work and heritage development projects over the past 15 years of service. The completed projects vary from Phase 1 and Phase 2 as well as heritage management work for government, parastatals (Eskom) and several private companies such as BHP Billiton, South 32, Seriti Power and Rhino Minerals.

Independence

The views expressed in this document are the objective, independent views of Mr Trust Mlilo and the survey was carried out under Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd. The company has no business, personal, financial or other interest in the proposed prospecting apart from fair remuneration for the work performed.

Conditions relating to this report.

The content of this report is based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd reserves the right to modify the report in any way deemed fit should new, relevant or previously unavailable or undisclosed information become known to the author from on-going research or further work in this field or pertaining to this investigation.

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

Authorship: This AIA/HIA Report has been prepared by Mr Trust Mlilo (Professional Archaeologist). The report is for the review of the Heritage Resources Agency (PHRA).


Geographic Co-ordinate Information: Geographic co-ordinates in this report were obtained using a hand-held Garmin Global Positioning System device. The manufacturer states that these devices are accurate to within +/- 5 m.

Maps: Maps included in this report use data extracted from the NTS Map and Google Earth Pro.

Disclaimer: The Authors are not responsible for omissions and inconsistencies that may result from information not available at the time this report was prepared.

The Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment Study was carried out within the context of tangible and intangible cultural heritage resources as defined by the SAHRA Regulations and Guidelines as to the approval of the Prospecting Right Application being submitted by Temla 13 (Pty) Ltd

Signed by



10/04/2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges NDI Geological Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd for their assistance with the project details and responding to technical queries related to the project. Special thanks go to Solly Olifant for facilitating our access to the site and translations from Afrikaans to English during consultations with stakeholders and residents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOCUMENT SYNOPSIS (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)	<i>i</i>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	<i>vi</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	- 7 -
ABBREVIATIONS	- 10 -
KEY CONCEPTS AND TERMS	- 11 -
Periodization	- 11 -
Definitions	- 11 -
Assumptions and disclaimer	- 13 -
1 INTRODUCTION	- 14 -
1.1 Terms of Reference (ToR).....	- 14 -
1.2 Project Location.....	- 15 -
1.3 Project Description.....	- 20 -
2 LEGAL FRAMEWORK	- 21 -
3 METHODOLOGY	- 24 -
3.1 The Fieldwork survey.....	- 24 -
3.2 Visibility and Constraints.....	- 24 -
3.3 Consultations.....	- 24 -
4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT	- 36 -
Historical	- 39 -
Intangible Heritage	- 40 -
SAHRIS Database and Impact assessment reports in the proposed project area	- 40 -
5 RESULTS OF THE FIELD STUDY	- 41 -
5.1 Archaeology.....	- 41 -
5.2 Burial grounds and Graves.....	- 42 -
5.3 Public Monuments and Memorials.....	- 44 -
5.4 Buildings and Structures	- 44 -
5.5 Impact Statement.....	- 44 -
5.6 Assessment of development impacts.....	- 45 -
5.7 Cumulative Impacts.....	49
5.8 Mitigation.....	49
6 ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE	50
7 DISCUSSION	50

8	CONCLUSION	51
9	RECOMENDATIONS	52
10	REFERENCES	53
11	APPENDIX 1: CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE FOR THE PROPOSED PROSPECTING RIGHT APPLICATION ON PORTION 2 OF THE A PORTION OF FARM MIER 585 WITHIN THE DAWID KRUIPER LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE.	58
11.1	CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE	60
11.1.1	Introduction.....	60
11.1.2	Definitions	60
11.1.3	Background.....	60
11.1.4	Purpose.....	61
11.2	GENERAL CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE	62
11.2.1	General	62
11.2.2	Management of chance finds	63
12	APPENDIX 2: HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN INPUT INTO THE PROPOSED PROSPECTING RIGHT APPLICATION	- 65 -
13	APPENDIX 4: LEGAL PRINCIPLES OF HERITAGE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA - 66 -	
13.1	Burial grounds and graves	- 67 -
13.2	General policy	- 68 -
14	APPENDIX 4: CV OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST (Trust Mlilo)	70

TABLE OF PLATES [PHOTOGRAPHS]

Plate 1: showing the proposed prospecting site.	- 25 -
Plate 2: showing the proposed prospecting site.	- 25 -
Plate 3: showing proposed prospecting site.	- 26 -
Plate 4: showing proposed prospecting site surveyed from the public road.	- 26 -
Plate 5: showing the site earmarked for prospecting.	- 27 -
Plate 6: showing proposed prospecting site.	- 27 -
Plate 7: showing the proposed prospecting site.	- 28 -
Plate 8: showing the proposed prospecting site.	- 28 -
Plate 9: showing the proposed prospecting site	- 29 -
Plate 10: showing the proposed prospecting site	- 29 -
Plate 11: showing farm structures within the proposed prospecting site	- 30 -
Plate 12: showing remains of derelict temporary structures within the proposed prospecting site	- 30 -
Plate 13: showing an abandoned borehole within the proposed prospecting site	- 31 -
Plate 14: showing proposed prospecting site	- 31 -
Plate 15: showing a public road cutting across the proposed prospecting site	- 32 -
Plate 16: showing the proposed prospecting site	- 32 -
Plate 17: showing the proposed prospecting site	- 33 -
Plate 18: showing farm roads cutting across the proposed prospecting site	- 33 -

Plate 19: showing the proposed prospecting site	- 34 -
Plate 20: showing the proposed prospecting site	- 34 -
Plate 21: showing vegetated sections of the proposed prospecting site	- 35 -
Plate 22: showing a stream that cuts across the proposed prospecting site	- 35 -
Plate 23: showing lithic tools picked from eroded sections of the proposed prospecting site	- 41 -
Plate 24: showing an isolated core identified within the proposed prospecting site.	- 42 -
Plate 35: showing farm structures within the proposed prospecting site	- 43 -
Plate 36: showing farm structures within the proposed prospecting site	- 43 -

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Location of the proposed project site (ISS, 2023)	- 16 -
Figure 2: Tracklogs for the surveyed area (ISS, 2023).....	- 17 -
Figure 3: Location of the proposed project site (NDI Geological Services 2023).....	- 18 -
Figure 4: Identified Heritage Sites within the proposed development site (NDI Geological services, 2023).....	- 19 -

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA	Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIA	Early Iron Age (<i>EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age but in both cases the acronym is internationally accepted.</i>)
EIAR	Environmental Impact Assessment Report
ESA	Early Stone Age
GPS	Global Positioning System
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
ICOMOS	International Council of Monuments and Sites
LIA	Late Iron Age
LFC	Late Farming Community
LSA	Late Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
ToR	Terms of Reference

KEY CONCEPTS AND TERMS

Periodization

Periodization Archaeologists divide the different cultural epochs according to the dominant material finds for the different time periods. This periodization is usually region-specific, such that the same label can have different dates for different areas. This makes it important to clarify and declare the periodization of the area one is studying. These periods are nothing a little more than convenient time brackets because their terminal and commencement are not absolute and there are several instances of overlap. In the present study, relevant archaeological periods are given below.

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

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

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

Early Iron Age (~ AD 200 to 1000)

Late Iron Age (~ AD1100-1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950, but a Historic building is classified as over 60 years old)

Definitions

Definitions Just like periodization, it is also critical to define key terms employed in this study. Most of these terms derive from South African heritage legislation and its ancillary laws, as well as international regulations and norms of best practice. The following aspects have a direct bearing on the investigation and the resulting report:

Cultural (heritage) resources are all non-physical and physical human-made occurrences, and natural features that are associated with human activity. These can be singular or in groups and include significant sites, structures, features, ecofacts and artefacts of importance associated with the history, architecture, or archaeology of human development.

Cultural significance is determined by means of aesthetic, historic, scientific, social, or spiritual values for past, present, or future generations.

Value is related to concepts such as worth, merit, attraction or appeal, concepts that are associated with the (current) usefulness and condition of a place or an object. Although significance and value are not mutually

exclusive, in some cases the place may have a high level of significance but a lower level of value. Often, the evaluation of any feature is based on a combination or balance between the two.

Isolated finds are occurrences of artefacts or other remains that are not in-situ or are located apart from archaeological sites. Although these are noted and recorded, but do not usually constitute the core of an impact assessment, unless if they have intrinsic cultural significance and value.

In-situ refers to material culture and surrounding deposits in their original location and context, for example an archaeological site that has not been disturbed by farming.

Archaeological site/materials are remains or traces of human activity that are in a state of disuse and are in, or on, land and which are older than 100 years, including artefacts, human and hominid remains, and artificial features and structures. According to the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (Act No. 25 of 1999), no archaeological artefact, assemblage or settlement (site) and no historical building or structure older than 60 years may be altered, moved or destroyed without the necessary authorisation from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) or a provincial heritage resources authority.

Historic material are remains resulting from human activities, which are younger than 100 years, but no longer in use, including artefacts, human remains and artificial features and structures.

Chance finds means archaeological artefacts, features, structures or historical remains accidentally found during development.

A grave is a place of interment (variably referred to as burial) and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such place. A grave may occur in isolation or in association with others where upon it is referred to as being situated in a cemetery (contemporary) or burial ground (historic).

A site is a distinct spatial cluster of artefacts, structures, organic and environmental remains, as residues of past human activity.

Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) refers to the process of identifying, predicting and assessing the potential positive and negative cultural, social, economic and biophysical impacts of any proposed project which requires authorisation of permission by law, and which may significantly affect the cultural and natural heritage resources. Accordingly, an HIA must include recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures for minimising or circumventing negative impacts, measures enhancing the positive aspects of the proposal and heritage management and monitoring measures.

Impact is the positive or negative effects on human well-being and / or on the environment.

Mitigation is the implementation of practical measures to reduce and circumvent adverse impacts or enhance beneficial impacts of an action.

Mining heritage sites refer to old, abandoned mining activities, underground or on the surface, which may date from the prehistorical, historical or the relatively recent past.

Study area or '**project area**' refers to the area where the developer wants to focus its development activities (refer to plan).

Phase I studies refer to surveys using various sources of data and limited field walking in order to establish the presence of all possible types of heritage resources in any given area.

Assumptions and disclaimer

The investigation has been influenced by the unpredictability of buried archaeological remains (absence of evidence does not mean evidence of absence) and the difficulty in establishing intangible heritage values. It should be remembered that archaeological deposits (including graves and traces of mining heritage) usually occur below the ground level. Should artefacts or skeletal material be exposed during prospecting activities, such activities should be halted immediately, and a competent heritage practitioner and SAHRA must be notified in order for an investigation and evaluation of the find(s) to take place (see NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 36 (6). Recommendations contained in this document do not exempt the applicant from complying with any national, provincial, and municipal legislation or other regulatory requirements, including any protection or management or general provision in terms of the NHRA. Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd assumes no responsibility for compliance with conditions that may be required by SAHRA in terms of this report.

1 INTRODUCTION

Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd was retained by NDI Geological Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd on behalf of Temla 13 (Pty) Ltd to carry out a Phase 1 AIA/ HIA for the Prospecting Right Application on a portion of Farm Mier 585 in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality in Northern Cape Province. This study was conducted to fulfil the requirements of Section 38 (8) of the NHRA. The purpose of this heritage study is to identify and assess any heritage resources that may be located within the proposed prospecting site in order to make recommendations for their appropriate management. To achieve this, we conducted background research of published literature, maps, and databases (desktop studies) which was then followed by ground-truthing by means of drive-through surveys and field walking. Desktop studies revealed that the general project area is rich in Late Stone Age (LSA) and historical sites. It should be noted that while heritage resources may have been located in the entire study area, subsequent developments previous and agriculture, road and boundary fence lines have either obliterated these materials or reduced them to isolated finds that can only be identifiable as chance finds during prospecting. The proposed Prospecting Right Application may be approved subject to adopting recommendations and mitigation measures proposed in this report. Based on the findings, there is no archaeological and heritage reasons why the Prospecting Right Application cannot be approved, taking full cognizance of clear procedures to follow in the event of chance findings. The identified cemetery can be avoided without compromising the prospecting plan.

1.1 Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd was requested by NDI Geological Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd to conduct an AIA/HIA study addressing the following issues:

- Archaeological and heritage potential of the proposed prospecting site including any known data on affected areas.
- Provide details on methods of study; potential and recommendations to guide the SAHRA to make an informed decision in respect of authorisation of the Prospecting Right Application
- Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural heritage sites) located within the proposed prospecting site;
- Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their archaeological, historical, scientific, social, religious, aesthetic and tourism value;
- Describe the possible impact of the prospecting on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions;

- Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the cultural resources; and
- Review applicable legislative requirements.

1.2 Project Location

The proposed prospecting with bulk sampling will be undertaken on a portion of Farm Mier 585, located less than 1km to the east of Rietfontein in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality, ZF Mgcau District Municipality (previously known as Siyanda District Municipality), Northern Cape Province. The footprint of the area is approximately ±1 870.6 ha. The description of the affected properties is provided in Table 1 and maps showing the affected property are provided in Figure 1 and 2.

Table 1: Description of Properties affected by the proposed prospecting Project.

Farm Name:	a Portion of Farm Mier 585
Application area (Ha)	±1 870.6 hectares
Magisterial district:	Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality,
Distance and direction from nearest town	Approximately ±1 km east to north of Rietfontein.
21-digit Surveyor General Code for each farm portion	C02800000000058500000




Figure 1: Location of the proposed project site (ISS, 2023)




Figure 2: Tracklogs for the surveyed area (ISS, 2023)

PHASE 1 HIA/ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROSPECTING RIGHT APPLICATION




Figure 3: Location of the proposed project site (NDI Geological Services 2023)




Figure 4: Identified Heritage Sites within the proposed development site (NDI Geological services, 2023)

1.3 Project Description

The prospecting project will include:

- Prospecting and bulk sampling with pits and trenches;
- Ablution facility;
- Access roads;
- Diesel storage;
- Office site;
- Plant site;
- Slimes dam;
- Office Area; and
- Vehicle parking area.

The prospecting right will be required for five (5) years.

2 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Three main pieces of legislations are relevant to the present study. The proposed Prospecting Right Application is submitted in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (NEMA) and the 2017 EIA Regulations for activities that trigger the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (MPRDA) (As amended). Therefore, this is in fulfilment of the assessment of the impact to heritage resources as required by section 24(4)(b)(iii) of NEMA and section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA). An AIA or HIA is required as a specialist sub-section of the Basic Assessment (BA) process. This study was conducted in terms of Section 38(8) as part of environmental authorisation. The provisions of this section do not apply to a development as described in subsection (1) if an evaluation of the impact of such development on heritage resources is required in terms of the Environment Conservation Act, 1989 (Act No. 73 of 1989), or the integrated environmental management guidelines issued by the Department of Environment Affairs and Tourism, or the Minerals Act, 1991 (Act No. 50 of 1991), or any other legislation: Provided that the consenting authority must ensure that the evaluation fulfils the requirements of the relevant heritage resources authority in terms of subsection (3), and any comments and recommendations of the relevant heritage resources authority with regard to such development have been taken into account prior to the granting of the consent.

Thus, any person undertaking any development in the above categories, 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. Section 38 (2) (a) of the same act also requires the submission of a heritage impact assessment report for authorization purposes to the responsible heritage resources agencies (SAHRA/PHRAs). Because the proposed development will change the character of a site exceeding 5000 m², then an HIA is required according to this section of the Act.

Related to Section 38 of the NHRA are Sections 34, 35, 36 and 27. Section 34 stipulates that no person may alter damage, destroy and relocate any building or structure older than 60 years, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority. This section may not apply to present study since none were identified. Section 35 (4) of the NHRA stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA, destroy, damage, excavate, alter, or remove from its original position, or collect, any archaeological material or object. This section may apply to any significant archaeological sites that may be discovered before or during construction. This means that any chance find must be reported to the heritage practitioner or SAHRA/PHRA, who will assist in investigating the extent and significance of the finds and inform the applicant about further actions. Such actions may entail the removal of material after documenting the find site or mapping of larger sections before destruction. Section 36 (3) of the NHRA also stipulates that no person may, without a permit issued by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA), destroy, damage, alter, exhume or 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. This section may apply in case of the discovery of chance burials, which is unlikely. The procedure for reporting chance finds also applies to the unlikely discovery of burials or graves by the applicant or his contractors. Section 27 of the NHRA deals with public monuments and memorials but this may not apply to this study because no protected monument will be physically affected by the proposed prospecting.

In addition, the EIA Regulations of 2014 (as amended in 2017) promulgated in terms of NEMA (Act 107 of 1998) stated that environmental assessment reports will include cultural (heritage) issues. The new regulations in terms of Chapter 5 of the NEMA provide for an assessment of development impacts on the cultural (heritage) and social environment and for Specialist Studies in this regard. The end purpose of such a report is to alert the applicant (Temla 13 (Pty) Ltd) SAHRA/ PHRA and interested and affected parties about existing heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed prospecting, and to recommend mitigatory measures aimed at reducing the risks of any adverse impacts on these heritage resources.

Table 2: Evaluation of the proposed development as guided by the criteria in NHRA and NEMA

ACT	Stipulation for developments	Requirement details
NHRA Section 38(8)	The provisions of this section do not apply to a development as described in subsection (1) if an evaluation of the impact of such development on heritage resources is required in terms of the Environment Conservation Act, 1989 (Act No. 73 of 1989), or the integrated environmental management guidelines issued by the Department of Environment Affairs and Tourism, or the Minerals Act, 1991 (Act No. 50 of 1991), or any other legislation: Provided that the consenting authority must ensure that the evaluation fulfils the requirements of the relevant heritage resources authority in terms of subsection (3), and any comments and recommendations of the relevant heritage resources authority with regard to such development have been taken into account prior to the granting of the consent	yes
NHRA Section 34	Impacts on buildings and structures older than 60 years	Subject to identification during Phase 1
NHRA Section 35	Impacts on archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources	Subject to identification during Phase 1
NHRA Section 36	Impacts on graves	Subject to identification during Phase 1
NHRA Section 37	Impacts on public monuments	Subject to identification during Phase 1
Chapter 5 (21/04/2006) NEMA	HIA is required as part of an EIA	Yes
Section 39(3)(b) (iii) of the MPRDA	AIA/HIA is required as part of an EIA	Yes

3 METHODOLOGY

This document aims at providing an informed heritage-related opinion about the Prospecting Right Application in the Northern Cape Province. This is usually achieved through a combination of a review of any existing literature and a site inspection. As part of the desktop study, published literature and cartographic data, as well as archival data on heritage legislation, the history and archaeology of the area were studied. The desktop study was followed by field surveys conducted within the entire site. The study was conducted according to generally accepted AIA/HIA practices and aimed at locating all possible objects, sites, and features of cultural significance on the prospecting footprint. A drive-through was undertaken around the proposed prospecting site as a way of acquiring the archaeological impression of the general area. Photographic recording was undertaken where relevant. The findings were then analysed in view of the Prospecting Right Application in order to make recommendations to the competent authority. The result of this investigation is a report indicating the presence/absence of heritage resources and how to manage them in the context of the proposed prospecting.

3.1 The Fieldwork survey

The fieldwork survey was undertaken on the 1st of April 2023. The field survey was effective because there are public roads and tracks that cut across the site. The survey focused on parts of the project site which could be accessed along public roads. This survey was aided by Solly Olifants who facilitated access to the site and assisted in translations from Afrikaans to English during consultations.

The literature survey suggests that prior to the 20th century modern agriculture activities, the general area would have been a rewarding region to locate heritage resources related to Stone Age and historical sites (Bergh 1999: 4). However, the study did not identify any significant archaeological sites within the proposed prospecting site.

3.2 Visibility and Constraints

Most sections of the site are accessible, and the study team conduct the field survey with limited constraints. Surface visibility was compromised due to dense grass cover since in some sections. It is conceded that due to the subterranean nature of cultural remains this report should not be construed as a record of all archaeological and historic sites in the area.

3.3 Consultations

Public Participation process is conducted by the EAP. The social facilitator consulted stakeholders who provided vital information about the heritage character of their area and location of the village cemetery. The Public

Participation Process will also invite and address comments from the public and any registered heritage bodies on any matter related to the Prospecting Right Application including heritage concerns that may arise relating to the proposed prospecting. The heritage issues and concerns raised by the public will also be included in the Prospecting Right Application to be submitted to DMRE.

The following photographs illuminate the nature and character of the Project Area.



Plate 1: showing the proposed prospecting site.



Plate 2: showing the proposed prospecting site.



Plate 3: showing proposed prospecting site.



Plate 4: showing proposed prospecting site surveyed from the public road.



Plate 5: showing the site earmarked for prospecting.



Plate 6: showing proposed prospecting site.



Plate 7: showing the proposed prospecting site.



Plate 8: showing the proposed prospecting site.



Plate 9: showing the proposed prospecting site



Plate 10: showing the proposed prospecting site



Plate 11: showing farm structures within the proposed prospecting site



Plate 12: showing remains of derelict temporary structures within the proposed prospecting site



Plate 13: showing an abandoned borehole within the proposed prospecting site



Plate 14: showing proposed prospecting site



Plate 15: showing a public road cutting across the proposed prospecting site



Plate 16: showing the proposed prospecting site



Plate 17: showing the proposed prospecting site



Plate 18: showing farm roads cutting across the proposed prospecting site



Plate 19: showing the proposed prospecting site



Plate 20: showing the proposed prospecting site



Plate 21: showing vegetated sections of the proposed prospecting site



Plate 22: showing a stream that cuts across the proposed prospecting site

4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

South Africa is one of the privileged countries in the world to have a very long and varied history of human occupation (Deacon and Deacon 1999). The Northern Cape Province is one area where indications of this rich and diverse historical sequence can be crystallised. Stone Age archaeology is prevalent in the larger geographical area, but generally, the Askham, Andriesvale and Rietfontein areas do not seem to have attracted much of habitation. Perhaps the lack of large rock-shelters, the domination of exposed environments and the lack of preferred stone raw materials for tools, dissuaded early man (ESA ~ 2.6 million to 250 000 years ago) from occupying this part of the area. Further to the north west of this area, the ESA is very well represented at sites such as Kathu Pan 1, Kathu Townlands, Bestwood 1 (Wilkins and Chazan 2012; Chazan *et al.* 2012; Walker *et al.* 2014) and Wonderwerk Cave (Thackeray *et al.* 1981). All of the above sites produced well-made Acheulean hand axes and cleavers, as well as Fauresmith lithic materials that are transitional between the Acheulean (ESA) and the MSA.

The ESA is generally associated with the earlier Oldowan industry (marked by crude choppers and other unifacial core tools), followed by the still large but better fashioned hand axes and cleavers of the Acheulean techno-complex (Deacon and Deacon 1999). The Fauresmith Industry is characterized by a prepared core technology that produced both blades and points, making it transitional between the ESA and the MSA (~ 250 000 to 40-25 000 years ago) (Porat *et al.* 2010; Wilkins and Chazan 2012; Walter *et al.* 2014). Until recently, the Fauresmith Industry was poorly defined, being mostly identified based on the co-occurrence of Levallois points and hand axes (Beaumont and Vogel 2006: 224), and prepared cores, blades, and 'side-scrapers on flakes' (Beaumont 1990:79).

The MSA is better understood as a flake-technological stage characterized by faceted platforms, produced from prepared cores, as distinct from the core tool-based ESA technology (Barham and Mitchell 2008). In the area under study, MSA material mostly occur on the same sites with ESA material, suggesting longer sequences of occupation that have allowed researchers to probe into the behavioural changes that influenced these technological developments (Porat *et al.* 2010; Walker *et al.* 2014). Thus, characteristic MSA have been reported at sites such as Kathu Pan 1 (Wilkins and Chazan 2012), Wonderwerk Cave (Beaumont and Vogel 2006), but they also have been reported in isolated clusters (van Vollenhoven and Pelsler 2012). At Wonderwerk Cave, the MSA component was associated with pieces of haematite and several incised stone slabs, most with curved parallel lines that add to the behavioural shifts that went beyond stone tools and ushered in the appreciation of art (Beaumont and Vogel 2006).

More technological and behavioural changes than those witnessed in the MSA, occurred during the LSA (~ 40-25 000, to recently, 100 years ago), which is also associated with *Homo Sapiens* (Barham and Mitchell 2008). For the first time there is evidence of people's activities derived from material other than stone tools (ostrich eggshell beads, ground bone arrowheads, small, bored stones and wood fragments) (Deacon and Deacon 1999). The LSA

people are also credited with the production of rock art (engravings and paintings), which is an expression of their complex social and spiritual beliefs (Parkington *et al.* 2008). Not much is known about these rock shelters, save for the fact that they have LSA material that includes rock paintings (Morris 2010; van der Walt 2013: 18).

In terms of characterization, the lithic succession at Wonderwerk Cave serves as a benchmark for the Stone Age sequence of the Northern Cape (Beaumont and Vogel 2006; Kusel *et al.* 2009). The sequence comprises an uppermost LSA sequence that contains Ceramic LSA, Wilton and Oakhurst industries. Some researchers have named the earlier LSA industry of the region as the Oakhurst industry (some have labelled this local variant the Kuruman), characterized by rare, retouched artefacts, most of which are large scrapers that are oblong with retouch on the side. A number of Stone Age sites and scattered finds of Stone Age material were identified by Kusel *et al.* (2009) and Archaetnos close to the town of Hotazel and adjacent to the Gamagara River during 2011. However, it is not necessary to belabour the descriptions of these industries, especially because no LSA remains were recovered on the proposed development footprint. All the same, variants of the LSA industries were located at other sites such as Kathu Pan 1 (Porat *et al.* 2013) have been reported. At this site, ostrich eggshell fragments, beads and lithic artifacts attributed to Wilton and Albany industries were found. It's also important to note that it is still possible to encounter isolated finds during construction and when this happens, the procedure (described in detail below) for reporting chance finds must be followed.

Other than the Wonderwerk Cave the Northern Cape Province is characterized by a general scarcity of cave sites. There is an abundance of inherently short-term open-air sites (Parson 2003). These assemblages, all of which are associated with ceramics, are described as belonging to either the Swartkop (hunters) or the Doornfontein Industry (Herders) (Beaumont & Morris 1990; Beaumont *et al.* 1995). Most of these open-air sites consist of a collection of stone artefacts and it is difficult to distinguish if the sites belonged to herders or hunter gatherers. Beaumont *et al.* (1995) argues that the Swartkop Industry is characterized by a formal component almost identical to that of the preceding local Wilton Complex, namely the Springbokoog. All Swartkop sites occur close to pans, streambeds or other potential water sources, on low koppies or in deflation hollows (Beaumont *et al.* 1995). In contrast the contemporary Doornfontein Industry consists of mainly amorphous (shapeless) lithic artefacts, often manufactured on quartz and almost no formal tools (Beaumont *et al.* 1995). The implication is that the Wilton Complex gave direct rise to the Swartkop Industry approximately 2000 years ago. Swartkop assemblages are described as having the following elements in common: they are characterized by cryptocrystalline silicates, contain high frequencies of blade flakes and backed blades and also associated with undecorated, grass tempered ceramics (Beaumont & Vogel 1989).

The raw material used for stone tool production of the LSA industries constitute four basic types: chert, quartz, quartzite and banded shale (Humphreys and Thackeray 1983). The chert includes siliceous types such as chert, agate, chalcedony and jasper, which are essentially fine-grained raw materials. Quartz is equally fine grained but

tends to be very brittle. The flake implements of the MSA were replaced by the long, small blades of the Later Stone Age (LSA) from 20 000 years onwards. However, the traditional life style did not change significantly in a very long time (Deacon and Deacon 1999). Assemblages provisionally assigned to the Doornfontein Industry, are associated with groups of people practicing some form of herding during most of the last 2000 years (Beaumont *et al.* 1995: 247–8). Doornfontein assemblages are generally described as including predominantly shapeless lithic flakes, with a formal lithic component.

Information on the pre-colonial archaeology of the study area is largely derived from a number of impact assessment reports which have been undertaken in the last few years. Mitchell (2002: 126) indicates that the language group who occupied this part of the Northern Cape is the /Auni-//Khomani and Eastern /Hoa. These people were hunters and gatherers which means that they would have moved around, leaving little trace of their existence. The desktop study revealed that very little scientific archaeological work had been done in the Andriesvale, Askham area and the small settlements in the general study area, however due to infrastructure and mining developments in the last few years several heritage studies have been conducted in the area, as part of the EIA authorisation process, eg. Engelbrecht (2013) and Van Pletzen Vos and Rust (2013a, 2013b). Studies have revealed that archaeological remains mostly consist of thin surface scatters of LSA, MSA and ESA lithic assemblages, although there have been rare exceptions where larger scatters do occur. Beaumont (2006) identified only 2 stone flakes during heritage impact study for the construction of several chalets on a game farm in the vicinity of Andriesvale and Askham villages. Van Pletzen–Vos and Rust (2013a) did not identify any archaeological heritage resources during their heritage study for the proposed low cost housing project, however they recorded several traditional graves which occur sporadically in the project area. Smith (1995) recorded ephemeral surface scatters of Later Stone Age (LSA) implements and pottery on deflated dune surfaces, and around small dry pans in the surrounding area at Rietfontein further west of the project area. Engelbrecht (2013) recorded low density scatters of ESA, MSA and LSA tools during heritage impact studies for a low cost housing development, while Engelbrecht (2013) also notes the presence of LSA sites with pottery and stone tools on several farms in the surrounding area. Van Pletzen-Vos and Rust (2013b) documented diffuse scatters of LSA tools and ostrich eggshell near Rooipan and Witpan north east of Rietfontein. Van Pletzen-Vos and Rust (2013b) identified low density scatters of both ESA, MSA and LSA implements during an HIA for a proposed low cost housing development at Groot Mier north of the R31 between Rietfontein and Askham. At Loubos, however, north east of Rietfontein, several large clusters of MSA flakes and cores were recorded by Van Pletzen-Vos & Rust (2013c) during heritage impact studies for another low cost housing project, while at Noenieput, about 50kms south of Askham, large numbers of MSA tools including flakes and cores were counted during a HIA for an affordable housing project (Van Pletzen-Vos & Rust 2013d). The presence of a small spring on the proposed housing development site at Loubos may have been the primary attraction to the area by Stone Age hunter-gatherers while the current project site was probably avoided because of lack water sources. Thin, surface

scatters of LSA flake tools, pottery and ostrich eggshell have also been recorded among the red sand dunes in the Twee Rivieren area, on the Molopo Road to the Kgalagadi National Park (Smith 1995). The survey area in the Kalaharian Ecozone, broadly known as the Kalahari Desert (Klein 1984) and riverine basin of the Molopo, is covered by a low density of lithic scatter (mainly quartzite and hornfel flakes, banded ironstone, with a dominance of irregular flakes). The surface survey indicates limited occupation; lithic surface finds with prepared cores, blades and points (marked retouch on scrapers) ascribable to the Middle Stone Age and moderately to heavily weathered Early Stone Age (hand axes, choppers and cleavers with a distinctive Acheulian phase (Beaumont and Morris 1990, Morris 2006; 2011).

Historical

The Middle Orange River—that part of the river between the Vaal confluence and the Augrabies Falls—contains numerous islands that were favoured by herding communities for the natural protection they provided against wild animals and stock thieves. This stretch of the river was, therefore, densely inhabited in pre and proto colonial times (Penn 1995; Smith and Metelerkamp 1995). Additionally, the resources of the river were shared by hunter gatherers, while the area west of the Langeberg, (located to the east of Upington near the Orange River), was also occupied by Iron Age groups particularly the BaThaping, whose influence reached as far down the river as Upington (Morris 1992). By the early eighteenth century, the Khoekhoe and the San hunter gatherers had reached a form of stability in the region. As the colonial frontier moved relentlessly northwards during the eighteenth century, ‘Bastaards’ (persons of white/Khoe or white/slave parentage) and ‘Bastaard Hottentots’ (persons of slave/Khoe parentage) gradually moved away towards Namaqualand and eventually also focused on the Orange River as a sanctuary from colonial rule (Penn 1995: 48). The first loan farm next to the river was officially registered in 1751 (Penn 1995: 51). The relatively stable circumstances described along the ProActive Archaeology 8 20130118 DRAFT HIA – Askham Portion 1 of Farm 139 Orange River became increasingly complicated in the second half of the eighteenth by an influx of newcomers wishing to avoid the colonial powers at the Cape. Trekboers (migrant farmers of colonial origin) had reached the Kalahari basin by 1780 (Penn 1995). This marked a period of northward colonial advance and accompanying social disruption in the Orange River area during the 18th century. Further disrupting factor in the area was the extremely violent behavior of European big game hunters and individuals searching for cattle (Penn 1995: 51–8). Such a state of contact and interaction would inevitably lead to sociocultural stress and transformation. Radiocarbon dates indicate that specularite and red ochre mining at Blinkklipkop and Doornfontein near Postmansburg in the Northern Cape (Humphreys and Thackeray 1983) began some time before 1200 BP. The evidence from Blinkklipkop indicates that pottery appeared in the Postmasburg area by this date (1200 BP). This is older than the previously suggested date of only 400 BP. The importance of Blinkklipkop in the context of the history of the Northern Cape is thus to provide evidence that domestic animals and pottery were present in the region by 1200 BP. It also serves to remind us

that historically in the last few hundred years the Northern Cape involves a complex interaction of at least three different peoples in the region at the time of the arrival of Europeans in the eighteenth century.

Intangible Heritage

As defined in terms of the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) intangible heritage includes oral traditions, knowledge and practices concerning nature, traditional craftsmanship and rituals and festive events, as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated with group(s) of people. Thus, intangible heritage is better defined and understood by the particular group of people that uphold it. In the present study area, very little intangible heritage is anticipated on the development footprint because most historical knowledge does not suggest a relationship with the study area per se.

SAHRIS Database and Impact assessment reports in the proposed project area

Several heritage sites are on record in the Dawid Kruijer area. SAHRIS was consulted to collect data from previously conducted CRM projects in the region to provide a comprehensive account of the archaeological and heritage character of the study area. Beaumont (2006) and Van Pletzen-Vos and Rust (2013) conducted heritage assessments in the vicinity of the project area in the Northern Cape. Beaumont identified scattered MSA lithics on the Farm "Dreghorn" North East of Askham village. According to Van Pletzen-Vos and Rust (2013) there were no significant archaeological deposits detected during their assessment in the vicinity of the Askham informal settlement. There were however graves detected and this was mitigated according to legislation, SAHRA minimum standards and the procedures described in the Van Pletzen-Vos and Rust (2013) report. This confirms that the area of Kameelduin farm has no significant lithic or other archaeological deposits, but socio-economical and socio-political significance of living heritage is rated as medium. Van Pletzen-Vos and Rust (2013b) recorded low density scatters of both ESA, MSA and LSA implements during an HIA for a proposed low-cost housing development at Groot Mier north of the R31 between Rietfontein and Askham. At Loubos, however, north east of Rietfontein, several large clusters of MSA flakes and cores were recorded by Van Pletzen-Vos & Rust (2013c) during a HIA for another low-cost housing project, while at Noenieput, about 50kms south of Askham, large numbers of MSA tools including flakes and cores were counted during a HIA for an affordable housing project (Van Pletzen-Vos & Rust 2013d). The presence of a small spring on the proposed housing development site at Loubos may have been the primary attraction to the area by Stone Age hunter-gatherers. Thin, surface scatters of LSA flake tools, pottery and ostrich eggshell have also been recorded among the red sand dunes in the Twee Rivieren area, on the Molopo Road to the Kgalagadi National Park (Smith 1995).

5 RESULTS OF THE FIELD STUDY

5.1 Archaeology

The study identified isolated lithic tools mainly occurring on eroded sections of the study site. The lithic tools were probably washed from their original sites as such they lack provenance. Based on the field study results and field observations, the receiving environment for the proposed prospecting site is low to medium potential to yield previously unidentified archaeological sites during prospecting. Literature review also revealed that no Stone Age sites are shown on a map contained in a historical atlas of this area. This, however, should rather be seen as a lack of research in the area and not as an indication that such features do not occur.



Plate 23: showing lithic tools picked from eroded sections of the proposed prospecting site



Plate 24: showing an isolated core identified within the proposed prospecting site.

5.2 Burial grounds and Graves

Human remains and burials are commonly found close to archaeological sites and abandoned settlements; they may be found in abandoned and neglected burial sites or occur sporadically anywhere because of prehistoric activity, victims of conflict or crime. It is often difficult to detect the presence of archaeological human burials on the landscape as these burials, in most cases, are not marked at the surface and concealed by dense vegetation cover. Human remains are usually identified when they are exposed through erosion, earth moving activities and construction. In some instances, packed stones or bricks may indicate the presence of informal burials. If any human bones are found during the course of prospecting work, then they should be reported to an archaeologist and work in the immediate vicinity should cease until the appropriate actions have been carried out by the archaeologist. Where human remains are part of a burial, they would need to be exhumed under a permit from either SAHRA (for pre-colonial burials as well as burials later than about AD 1500) or Department of Health for graves younger than 60 years.

The field survey identified one cemetery within the proposed prospecting site. The cemetery caters for Rietfontein residents, and it is well known. It has more than 200 graves which are marked by oval shaped stone piles, tombstones and inscribed headstones, brick lining and cement plaster. It is the considered opinion of the author that the cemetery can be safely avoided during prospecting. The prospecting planners must ensure that they

provide for a 100m buffer zone from the identified burial site. The possibility of encountering previously unidentified burial sites is low within the proposed prospecting site, however, should such sites be identified during prospecting, they are still protected in terms of Section 36 of NHRA.



Plate 25: showing farm structures within the proposed prospecting site



Plate 26: showing farm structures within the proposed prospecting site

5.3 Public Monuments and Memorials

The study did not record any public memorials and monuments within the proposed prospecting site. As such the Prospecting Right Application may be approved without any further investigation and mitigation in terms of Section 27 & of the NHRA.

5.4 Buildings and Structures

There is a farm structure which was confirmed to be younger than 60 years. Based on the satellite imagery and historical maps, the farm structure is younger than 60 years old. As such, in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA the Prospecting Right Application may be approved without any further investigation and mitigation.

5.5 Impact Statement

The main cause of impacts to archaeological sites is direct, physical disturbance of the archaeological remains themselves and their contexts. It is important to note that the heritage and scientific potential of an archaeological site is highly dependent on its geological and spatial context. This means that even though, for example a deep excavation may expose buried archaeological sites and artefacts, the artefacts are relatively meaningless once removed from their original position. The primary impacts are likely to occur during clearance and drilling, indirect impacts may occur during movement of heavy prospecting vehicles. Any additional excavation for foundations temporary camp sites will result in the relocation or destruction of all existing surface heritage material (if any are present).

Similarly, the clearing of access roads will impact on material that lies buried in the topsoil. Since heritage sites, including archaeological sites, are non-renewable, it is important that they are identified, and their significance assessed prior to prospecting. It is important to note that due to the localised nature of archaeological resources, that individual archaeological sites could be missed during the survey, although the probability of this is very low within the proposed prospecting site. Further, archaeological sites and unmarked graves may be buried beneath the surface and may only be exposed during surface clearance. The purpose of the AIA is to assess the sensitivity of the area in terms of archaeology and to avoid or reduce the potential impacts of prospecting by means of mitigation measures (see appended Chance Find Procedure). There is still a possibility of finding archaeological remains buried beneath the ground. It is the considered opinion of the author that the chances of recovering significant archaeological materials is present within the prospecting site.

Table 3: Summary of Findings

No	Site Name	Site	Description	Co-ordinates	Mitigation measure
1	AS1	Scatter of lithic tools	Isolated finds from eroded sections of the site	26°44'37.11"S 20°02'21.67"E	Low significance, No need for mitigation
2	BS01	Grave site	Large village cemetery with more than 200 graves	26°44'42.56"S 20°02'18.18"E	No-go area. Provide 100m buffer zone.

5.6 Assessment of development impacts

An impact can be defined as any change in the physical-chemical, biological, cultural, and/or socio-economic environmental system that can be attributed to human activities related to the project site under study for meeting a project need. The significance of the impacts of the process will be rated by using a matrix derived from Plomp (2004) and adapted to some extent to fit this process. These matrixes use the consequence and the likelihood of the different aspects and associated impacts to determine the significance of the impacts.

The significance of the impacts will be assessed considering the following descriptors:

Table 4: Criteria Used for Rating of Impacts

Nature of the impact (N)		
Positive	+	Impact will be beneficial to the environment (a benefit).
Negative	-	Impact will not be beneficial to the environment (a cost).
Neutral	0	Where a negative impact is offset by a positive impact, or mitigation measures, to have no overall effect.
Magnitude(M)		
Minor	2	Negligible effects on biophysical or social functions / processes. Includes areas / environmental aspects which have already been altered significantly and have little to no conservation importance (negligible sensitivity*).
Low	4	Minimal effects on biophysical or social functions / processes. Includes areas / environmental aspects which have been largely modified, and / or have a low conservation importance (low sensitivity*).
Moderate	6	Notable effects on biophysical or social functions / processes. Includes areas / environmental aspects which have already been moderately modified and have a medium conservation importance (medium sensitivity*).
High	8	Considerable effects on biophysical or social functions / processes. Includes areas / environmental aspects which have been slightly modified and have a high conservation importance (high sensitivity*).
Very high	10	Severe effects on biophysical or social functions / processes. Includes areas / environmental aspects which have not previously been impacted upon and are pristine, thus of very high conservation importance (very high sensitivity*).

Extent (E)		
Site only	1	Effect limited to the site and its immediate surroundings.
Local	2	Effect limited to within 3-5 km of the site.
Regional	3	Activity will have an impact on a regional scale.
National	4	Activity will have an impact on a national scale.
International	5	Activity will have an impact on an international scale.
Duration (D)		
Immediate	1	Effect occurs periodically throughout the life of the activity.
Short term	2	Effect lasts for a period 0 to 5 years.
Medium term	3	Effect continues for a period between 5 and 15 years.
Long term	4	Effect will cease after the operational life of the activity either because of natural process or by human intervention.
Permanent	5	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.
Probability of occurrence (P)		
Improbable	1	Less than 30% chance of occurrence.
Low	2	Between 30 and 50% chance of occurrence.
Medium	3	Between 50 and 70% chance of occurrence.
High	4	Greater than 70% chance of occurrence.
Definite	5	Will occur, or where applicable has occurred, regardless or in spite of any mitigation measures.

Once the impact criteria have been ranked for each impact, the significance of the impacts will be calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Significance Points (SP)} = (\text{Magnitude} + \text{Duration} + \text{Extent}) \times \text{Probability}$$

The significance of the ecological impact is therefore calculated by multiplying the severity rating with the probability rating. The maximum value that can be reached through this impact evaluation process is 100 SP (points). The significance for each impact is rated as High (SP≥60), Medium (SP = 31-60) and Low (SP<30) significance as shown in the below.

Table 5: Criteria for Rating of Classified Impacts

Significance of predicted NEGATIVE impacts		
Low	0-30	Where the impact will have a relatively small effect on the environment and will require minimum or no mitigation and as such have a limited influence on the decision
Medium	31-60	Where the impact can have an influence on the environment and should be mitigated and as such could have an influence on the decision unless it is mitigated.
High	61-100	Where the impact will definitely have an influence on the environment and must be mitigated, where possible. This impact will influence the decision regardless of any possible mitigation.
Significance of predicted POSITIVE impacts		
Low	0-30	Where the impact will have a relatively small positive effect on the environment.
Medium	31-60	Where the positive impact will counteract an existing negative impact and result in an overall neutral effect on the environment.
High	61-100	Where the positive impact will improve the environment relative to baseline conditions.

Table 6: Operational Phase

Impacts and Mitigation measures relating to the proposed project during Prospecting Phase														
Activity/Aspect	Impact /	Aspect	Nature	Magnitude	Extent	Duration	Probability	Impact before mitigation	Mitigation measures	Magnitude	Extent	Duration	Probability	Impact after mitigation
Clearing and mining	Destruction of archaeological remains	Cultural heritage	-	2	1	1	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use chance find procedure to cater for accidental finds 	2	1	1	2	8
	Disturbance of graves	Cultural heritage	-	6	2	4	3	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No go area. Provide 100m buffer zone. Mark position of burial site on the prospecting map Use appended Chance find procedure to cater for accidental finds. 	2	1	1	1	4
	Disturbance of buildings and structures older than 60 years old	Operational	-	2	1	1	1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation not required 	2	1	1	1	4
Haulage	Destruction public monuments and plaques	Operational	-	2	1	1	1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation is not required because there are no public monuments within the project site 	2	1	1	1	4

5.7 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are defined as impacts that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project. Therefore, the assessment of cumulative impacts for the proposed prospecting is considered the total impact associated with the proposed project when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future developments projects. The impacts of the proposed prospecting were assessed by comparing the post-project situation to a pre-existing baseline. This section considers the cumulative impacts that would result from the combination of the proposed prospecting.

This proposed prospecting combined with other proposed project activities will eventually transform the landscape should the proposed prospecting proceed to mining phase. The cumulative impact will negatively affect the landscape quality of the area which are ordinarily considered to be source. The frequency of development proposals in the area has a potential of collectively changing the character of the landscape. The once isolated landscape will see volumes of people establishing low settlement or enlarging the existing ones. In the long run the accumulative impact will be of high significance in terms of its potential to change the characteristics and quality of the landscape in the long run. The field survey focused on potential of LSA lithic tools that are known to occur in the study area.

5.8 Mitigation

Mitigation for the proposed prospecting site is required to protect the recorded burial site. The prospecting planners must provide for a 100m buffer zone from the burial site. The site must be mapped on the prospecting plan to avoid any accidental damage. A copy of the chance finds procedure must be kept at the site office to ensure appropriate management of any accidental finds during prospecting.

6 ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE

The Guidelines to the SAHRA Guidelines and the Burra Charter define the following criterion for the assessment of cultural significance: The identified burial site has social significance that must be put into consideration during prospecting. The graves are a focus of spiritual and religious significance. It should be noted that burial grounds and gravesites are accorded the highest social significance threshold (see Appendix 3). They have both historical and social significance and are considered sacred. Wherever they exist or not, they may not be tempered with or interfered with without a permit from SAHRA. It should also be borne in mind that the possibility of encountering human remains during subsurface earth moving works anywhere on the landscape is ever present.

7 DISCUSSION

Due to infrastructure and mining developments a number of Phase 1 Archaeological and Heritage Impact studies were conducted in the project area recently. The studies were conducted for various infrastructure developments such as powerlines and substations, water supply pipelines and residential developments. These studies noted that project area has sparsely located Open Air sites associated with nomadic hunter gatherer San communities. The current study should be read in conjunction with previous Phase 1 Impact Studies conducted in the proposed project area to get insights about the archaeological character of the project area in general. The absence of confirmable and significant archaeological cultural heritage site is not evidence in itself that such sites did not exist in the general project area. It should be noted that significance of the sites of Interest is not limited to presence or absence of physical archaeological sites.

8 CONCLUSION

Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd was tasked by NDI Geological Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment for Prospecting Right and Associated Environmental Authorisation and Waste Management Licence (WML) for the Proposed Prospecting (With Bulk Sampling) for Alluvial Diamonds (Da), Kimberlitic Diamonds (Dk), Gravel (Grav), Sand General (Qy) and Potential Accompanying Trace Gold (Au) Ore on a Portion of Farm Mier 585 in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Desktop research revealed that the project area is rich in archaeological sites ranging from ESA, MSA to LIA, however, the field study did not identify any sites of significance within the proposed prospecting site. In terms of the archaeology, there are no obvious 'Fatal Flaws' or 'No-Go' areas. In terms of Section 36 of the NHRA, the identified burial site must be treated as a NO-GO area and measures to protect it must be put in place before prospecting. Based on the study results, the potential of encountering chance finds during prospecting is very limited although the contractors must be watchful. The procedure for reporting chance finds has clearly been laid out and if this report is adopted by SAHRA, then there are no archaeological reasons why the proposed Prospecting Right Application cannot be approved.

9 RECOMENDATIONS

Report makes the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that SAHRA endorse the report as having satisfied the requirements of Section 38 (8) of the NHRA requirements.
2. It is recommended that SAHRA make a decision in terms of Section 38 (4) of the NHRA to approve the proposed Prospecting Right Application on condition that the identified burial site is treated as NO GO Area during prospecting and 100m buffer zone must be provided for in terms of SAHRA Regulations of 2020.
3. The identified burial site must be properly mapped and marked on the prospecting plan.
4. From a heritage perspective supported by the findings of this study, the Prospecting Right Application is supported. However, the prospecting should be approved under observation that prospecting does not extend beyond the area considered in this report/affect the identified heritage sites.
5. Should chance archaeological materials or human remains be exposed during prospecting on any section of the site, work should cease on the affected area and the discovery must be reported to the heritage authorities immediately so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. The overriding objective, where remedial action is warranted, is to minimize disruption in Prospecting scheduling while recovering archaeological and any affected cultural heritage data as stipulated by the NHRA regulations.
6. Subject to the recommendations herein made and the implementation of the mitigation measures and adoption of the project EMP, there are no significant cultural heritage resources barriers to the proposed Prospecting Right Application. The Heritage authority may approve the Prospecting Right Application as planned with special commendations to implement the recommendations here in made.

10 REFERENCES

- Australia ICOMOS (1999) The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance. Burwood.
- Baker, S. Caruana, M.V. Forssman, T.R. and Lotter, M.G. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the Application of an Integrated Water Use License by Environmental Impact Management Services on the S. Bothma and Son Transport Sand Mine on the remaining portion of the Farm Boschbank 12, Sasolburg, Free State Province. Heritage and Research Management Services (Pty) Ltd
- Bergh, J.S., (ed.) Geskiedenisatlas van Suid Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik Uitgewers. 1999.
- Beaumont, P. B. 2006. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report on a planned Kalahari Tourism Facility on the Farm Dreghorn 145, near Ashkam, Siyanda District Municipality, Northern Cape. Report prepared for MEG Environmental Impact studies. Department of Archaeology, McGregor Museum, Kimberley.
- Beaumont, P. B. 2006. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report on Portion 148 of Portion 59 (Vrysootpan of the Farm Kalahari Wes 251a near Askam, Siyanda District Municipality, Northern Cape. Report prepared for MEG Environmental Impact studies. Department of Archaeology, McGregor Museum, Kimberley.
- Beaumont PB & Morris D (eds.) 1990. Guide to Archaeological Sites in the Northern Cape. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.
- Bickford, A. and Sullivan, S. 1977. "Assessing the research significance of historic sites" in S Sullivan and S Bowdler (eds) Site Surveys and Significance assessment in Australian Archaeology. Canberra: ANU.
- Brodie, N. 2008. The Origins of Man. In Brodie, N. (Ed) The Joburg Book: A guide to the city's history, people and places. Pan Macmillan South Africa, Johannesburg
- Burke, H. and Smith, C. 2004. The archaeologist's field handbook. Australia. Allen and Unwin.
- Cooke, H.J. 1985. The Kalahari Today: A case of conflict over resource use. The Geographical Journal 151(1) 75-85.

Cooper, M. A; Firth, A., Carman, J. & Wheatley, D. (eds.) 1995: *Managing Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Deacon, H. J. and Deacon J. 1999. *Human beginnings in South Africa*. Cape Town: David Philips Publishers.

De Jong, R.C. 2010. *Heritage impact assessment report: proposed manganese and iron ore mining right application in respect of the remainder of the farm Paling 434, Hay registration division, Northern Cape*. Unpublished report, Pretoria, Cultmatrix

De Jong, R.C. 2010. *Heritage impact assessment report: proposed manganese and iron ore mining right application in respect of the remainder of the farm Paling 434, Hay registration division, Northern Cape*. Unpublished report, Pretoria, Cultmatrix.

De Witt, B. 2013. *Heritage Impact Assessment Report for the proposed residential development of 100erven and associated infrastructure on Portion 1 of the Farm No. 139, Gordonia Road, Mier Municipality, Northern Cape Province*.

Dreyer, C. 2005. *First Phase Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Development of the Heron Banks Golf and River Estate, Sasolburg, Free State*.

Dreyer, C. 2005. *First Phase Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Residential Developments at Amelia 518, Sasolburg*.

Engelbrecht, J. 2013. *Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report 2: Proposed development for Low-Cost Housing Mier Local Municipality, Siyanda District Municipality, Northern Cape Province, South Africa*. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica. Ubique Heritage Consultants (Pty) Ltd. Askham.

Glazewski, J., 2000: *Environmental Law in South Africa*. Durban: Butterworths.

Hammond-Tooke, D.1993. *The roots of Black South African*. Johannesburg: WUP.

Huffman, T. N. 2007. *Southern Africa*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, Scottsville. Luipaardsvlei Archaeological Assessment, Randfontein. Unpublished report.

Kaplan, K 2014. *Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Kalahari East Bulk Water Supply Scheme Phase 1A Askham to Philandersbron, Northern Cape*.

Küsel, U., Van der Ryst, M. & Küsel, S. 2009. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment of Manganese Mining Areas on the farms Belgravia 264, Santoy 230, Gloria 226 and Nchwaning 267, at Black Rock, North of Kuruman, Kgalagadi District Municipality Northern Cape Province. Unpublished Report, African Heritage Consultants.

Küsel, U., Van der Ryst, M. & Küsel, S. 2009. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment of Manganese Mining Areas on the farms Belgravia 264, Santoy 230, Gloria 226 and Nchwaning 267, at Black Rock, North of Kuruman, Kgalagadi District Municipality Northern Cape Province. Unpublished Report, African Heritage Consultants

Macroplan. 2012. Askham: Application for the rezoning and subdivision according to the Northern Cape Planning and Development Act (ACT 7 Of 1998). Portion 1 Of Farm No. 139, Gordonia Rd, Mier Municipality, Northern Cape Province.

Morris, D. 2005. Report on a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment of proposed mining areas on the farms Ploegfontein, Klipbankfontein, Welgevonden, Leeuwfontein, Wolhaarkop and Kapsteviel, west of Postmasburg, Northern Cape. Unpublished report, Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 2010. Cultural Heritage Assessment: Gamsberg. Supplementary observations to a previous specialist report on archaeological resources. Unpublished report.

Morris, D. 2006 Unpublished Archaeological Specialist Input to the EIA Phase for the proposed AriesGarona Eskom Transmission Power Line, Northern Cape# and comment on Garona Substation Extension

Morris, D. 2010. Cultural Heritage Assessment: Gamsberg. Supplementary observations to a previous specialist report on archaeological resources. Unpublished report.

Morris, D. 2011. Unpublished Heritage Impact Assessment: SATO Energy Holdings Zuurwater Photovoltaic Energy Generation Facility development near Aggeneys, Northern Cape.

Morris, D. 2011b. SATO Energy Holdings: Zuurwater Photovoltaic Energy Generation Facility development near Aggeneys, Northern Cape. Unpublished report for SATO Energy Holdings.

Morris, D. 2011c. Black Mountain Concentrated Solar Power Facility development at Aggeneys, Northern Cape. Unpublished report for Aurora Power Solutions (Pty) Ltd.

Pelser, A.J. 2011. A Report on an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) for the proposed solar energy plant on Konkoonsies 91, Pofadder District, Northern Cape. Unpublished report for Robert de Jong & Associates.

Pelser, A.J. 2011. A report on an archaeological impact assessment (AIA) for the proposed solar energy plant on Konkooksies 91, Pofadder district, Northern Cape. Unpublished report, Archaetnos: Wonderboompoort.

Pelser, A.J. 2012. Final report on the archaeological Phase 2 mitigation of an open-air stone age site to be impacted on by the Aries Solar Energy Plant on portion 1 of the farm Klein Zwart Bast 188 Kenhardt District, Northern Cape. Unpublished report, Archaetnos, Groenkloof.

South Africa, 1983. Human Tissue Act. Government Gazette.

South Africa 1999. National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999), Government Gazette. Cape Town.

SAHRA APMHOB. 2004. Policy for the management of Archaeology, Palaeontology, Meteorites and Heritage Object. SAHRA: Cape Town.

SAHRA APM. 2006. Guidelines: Minimum standards for the archaeological and palaeontological Component of Impact Assessment Reports. SAHRA: Cape Town.

SAHRA APMHOB 2002. General Introduction to surveys, impact assessments and management plans. SAHRA: CT.

SAHRA. 2002. General guidelines to Archaeological Permitting Policy. SAHRA: Cape Town.

SAHRA. 2002. General Introduction to surveys, impact assessments and management plans.

SAHRA. What to do when Graves are uncovered accidentally.

SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009 SAHRIS (Cited 16 December 2018)

UCT database of British Concentration Camps of the South African War 1900-1902; <http://www2.lib.uct.ac.za/mss/bccd/>

Van Pletzen-Vos, L. & Rust, R. 2013a. Heritage Impact Assessment Report, proposed residential development of 100 erven and associated infrastructure on Portion 1 of Farm No. 139, Gordon Road,

Mier Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica cc. Pro-Active Archaeology. Somerset West, Cape Town Van Pletzen-Vos, L. & Rust, R. 2013b.

Van Pletzen-Vos, L. & Rust, R. 2013a. Heritage Impact Assessment Report, proposed residential development of 100 erven and associated infrastructure on Portion 1 of Farm No. 139, Gordonia Road, Mier Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica cc. Pro-Active Archaeology. Somerset West, Cape Town

Van Pletzen-Vos, L. & Rust, R. 2013b. Heritage Impact Assessment Report, proposed low-income housing project Rietfontein, Remainder Farm No. 585, Gordonia Road, Groot Mier Municipality, Northern Cape. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica cc. Pro-Active Archaeology. Somerset West, Cape Town

Van Pletzen-Vos, L. & Rust, R. 2013c. Preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment Report, proposed low-income housing project on Remainder Farm 585 (Loubos), Groot Mier Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica. Pro-Active Archaeology. Somerset West, Cape Town.

Van Pletzen-Vos, L. & Rust R. 2013d. Heritage Impact Assessment Report proposed Low Income Housing Project, Noenieput, Groot Mier Municipality, Northern Cape. Report prepared for EnviroAfrica. Pro-Active Archaeology. Somerset West, Cape Town.

Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2012. A report on a heritage impact assessment for the proposed SASOL CSP and CPV project near Uoington in the Northern Cape. Unpublished report, Archaetnos, Groenkloof.

Van Vollenhoven, A C. 2013 A Report on a Phase 11 Archaeological Mitigation of Stone Age Sites at the proposed Sasol CSP and CPV Project near Upington in the Northern Cape Province

Webley, L. & Halkett, D. 2011. Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Aggeneis – Oranjemond 400kV line and substations upgrade, Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report for Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd.

www.sahistory.org.za

11 APPENDIX 1: CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE FOR THE PROPOSED PROSPECTING RIGHT APPLICATION ON PORTION 2 OF THE A PORTION OF FARM MIER 585 WITHIN THE DAVID KRUIPER LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE.

10 APRIL 2023

ACRONYMS

BGG	Burial Grounds and Graves
CFPs	Chance Find Procedures
ECO	Environmental Control Officer
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999)
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Authority
SAPS	South African Police Service
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

11.1 CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE

11.1.1 Introduction

An Archaeological Chance Find Procedure (CFP) is a tool for the protection of previously unidentified cultural heritage resources during prospecting. The main purpose of a CFP is to raise awareness of all construction, prospecting workers and management on site regarding the potential for accidental discovery of cultural heritage resources and establish a procedure for the protection of these resources. Chance Finds are defined as potential cultural heritage (or paleontological) objects, features, or sites that are identified outside of or after Heritage Impact studies, normally as a result of prospecting monitoring. Chance Finds may be made by any member of the project team who may not necessarily be an archaeologist or even visitors. Appropriate application of a CFP on development projects has led to discovery of cultural heritage resources that were not identified during archaeological and heritage impact assessments. As such, it is considered to be a valuable instrument when properly implemented. For the CFP to be effective, the site manager must ensure that all personnel on the proposed prospecting site understand the CFP and the importance of adhering to it if cultural heritage resources are encountered. In addition, training or induction on cultural heritage resources that might potentially be found on site should be provided. In short, the Chance find procedure details the necessary steps to be taken if any culturally significant artefacts are found during prospecting.

11.1.2 Definitions

In short, the term 'heritage resource' includes structures, archaeology, meteors, and public monuments as defined in the South African National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA) Sections 34, 35, and 37. Procedures specific to burial grounds and graves (BGG) as defined under NHRA Section 36 will be discussed separately as this requires the implementation of separate criteria for CFPs.

11.1.3 Background

The proposed Prospecting Right Application is located on a Portion of Farm Mier 585 situated in the Dawid Kruiper Local Municipality in the Northern Cape Province. The proposed prospecting is subject to heritage survey and assessment at planning stage and Prospecting Right Application in accordance with Section 38(8) of NHRA. These surveys are based on surface indications alone and it is therefore possible that sites or significant archaeological remains can be missed during surveys because they occur beneath the

surface. These are often accidentally exposed in the course of construction or any associated construction work and hence the need for a Chance Find Procedure to deal with accidental finds. In this case an extensive Archaeological Impact Assessment was completed by T. Mlilo (2023) on the prospecting site. The AIA/HIA conducted was very comprehensive, covering the entire site. The current study (Mlilo 2023) recorded one burial site within the proposed prospecting site.

11.1.4 Purpose

The purpose of this Chance Find Procedure is to ensure the protection of previously unrecorded heritage resources within the prospecting site. This Chance Find Procedure intends to provide the applicant and contractors with appropriate response in accordance with the NHRA and international best practice. The aim of this CFP is to avoid or reduce project risks that may occur as a result of accidental finds whilst considering international best practice. In addition, this document seeks to address the probability of archaeological remains finds and features becoming accidentally exposed during prospecting and movement of prospecting equipment. The proposed prospecting activities have the potential to cause severe impacts on significant tangible and intangible cultural heritage resources buried beneath the surface or concealed by dense grass cover. Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd developed this Chance Find Procedure to define the process which governs the management of Chance Finds during prospecting. This ensures that appropriate treatment of chance finds while also minimizing disruption of the prospecting schedule. It also enables compliance with the NHRA and all relevant regulations. Archaeological Chance Find Procedures are to promote preservation of archaeological remains while minimizing disruption of prospecting scheduling. It is recommended that due to the moderate archaeological potential of the project area, all site personnel and contractors be informed of the Archaeological Chance Find procedure and have access to a copy while on site. This document has been prepared to define the avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures necessary to ensure that negative impacts to known and unknown archaeological remains as a result of project activities and are prevented or where this is not possible, reduced to as low as reasonably practical during prospecting.

Thus, this Chance Finds Procedure covers the actions to be taken from the discovering of a heritage site or item to its investigation and assessment by a professional archaeologist or other appropriately qualified person to its rescue or salvage.

11.2 GENERAL CHANCE FIND PROCEDURE

11.2.1 General

The following procedure is to be executed in the event that archaeological material is discovered:

- All construction/clearance activities in the vicinity of the accidental find/feature/site must cease immediately to avoid further damage to the find site.
- Briefly note the type of archaeological materials you think you have encountered, and their location, including, if possible, the depth below surface of the find
- Report your discovery to your supervisor or if they are unavailable, report to the project ECO who will provide further instructions.
- If the supervisor is not available, notify the Environmental Control Officer immediately. The Environmental Control Officer will then report the find to the Site Manager who will promptly notify the project archaeologist and SAHRA.
- Delineate the discovered find/ feature/ site and provide 30m buffer zone from all sides of the find any other project and 100m buffer zone for mining projects.
- Record the find GPS location, if able.
- All remains are to be stabilised *in situ*.
- Secure the area to prevent any damage or loss of removable objects.
- Photograph the exposed materials, preferably with a scale (a yellow plastic field binder will suffice).
- The project archaeologist will undertake the inspection process in accordance with all project health and safety protocols under direction of the Health and Safety Officer.
- **Finds rescue strategy:** All investigation of archaeological soils will be undertaken by hand, all finds, remains and samples will be kept and submitted to a museum as required by the heritage legislation. In the event that any artefacts need to be conserved, the relevant permit will be sought from the SAHRA.
- An on-site office and finds storage area will be provided, allowing storage of any artefacts or other archaeological material recovered during the monitoring process.
- In the case of human remains, in addition, to the above, the SAHRA Burial Ground Unit will be contacted and the guidelines for the treatment of human remains will be adhered to. If skeletal remains are identified, an archaeologist will be available to examine the remains.

- The project archaeologist will complete a report on the findings as part of the prospecting right application process.
- Once authorisation has been given by SAHRA, the Applicant will be informed when prospecting activities can resume.

11.2.2 Management of chance finds

Should the Heritage specialist conclude that the find is a heritage resource protected in terms of the NRHA (1999) Sections 34, 36, 37 and NHRA (1999) Regulations (Regulation 38, 39, 40), Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd will notify SAHRA and/or PHRA on behalf of the applicant. SAHRA/PHRA may require that a search and rescue exercise be conducted in terms of NHRA Section 38, this may include rescue excavations, for which ISS will submit a rescue permit application having fulfilled all requirements of the permit application process.

In the event that human remains are accidentally exposed, SAHRA Burial Ground Unit or ISS Heritage Specialist must immediately be notified of the discovery in order to take the required further steps:

- a. Heritage Specialist to inspect, evaluate and document the exposed burial or skeletal remains and determine further action in consultation with the SAPS and Traditional authorities:
- b. Heritage specialist will investigate the age of the accidental exposure in order to determine whether the find is a burial older than 60 years under the jurisdiction of SAHRA or that the exposed burial is younger than 60 years under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health in terms of the Human Tissue Act.
- c. The local SAPS will be notified to inspect the accidental exposure in order to determine where the site is a scene of crime or not.
- d. Having inspected and evaluated the accidental exposure of human remains, the project Archaeologist will then track and consult the potential descendants or custodians of the affected burial.
- e. The project archaeologist will consult with the traditional authorities, local municipality, and SAPS to seek endorsement for the rescue of the remains. Consultation must be done in terms of NHRA (1999) Regulations 39, 40, 42.

- f. Having obtained consent from affected families and stakeholders, the project archaeologist will then compile a Rescue Permit application and submit to SAHRA Burial Ground and Graves Unit.
- g. As soon as the project archaeologist receives the rescue permit from SAHRA he will, in collaboration with the company/contractor, arrange for the relocation in terms of logistics and appointing of an experienced undertaker to conduct the relocation process.
- h. The rescue process will be done under the supervision of the archaeologist, the site representative and affected family members. Retrieval of the remains shall be undertaken in such a manner as to reveal the stratigraphic and spatial relationship of the human skeletal remains with other archaeological features in the excavation (e.g., grave goods, hearths, burial pits, etc.). A catalogue and bagging system shall be utilised that will allow ready reassembly and relational analysis of all elements in a laboratory. The remains will not be touched with the naked hand; all Contractor personnel working on the excavation must wear clean cotton or non-powdered latex gloves when handling remains in order to minimise contamination of the remains with modern human DNA. The project archaeologist will document the process from exhumation to reburial.
- i. Having fulfilled the requirements of the rescue/burial permit, the project archaeologist will compile a mitigation report which details the whole process from discovery to relocation. The report will be submitted to SAHRA and to the client.

Note that the relocation process will be informed by SAHRA Regulations and the wishes of the descendants of the affected burial.

12 APPENDIX 2: HERITAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN INPUT INTO THE PROPOSED PROSPECTING RIGHT APPLICATION

Objective								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of archaeological sites and land considered to be of cultural value. Protection of known physical cultural property sites against vandalism, destruction and theft; and The preservation and appropriate management of new archaeological finds should these be discovered during construction. 								
No.	Activity	Mitigation Measures	Duration	Frequency	Responsibility	Accountable	Contacted	Informed
Pre-prospecting Phase								
1	Planning	Ensure all known sites of cultural, archaeological, and historical significance are demarcated on the site layout plan and marked as no-go areas.	Throughout Project	Weekly Inspection	Contractor [C] CECO	SM	ECO	EA EM PM
Prospecting Phase								
1	Emergency Response	Should any archaeological or physical cultural property heritage resources be exposed during excavation for the purpose of construction, construction in the vicinity of the finding must be stopped until heritage authority has cleared the development to continue.	N/A	Throughout	C CECO	SM	ECO	EA EM PM
		Should any archaeological, cultural property heritage resources be exposed during excavation or be found on development site, a registered heritage specialist or PHRA official must be called to site for inspection.		Throughout	C CECO	SM	ECO	EA EM PM
		Under no circumstances may any archaeological, historical or any physical cultural property heritage material be destroyed or removed from site;		Throughout	C CECO	SM	ECO	EA EM PM
		Should remains and/or artefacts be discovered on the development site during earthworks, all work will cease in the area affected and the Contractor will immediately inform the Construction Manager who in turn will inform Northern Cape PHRA		When necessary	C CECO	SM	ECO	EA EM PM
		Should any remains be found on site that is potentially human remains, the Northern Cape PHRA and South African Police Service should be contacted.		When necessary	C CECO	SM	ECO	EA EM PM
Rehabilitation Phase								
		Same as prospecting phase.						
Operational Phase								
		Same as prospecting phase.						

13 APPENDIX 4: LEGAL PRINCIPLES OF HERITAGE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Extracts relevant to this report from the National Heritage Resources Act No. 25 of 1999, (Sections 5, 36 and 47):

General principles for heritage resources management

5. (1) All authorities, bodies and persons performing functions and exercising powers in terms of this Act for the management of heritage resources must recognise the following principles:

(a) Heritage resources have lasting value in their own right and provide evidence of the origins of South African society and as they are valuable, finite, non-renewable and irreplaceable they must be carefully managed to ensure their survival;

(b) every generation has a moral responsibility to act as trustee of the national heritage for succeeding generations and the State has an obligation to manage heritage resources in the interests of all South Africans.

(c) heritage resources have the capacity to promote reconciliation, understanding and respect, and contribute to the development of a unifying South African identity; and

(d) heritage resources management must guard against the use of heritage for sectarian purposes or political gain.

(2) To ensure that heritage resources are effectively managed

(a) the skills and capacities of persons and communities involved in heritage resources management must be developed; and

(b) provision must be made for the ongoing education and training of existing and new heritage resources management workers.

(3) Laws, procedures and administrative practices must

(a) be clear and generally available to those affected thereby;

(b) in addition to serving as regulatory measures, also provide guidance and information to those affected thereby; and

(c) give further content to the fundamental rights set out in the Constitution.

(4) Heritage resources form an important part of the history and beliefs of communities and must be managed in a way that acknowledges the right of affected communities to be consulted and to participate in their management.

(5) Heritage resources contribute significantly to research, education and tourism and they must be developed and presented for these purposes in a way that ensures dignity and respect for cultural values.

(6) Policy, administrative practice and legislation must promote the integration of heritage resources conservation in urban and rural planning and social and economic development.

(7) The identification, assessment and management of the heritage resources of South Africa must—

- (a) take account of all relevant cultural values and indigenous knowledge systems;
- (b) take account of material or cultural heritage value and involve the least possible alteration or loss of it;
- (c) promote the use and enjoyment of and access to heritage resources, in a way consistent with their cultural significance and conservation needs;
- (d) contribute to social and economic development;
- (e) safeguard the options of present and future generations; and
- (f) be fully researched, documented and recorded.

13.1 Burial grounds and graves

36. (1) Where it is not the responsibility of any other authority, SAHRA must conserve and generally care for burial grounds and graves protected in terms of this section, and it may make such arrangements for their conservation as it sees fit.

(2) SAHRA must identify and record the graves of victims of conflict and any other graves which it deems to be of cultural significance and may erect memorials associated with the grave referred to in subsection (1), and must maintain such memorials.

(3) (a) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority

(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; or

(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.

(4) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the destruction or damage of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection (3)(a) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant and in accordance with any regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority.

(5) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for any activity under subsection (3)(b) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has, in accordance with regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority

(a) made a concerted effort to contact and consult communities and individuals who by tradition have an interest in such grave or burial ground; and

(b) reached agreements with such communities and individuals regarding the future of such grave or burial ground.

(6) Subject to the provision of any other law, any person who in the course of development or any other activity discovers the location of a grave, the existence of which was previously unknown, must immediately cease such activity and report the discovery to the responsible heritage resources authority which must, in co-operation with the South African Police Service and in accordance with regulations of the responsible heritage resources authority

(a) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not such grave is protected in terms of this Act or is of significance to any community; and

(b) if such grave is protected or is of significance, assist any person who or community which is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such grave or, in the absence of such person or community, make any such arrangements as it deems fit.

(7) (a) SAHRA must, over a period of five years from the commencement of this Act, submit to the Minister for his or her approval lists of graves and burial grounds of persons connected with the liberation struggle and who died in exile or as a result of the action of State security forces or agents provocateur and which, after a process of public consultation, it believes should be included among those protected under this section.

(b) The Minister must publish such lists as he or she approves in the Gazette.

(8) Subject to section 56(2), SAHRA has the power, with respect to the graves of victims of conflict outside the Republic, to perform any function of a provincial heritage resources authority in terms of this section.

(9) SAHRA must assist other State Departments in identifying graves in a foreign country of victims of conflict connected with the liberation struggle and, following negotiations with the next of kin, or relevant authorities, it may re-inter the remains of that person in a prominent place in the capital of the Republic.

13.2 General policy

47. (1) SAHRA and a provincial heritage resources authority—

(a) must, within three years after the commencement of this Act, adopt statements of general policy for the management of all heritage resources owned or controlled by it or vested in it; and

(b) may from time to time amend such statements so that they are adapted to changing circumstances or in accordance with increased knowledge; and

(c) must review any such statement within 10 years after its adoption.

(2) Each heritage resources authority must adopt for any place which is protected in terms of this Act and is owned or controlled by it or vested in it, a plan for the management of such place in accordance with the best environmental, heritage conservation, scientific and educational principles that can reasonably be applied taking into account the location, size and nature of the place and the resources of the authority concerned, and may from time to time review any such plan.

(3) A conservation management plan may at the discretion of the heritage resources authority concerned and for

a period not exceeding 10 years, be operated either solely by the heritage resources authority or in conjunction with an environmental or tourism authority or under contractual arrangements, on such terms and conditions as the heritage resources authority may determine.

(4) Regulations by the heritage resources authority concerned must provide for a process whereby, prior to the adoption or amendment of any statement of general policy or any conservation management plan, the public and interested organisations are notified of the availability of a draft statement or plan for inspection, and comment is invited and considered by the heritage resources authority concerned.

(5) A heritage resources authority may not act in any manner inconsistent with any statement of general policy or conservation management plan.

(6) All current statements of general policy and conservation management plans adopted by a heritage resources authority must be available for public inspection on request.

14 APPENDIX 4: CV OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST (Trust Mlilo)

PERSONAL INFORMATION

ID NUMBER	690710 6184 187				
TITLE	Mr.	SURNAME	Mlilo	FIRST NAME	Trust
GENDER	Male			DATE OF BIRTH	10 July 1969
CONTACT	Email: trust.mlilo@gmail.com; Tel: +27 (0) 11 037 1565 (Bus) +27 71 685 9247 (Mobile)				
ADDRESSES	Bus. Physical: 65 Naaldehout Avenue, Heuweloord, Centurion, 0157 Cell: Fax: 086 652 9774 Web Site: www.sativatec.co.za				
QUALIFICATION: MA (ARCHAEOLOGY), BA Hons (Archaeology), [Univ. of Pretoria, Pretoria], PDGE, BA (Archaeology) UZ					

BRIEF PROFILE

Mr Trust Mlilo

Mr Trust Mlilo is the Archaeology/Heritage specialist at Sativa Travel and Environmental Consultants (Pty) Ltd. He is professional member of ASAPA and listed as an archaeologist and heritage specialist by Amafa aKwaZulu Natal and Eastern Cape Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (ECPHRA). Prior to joining SATIVATEC (Pty) Ltd, Trust Mlilo served as the Archaeologist and Heritage Manager at Nzumbululo Heritage Solutions (RSA Ltd.) [www.nzumbululo.com]. He has also collaborated in a number of archaeological and Heritage work with Siyathembana 293Trading (Pty) Ltd, Finishing Touch (Pty) Ltd, Vhubvo Archaeo Heritage (Pty) Ltd. And Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd. He is a professional heritage manager and research consultant with more than 15 years of practice and experience in archaeology, heritage management and education management. He has vast experience in Heritage Impact Assessments, Heritage induction, public consultations, monitoring and pre-construction heritage mitigation. He has worked as a researcher in Heritage development and nomination of heritage sites such as Nelson Mandela Legacy sites, Shembe sites and Delmas Treason Trial just to mention a few. He has attended and participated in several academic and professional symposiums and conferences.

Mr Mlilo has undertaken and assisted research teams in several projects in Sustainability, Energy & Environment (SEE); Environmental Health and Safety Solutions; Cultural Heritage Development (CHD) and Applied Socio-Economic Research and Enterprise Development [RED]. His willingness to learn has seen him participate as a researcher and coordinator in research teams responsible, for example, in developing a Heritage Management Plans for O.R Tambo and Chris Hani memorial sites (2016) as well as the Nelson Mandela sites (2014 -2015), Integrated Development Planning (IDP) Environmental Toolkit (Mpumalanga Province [2011]), the Tourism Development Toolkit (Department of Environment and Tourism [2009]), etc. He is also effective in public engagements and consultations and has facilitated in massive grave relocation projects for several mining and infrastructure developments companies such as BHP Billiton 2013-2015 and Rhino Minerals 2009-2014 as well as Eskom and Road Agency Limpopo. He has conducted hundreds of Heritage Impact Assessment projects for Eskom minor reticulation projects in North West Province, KwaZulu Natal, Eastern Cape, Limpopo Province, Mpumalanga, Gauteng and the Free State Province as well as HIAs for various public and private developers (See SAHRIS website for HIA reports registered under Nzumbululo Heritage Solutions [Murimbika and Mlilo as the authors], Sativa and Integrated Specialist Services. The major highlight of his work was the Heritage Impact Assessment for the 700km, 765KV Gamma Kappa and Kappa Omega powerline in the Western Cape. Under Sativa Travel and Environmental Consultants, Mlilo served high profile companies such as GIBB, Afrimat, Eskom and Trans Africa Projects. Trust Mlilo has sound knowledge of heritage permit application processes and heritage mitigation processes. He is also effective in resource mobilization, team building and coordination. In addition, he has vast experience in project presentation and consultation.

EDUCATION

Institution [Date from - Date to]	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained:
University of Pretoria 2013 - 2015	MA in Archaeology
University of Pretoria 2009 – 2010	BA Honours in Archaeology
University of Zimbabwe, 2000	Post Graduate Diploma in Education (History)
University of Zimbabwe (1991-1993)	BA Gen. (Archaeology, African Languages & Linguistics)

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (Good, Fair, Poor)

Language	Reading	Speaking	Writing
English	Good	Good	Good
Shona	Good	Good	Good
Ndebele	Good	Good	Fair
Zulu	Fair	Good	Fair
Tsonga	Good	Good	Good
Tshivenda	Poor	Fair	Poor
Sesotho	Poor	Fair	Poor
Setswana	Poor	Fair	Poor
Xhosa	Poor	Fair	Poor
Afrikaans	Beginner's stage		

SKILLS MATRIX

Current Skills levels:

1 Had appropriate training only

2 Limited practical experience

3 Solid practical experience

4 Well versed, extensive experience

5 Expert, extensive experience

Type of Experience	Experience In months	Date Last used	Skill level
Communication and Marketing	+120	Current	4
Inter-personal and inter-governmental liaison	+120	Current	3
Organizational skills	+120	Current	4
Coordination	+120	Current	5
Facilitation	+120	Current	5
Planning	+120	Current	4
People Management	+120	Current	4
Time Management	+120	Current	5
Computer literacy (MS Office, Project management software, MAC OS)	+120	Current	3
Project management	+120	Current	4

COMPUTER SKILLS:

- MS Operating System
 - Professional Level Competencies in MS Word, MS Excel, MS Power-point, PMS Publisher, and Internet.
- Mac Operating System
- Photoshop

ACADEMIC WORKS

- The challenges of cultural heritage management in South Africa: A focus on the Klasies River main site (Pending).

Title of Post-Graduate University Theses & Dissertations:

- **Master in Archaeology** (2013-2015), University of Pretoria) Management of the Klasies River main site along the Tsitsikamma Coast in the Eastern Cape Province.
- **BA Hons in Archaeology**. (2010, University of Pretoria): Comparison of conservation of archaeological sites under the jurisdiction of museums and sites in rural locations, the case BaKoni Malapa and Mahumane Late Iron Age sites in Limpopo Province.
- **Post Graduate Diploma in Education**. (2000, University of Zimbabwe): An assessment of attitudes towards use of media in the teaching of History in Secondary schools in Gweru, Zimbabwe

Selected Seminars, Lectures & Conference Papers

July 2014: Pan Africanist Archaeologist Conference. Johannesburg, South Africa Paper to be presented:

- *The challenges of heritage management in South Africa: A focus on the Klasies River main site.*

WORK & PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

PERIOD: 2015 to Present: Archaeologist/Heritage Manager at Integrated Specialist Services (Pty) Ltd [Web Site: www.sativatec.co.za] and emerging consultancy with highly experienced Heritage, Palaeontology and Ecology/Biodiversity Specialists. Sativa (Pty) Ltd 's main focus is to provide quality specialist services in Environmental and Heritage Management. Sativa (Pty) Ltd team has successfully completed a significant number of projects and is looking forward to building its profile in both Environmental and Heritage Management. The major clients are Bigtime Strategic Group Science and Research, Afrimat, Trans Africa Projects, Kimopax, Mawenje Consulting and Road Agency Limpopo. The following is a list of selected projects completed at Sativa (Pty). Ltd

- **ESKOM:** HIA study for the household electrification infrastructure of the proposed 22kv powerline for Norlim-Taung (15km) and Norlim Dikhuting (13km) in the Buxton area (Taung World Heritage Site) Greater Taung Municipality, North West Province.
- **GIBB:** HIA for proposed Assen / Tambotie Mining Right Application for the development of the Assen / Tambotie mine in Madibeng Local Municipality of North West Province
- HIA for proposed Eskom 13,5km, 132kv Randfontein Northern Strategy Power line and associated substations in Mogale City and Rand West City Local Municipalities of Gauteng Province
- HIA for proposed Eskom 132kv Westgate.Tarlton Power line in Mogale City and Rand West City Local Municipalities of Gauteng Province: Archaeological and Heritage Impact Assessment Report

- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for Eskom's proposed 11.065km 22kV Phase 3 Ngqeleni Electrification in Nyandeni Local Municipality of Eastern Cape Province
- HIA for proposed Eskom Wolvekrans Substation and 132kv Powerline in Mogale City and of Gauteng Province:
- HIA for Proposed Zandrivers Drift Mining Right Application in Madibeng Local Municipality of North West Province
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for Eskom's proposed KwaZamoxolo normalization power line development at Noupoot in Umsobomvu Local Municipality, Northern Cape Province.
- Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for Eskom's proposed 0.659km 22kv Murraysburg powerline move in the Pixley Ka Seme District Municipality, Northern Cape Province
- A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed, Tubatse Special Economic Zone in Burgersfort, Limpopo, under the jurisdiction of the Greater Tubatse Local Municipality of Limpopo Province.
- A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed construction of a new 20ML/D Pump station and bulk water pipeline in Middleburg, Steve Tshwete Local Municipality in Province.
- A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed 5.5km 88kV power line and substation in Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province.

PERIOD: 2008 to 2014: Archaeologist and Heritage Manager – Nzumbululo Holdings Limited [www.nzumbululo.com] (dynamic and market-leading consultancy providing innovative solutions in Applied Social-Economic Research and Enterprise Development services, Cultural Heritage Development, Sustainability, and Energy & Environment, Environmental Health and Safety).

Specialist Responsibilities: Assist in Project Management, fieldwork, community consultation and report compilation.

- Researcher for heritage and cultural landscape management projects that involve cultural resources management, heritage conservation management planning, heritage and environmental impact assessment, basic assessment, project management, public participation coordination, predevelopment planning specialists input coordination and liaison with compliant agencies such as government departments.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITIES

None

SPECIALIST POSITIONS AND PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANCY EXPERIENCE

2007 - 2014 Archeological and Heritage Impact Assessment Studies

Have participated in phase 1 (scoping studies) to Phase 2 and 3 heritage and archeological impact assessment studies (mitigation excavations, rescue or salvage excavation and monitoring studies) for infrastructural developments including, powerlines, roads and other developments. The HIA and AIA portfolio during this period amounts to more than 300 projects across all nine provinces of South Africa and neighboring countries with an estimated value in excess of Million Rands in professional specialist's fees and billions in associated project budgets.

January 2008 – 2014: Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessment Study for Eskom SOC Limited 765kV Powerline Development Northern to Western Cape Provinces.

Field Archaeologist and Assistant Heritage Manager: Environmental Authorisation (EIA) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) studies for Eskom SOC Transmission Gamma-Kappa & Kappa-Omega 765kV Powerlines Development in Northern & Western Cape Provinces in South Africa 2012-14. The Field archaeologist and heritage manager responsibilities involve coordinating a team of 4 (Archaeology, Palaeontology, Visual and Cultural Landscapes and Built Environment). This power transmission project is one of the largest and strategic transmission projects Eskom has ever embarked on in the past two decades.

July 2011 – March 2012: Research, Design and Development of the Delmas Treason Trials Commemorative Monument Project at Delmas Magistrate's Court, Mpumalanga Province.

Project Heritage Manager and Research Assistant for archival, oral and historical research on the 1985-1989 Delmas 22 and 1989 Delmas 4 Treason Trials (the last of the infamous apartheid treason trials). The project entails detailed legal history on treason trials, conceptualise, design and develop and commission a public commemorative monument in honour of the treason Trialists. Hundreds of hours of digital recordings of interviews with legal struggle icons such as George Bizos, the late Justice Arthur Chaskalson, Advocate Gcina Malindi, Justice Yacob, former Premier Popo Molefe and all surviving Delmas trialists and their families were collected, project report was generated and South Africa's first monument dedicated to commemoration of treason trials was developed and unveiled in March 2012 at Delmas Court in Delmas Town, Mpumalanga.

2009 – October 2010: eThekweni Metropolitan Shembe Baptist Nazareth Church Cultural Landscape Project

Commissioned by the eThekweni Metro Council as **Assistant Heritage Manager and Research Assistant** for the eThekweni Metropolitan Shembe Baptist Nazareth Church Cultural Landscape Project. The project involved conducting historical research into the evolution of Shembe Church, one of Africa's older and

continuous independent churches that were founded by Isaiah Shembe in 1910. The second object was to propose, nominate the Shembe Cultural Landscape as Provincial Heritage Site under the protection of provincial and national heritage laws. The project closed with development of the cultural heritage Conservation Management Plan and nomination of Shembe cultural Landscape as Provincial Heritage Site (Nomination Approved by the KwaZulu Natal Provincial Heritage Council (Amafa Council) on October. 18 2010).

2008- 2009: Mpumalanga Province Greening, Heritage and Greening Mpumalanga Flagship Program Management Unit [PMU]

Research Assistant (Heritage) for the Mpumalanga Provincial Government commissioned Mpumalanga Province Greeting, Heritage and Greening Mpumalanga Flagship Program Management Unit [PMU]. Mr Mlilo assisted in archaeological and heritage components of the project.

AUXILIARY PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1996-2006: ‘O’ and “A” Level History Examiner (Ministry of Education in collaboration with Cambridge University, UK).

AUXILLIARY SPECIALIST SKILLS

Key Management skills

- Applied Environment & Heritage Management Research
- Sustainable development programmes assessment.
- Project Management
- Adult Education

Other skills

- Performance management
- Public Finance Management
- School administration and teaching
- Professional Archaeologist.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

- **Member of Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) No.396.**
Accredited by Amafa akwaZulu Natali and Eastern Cape Provincial Heritage Agency

REFEREES

Professor Sarah Wurz.

Institute for Human Evolution

University of Witwatersrand

Private Bag 3

Wits, 2050
South Africa

Tel: +27 (0) 11 717 1260; **Cell:** +082 449 3362

Email: sarah.wurz@wits.ac.za / sarahwurz@gmail.com

Professor. Innocent Pikirayi

Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, Faculty of Humanities
University of Pretoria
Cr Lynnwood and University Roads
Hatfield
Pretoria
0038
SA

Tel: +27 (0) 12 4204661; **Cell:** +27 (0) 797841396; **Email:** innocent.pikirayi@up.ac.za

Mr Chrispen Chauke

Mapungubwe National Park & World Heritage Site,
Box 383, Musina,
0900

E-mail: chrischauke@yahoo.com | **Mobile:** + (27) 760446697 |

Work: 015 5347923