

1

Recorded sites in the Fairbreeze mining lease

Site Name	Farm /Erf Name	Co-ordinates	Type of mitigation required
FBZ 1	Enyezane 8903	S29 02 42.8 E31 38 13.0	N/A
FBZ 2	Enyezane 10617	S29 02 40.3 E31 38 19.1	Re-examine
FBZ 3	Enyezane 8903	S29 02 51 E31 37 56.6	Graves/re-examine
FBZ 4	Enyezane 8903	S29 03 03.9 E31 37 27.8	N/A
FBZ 5	Enyezane 8903	S29 02 49 E31 37 30	N/A
FBZ 6	Enyezane 80344	S29 00 59.4 E31 39 59.3	N/A
FBZ 7	Enyezane 10617	S29 01 07.9 E31 39 23.5	N/A
FBZ 8	Enyezane 80344	S29 00 43 E31 40 18.1	Re-examine
FBZ9	89 9705	S28 58 56.3 E31 41 34.7	N/A
FBZ10	The Ranche 11368 + 91010011 (borders on	S28 58 19.2 E31 43 42.1	N/A
FBZ 11	Enyezane 9105	S29 00 17.1 E31 41 14.3	Test-pits

2

Site Name	Farm Erf/ Name	Co-ordinates	Type of mitigation required
IHM1	Enyezane 9724/Amatikulu 13872	S29 03 09, E31 34 41	Test-pits
IHM2	Enyezane 9724/Dunns Reserve	S29 03 14, E31 34 53	Pending position of line
IHM3	Enyezane 9724/Dunns Reserve	S29 03 14, E31 35 05	Pending position of line
IHM4	Enyezane 10488/Dunns Reserve	S29 03 15, E31 36 39	None
IHM5	Amatikulu 13481	S29 04 15, E31 32 34	None
IHM6	44 Amatikulu 14017	S29 05 08, E31 30 37	None
IHM7	Inyoni 13877	Approx. S29 05 23, E31 30 21	None
IHM8	40 1390	S29 05 51, E31 28 53	Test pits
IHM9	Amatikulu 14146	S29 03 24, E31 33 11	None
IHM10	Amatikulu 13872	S29 03 32, E31 32 52	None
IHM11	Amatikulu 3476	S29 03 58, E31 32 00	None
IHM12	St Kitts 14016	S29 04 21, E31 31 01	None

Approx. 50m radius from center of each GPS reading should be given

3

We will need the timetable for these developments/activities. However, we shall assume that all excavations will be undertaken in 2005. This allows a single budget to be spent, and not increased per year due to inflation, etc.

4

All sites require an individual destruction permit (but see below). While the permit may be valid for a year, Amafa will extend this. See point 5.

5

Apply for general destruction permit for all known and unknown (recorded and unrecorded) sites. State in permit application that the management plan includes a continual monitoring process. Submit all reports related to this project, even if Amafa does have them on record. Refer to reports in section of destruction permit where they query mitigation.

I suggest the following and you and Rob should discuss this with the rest of Tidor. Tidor should officially appoint a project archaeologist for the Fairbreeze mine, and servitude's. The project archaeologist is responsible for obtaining the necessary permits and authorizations, answer questions from the public, undertake the necessary "audits", ensure that the management plan is undertaken, etc. For example, we would handle queries 4/5 above and just forward you the papers to sign.

We have been appointed 'project archaeologists' for RBM, Eskom Braamhoek Scheme, and a large development along the south coast. With this we estimate a budget for the necessary desktop work, handle all problems and queries related to the contract, liaise with the necessary government bodies, etc. All government bodies, consultants, etc. know exactly who needs to be consulted, and we set up a *modus operandi* for the heritage matters during construction and operational phases of the contract

This may not seem to differ much from what occurs now (except you people deal with all the paperwork and need for re-assessing budgets). The project archaeologist allows the consultant to act as a "one-stop-shop" for Tidor, creating a regular/standard method of site assessments and mitigation. It also **looks good** for the project as you can state that you have one archaeological company dedicated to the project and is available at all times.

6

We do not submit the exact locations of sites in public documents. This is standard practice. The reasoning is that we do not make sites known as the public may then have access to a site and illegally remove artefacts. This has happened in the past. AMAFA KZN supports this non-submission.

The specialist study is not required to read popular articles/books, and relies on published papers and databases for information. If A. van Jaarsveld had previously noted/recorded a site then he should have submitted the site record to the Natal Museum or Amafa KZN.

This is required by archaeologists and is accepted practice. This site has never been officially recorded and is thus not in the database.

Hand-axes occur all over KZN and tend to be of low significance as they are not in a primary context. If I recall correctly it was stated (in the initial public participation process), that **one** handaxe had been previously found. One artefact does not constitute a site. In our methodology, more than 10 stone tools in well-defined area would be required before it is recorded as a site. If stone tools are dispersed over a wide area then they are noted as general scatters. Again I repeat my findings: isolated hand-axes on a few hills do not constitute a site, and are of low significance. The occurrences of these artefacts have been noted and will be added to the regional database.

I do not see the point of photographing diagnostic pottery sherds as part of the Phase 1 survey. A description of the pottery would suffice. Similarly, there is little point in photographing the site, as it would only show sugar cane. Photographs are not a requirement of a Phase 1 survey. Photographing the location of the site would be the same as submitting the GPS co-ordinates. Information regarding site altitude, vegetation, topography may be obtained from a 1:50 000 map and/or the specialist studies.