

Boegoebaai Port, SEZ and Namakwa Region SEA

Working Group Meeting 2 Key Notes & Actions

Document version: Final, 04 November 2024

Date: 10 October 2024

Time: 10:00 – 12:00

Platform: Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Appendix A

Purpose: To provide a brief overview of the proposed Boegoebaai port, Special Economic Zone (SEZ) and regional green hydrogen (GH2) development programme project, with a primary focus on outlining the status of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and presenting the scope and methodology for the SEA specialist studies.

Agenda:

1. Welcome and opening
2. Brief overview of proposed developments and infrastructure
3. Overview of the selection process for Boegoebaai as the preferred site
4. Scope and Methodology for the Specialist Studies
5. SEA Status update
6. Closure and next steps

Key Notes

1) **Welcome and opening:**

- The second Working Group (WG) meeting for the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Boegoebaai Port, Special Economic Zone (SEZ), and broader Namakwa Region development was opened by the Chairperson (Abulele Adams), who outlined the agenda and the purpose of the meeting:
 - to provide an overview of the proposed project developments, update attendees on the status of the SEA since the last meeting, and outline the scope and methodologies for the specialist studies to be applied across two Work Packages for the SEA.

2) **Brief overview of proposed developments and infrastructure (Appendix B):**

- Luanita Snyman van der Walt (CSIR) gave a recap of the proposed developments and infrastructure, which form the basis for the activities and aspects considered in the SEA.
- Discussed that the Northern Cape has been identified as a key region for GH2 development due to its renewable energy resources, land availability, and strategic location for accessing export markets, including links to Namibia, Western Cape, and mining areas in the central Northern Cape.
- Key catalytic infrastructure proposed includes a greenfields port at Boegoebaai, an adjacent SEZ, renewable energy generation and transmission networks, and transport infrastructure to support green hydrogen and Power-to-X (PtX) development activities.
- The SEA consists of two components:
 - **Work Package 1:** The port precinct and adjacent SEZ, focusing on short-term Phase 1a developments and potential long-term Phase 1b plans.

- **Work Package 2:** A regional approach involving four local municipalities in the port and SEZ area, considering cumulative impacts of the port and SEZ, along with regional infrastructure like rail, roads, renewable energy and battery storage required to support the green hydrogen economy.

3) **Overview of the selection process for Boegoebaai as the preferred site (Appendix C):**

- Thulisa Zukulu (Transnet National Ports Authority, TNPA) gave a presentation on the selection of Boegoebaai as the preferred location for the port after several assessments and studies since the conceptualization of the port over 20 years ago, with Transnet's involvement starting in 2015 at the request of the Northern Cape government.
- Outlined that the pre-feasibility studies involved multiple options, including Greenfields, Brownfields, and "do nothing" options, evaluating financial, legislative, and environmental factors.
- Highlighted that the Boegoebaai location was favoured due to its natural deep-water conditions, minimising the need for extensive dredging, and its suitability for a deep-water port with available land for port and SEZ development. The planning includes assessing rail and port connectivity for cost-effective solutions.
- Discussed that environmental and technical evaluations, including coastal sensitivities, bathymetry, and land-side characteristics, led to the final recommendation of Boegoebaai as the preferred port site.
- A question was raised about landowner consultation, specifically regarding the Richtersveld community and whether they were consulted during the 2019 site selection process.
 - TNPA's efforts to engage with the (Richtersveld Communal Property Association: RCPA) Management and broader community since rejoining the project in 2021 was explained, including a community extensive engagement program leading to the in principal agreement to negotiate the sale parameters.
- A question was raised regarding environmental constraints during site comparisons, specifically whether the presence of a Cape fur seal breeding colony at Boegoebaai was considered. And it was asked if the endangered Bank Cormorant breeding site was taken into account during the evaluation of environmental constraints.
 - It was explained that environmental screening was conducted, and a comprehensive report containing the process and findings was produced. The presence of the Cape Fur Seal colony at the site was acknowledged but identified as a non-fatal flaw, requiring close monitoring and potential mitigation solutions. The report can be shared with the group if needed. In addition to the initial screening, an SEA is underway, to be followed by detailed Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs).
- A participant highlighted concerns about the business case document, particularly the legal section, which they felt raised more questions than answers. The participant noted that while TNPA visited the four villages in October 2022, there had been no follow-up, and local communities were unaware of an August meeting in Port Nolloth. They highlighted unresolved issues around land ownership in terms of the Communal Property Associations Act and the 2003 Constitutional Court judgment. A Richtersveld community representative requested that key documents be shared.

- Further comments were also raised on the chat column regarding community engagement with the Richtersveld communities, as well as queries regarding land ownership.
 - It was explained that TNPA's last community engagement visit was in October 2023. The last engagement involved taking community members from the four villages to visit the Boegoebaai site. Future community visits are planned, but no specific dates were provided, as TNPA is still working to resolve funding and other internal matters. It was acknowledged that fiscal conditions currently have impacted the speed at which the negotiations have unfolded. TNPA is in a process of raising capital to streamline the process of purchasing the land and being ready for the land evaluation and negotiations for the outright purchase price.
- A WG member raised concerns about the Boegoebaai development, highlighting the lack of consultation with local fishermen during the planning process. He emphasized the division this has caused within the community and raised concerns about potential harm to fish populations and the environment, particularly in terms of pollution and damage to local vegetation.
- The Chairperson enquired about TNPA's plans for further consultations, noting that many questions raised were related to this topic.
 - It was confirmed that there are plans for further consultation regarding the project within this year. This includes visiting the villages to provide updates on the project's status and challenges.
- A WG member expressed concerns that environmental considerations were not adequately addressed before the project was taken to Treasury. The member sought clarification on the original demand for establishing a port, questioning the feasibility of the green hydrogen initiative and raising a concern that the planning was rushed. They emphasized the importance of maintaining heritage and ecosystem health to support local fishing communities.
 - It was explained that the primary driver for the project was the need for the Northern Cape to benefit from its mineral exports, particularly manganese, which were previously being transported through other ports outside the province. The addition of green hydrogen as a new commodity was noted, positioning Boegoebaai as a key enabler for the green hydrogen economy and aligning with national just energy transition strategies. It was emphasized that this has not been done hurriedly. Over a decade of work has gone into pre-feasibility studies and environmental screenings. The intent of the SEA is to further guide finer scale development planning and understand the cumulative impacts of the port and SEZ on the receiving environment.
 - A representative from the Northern Cape Provincial Government emphasised that the Boegoebaai project has been a priority since 2001, with extensive consultations already conducted and plans for further engagement. The representative noted the importance of the SEA as a critical tool for addressing social, economic, environmental, and cultural issues, as it pertains to the proposed project. They highlighted ongoing collaboration with Namibia and the International Finance Corporation to align with sustainable development frameworks. The representative encouraged continued participation in consultations, providing information on the upcoming Oceans Economy Symposium on the 16 & 17 October 2024 in Port Nolloth. Overall, they reaffirmed the provincial

government's commitment to ongoing consultation and comprehensive studies to inform project planning.

4) Strategic Environmental Assessment Overview and Scope and Methodology for the Specialist Studies (Appendix D):

- Greg Schreiner (CSIR) presented an overview of the purpose and significance of SEAs in the context of regional development, particularly regarding green hydrogen initiatives.
- It was explained that SEAs are designed to be open and collaborative, focusing on sustainability and cumulative impacts, unlike the more regulated and definitive nature of EIAs.
- It was highlighted that the SEA process involves two work packages, each addressing different scales and aspects of environmental sensitivity: Work Package 1 focuses on a local scale (33,500 hectares) to assess environmental sensitivities and constraints, while Work Package 2 encompasses a regional scale (6 million hectares) to evaluate cumulative impacts of green hydrogen development.
- He outlined that each work package consists of multiple chapters, with contributions from a team of experts who will conduct detailed assessments and provide independent peer reviews.
- It was highlighted that the SEA process is designed to be collaborative, involving stakeholder engagement and transparent communication through working groups and public briefings.
- The socio-economic potential of green hydrogen was noted, whilst highlighting the need for careful planning in a sensitive environment to mitigate risks and enhance positive impacts.
- He explained that outputs from the SEA will inform local planning and guide decision-making regarding suitable areas for renewable energy development in the Northern Cape
- In the discussion, the sufficiency of current public engagement was queried, emphasising the need for meaningful input from local communities and stakeholders. Additionally, the responsibility of WG members to ensure representative public participation was scrutinised, particularly in the context of economic development initiatives in the Northern Cape. The need for effective negotiation and participatory research methods was underscored to ensure that local knowledge is valued and utilised in decision-making. The selection of the experts on the team was queried.
 - It was explained that nominations of experts for the specialist teams were accepted from both the WG and any willing stakeholders, forming the basis for the construction of the specialist team. The SEA project team welcomed additional nominations, stating that there was no policy against including more contributing or corresponding authors with requisite specialised knowledge. Stakeholders were encouraged to send any relevant names and contact information to the project team for further engagement.
- A question was raised regarding the opportunity to define the specific terms of reference for the specialist teams.
 - The specialist teams submitted their plans of study to CSIR, which were summarised in PowerPoint presentations. These presentations were circulated to the WG prior to the meeting for review and comment.
- The discussion included a question regarding public participation for the SEA. It was noted that in addition to this WG, NCEDA is also conducting its own public consultation sessions. It was asked whether the SEA team would participate in the public sessions organised by NCEDA.

- It was emphasised that CSIR facilitates participation through the WG, which enables a bi-directional flow of information. Members of the WG can serve as conduits for information to their organisations, constituents and stakeholders, a common practice in global science policy and planning processes. Additionally, the multi-author teams serve as another vehicle for participation due to their diverse expertise, and there is an openness to include more experts with local knowledge in these teams.
- A representative from the Northern Cape Provincial Government mentioned that scheduling of upcoming sessions was in progress (noting the Oceans Economy Symposium mentioned earlier). Efforts will continue to organise and publicize these sessions.
- A WG member emphasised the need for a catch-up session for newcomers in the WG and the importance of providing reviews of the authors and terms of reference to ensure the credibility of the project. Specific questions were raised regarding the extent of the ocean space covered by the project, the feasibility of completing infrastructure by 2030, and the narrow scope of the no-go areas. The WG member also highlighted concerns about public consultation, stressing that it should not solely fall on NGOs to facilitate this process, and suggested that project developers should take greater responsibility for ensuring proper consultation.
 - The developing process of the WG formation was acknowledged, noting that full participation often only develops by the second or third meeting. Attendees were encouraged to share any concerns or comments regarding the multi-author teams for consideration.
 - Regarding public participation, it was clarified that, during the SEA phase, public meetings are typically not held as the process remains conceptual. While WG members are not expected to conduct public participation exercises, they are encouraged to share information with their networks about opportunities for involvement. It was highlighted that provincial government meetings would also provide avenues for public engagement.
 - Regarding the marine aspect, it was emphasised that a dedicated marine ecology team would thoroughly assess potential impacts without making premature conclusions. Additionally, the 2030 development scenarios, although ambitious and politically driven by NCEDA and the national government, serve to highlight the environmental risks associated with rapid development. The approach aims to ensure that worst-case scenarios are considered, preventing complacency in planning for future developments that may occur sooner than anticipated.
 - It was clarified that the "no-go" scenario referenced in discussions was not a strict prohibition like that in an EIA. Instead, it represented a "zero" scenario for green hydrogen development, indicating that while no new green hydrogen initiatives would occur, existing land use changes and development trends would continue. This approach allowed for a comprehensive assessment of cumulative impacts, taking into account ongoing factors such as climate change and socioeconomic developments alongside existing land uses, including ongoing mining and agriculture.
- A WG member suggested the need for focus groups to be convened on specific themes at designated times to enhance the engagement process.

- It was emphasised that the author teams would not solely rely on desktop research and could also engage with key local municipalities and key community stakeholders, as applicable. The consultation with key stakeholders, such as that being done by the socio-economics and fisheries and coastal livelihood experts, aims to gather essential local insights and address the limitations of existing desktop information.
- A concern was raised regarding the fisheries team, noting that it was solely focused on social science without any quantitative fisheries expertise. The WG member emphasised the need to incorporate fisheries science into the assessment, either within the fisheries team or integrated into the marine ecology and biodiversity aspects. They argued that a social-only approach would be insufficient for understanding the impacts on fisheries resources in the area.
 - The comment regarding the absence of a technical fisheries expert in the fisheries and coastal livelihoods chapter was acknowledged. CSIR would liaise with the lead author for that chapter, to address this concern. The WG member was encouraged to provide nominations for potential contributors who could enhance the chapter's technical aspects.
- The interconnectedness of various chapters within the study was emphasised, particularly noting the links between fisheries, the marine chapter, and the socio-economic chapter. The importance of avoiding siloed work was highlighted and ongoing team meetings to identify these interactions were mentioned.
- Regarding public participation, it was clarified that the SEA serves as an analytical tool to identify key issues and dynamics that should inform public participation efforts, which are primarily the responsibility of the Northern Cape government and local municipalities. The SEA will provide insights into potential developmental benefits and challenges related to the proposed port and industrial development, but it will not dictate the project's direction.
- Suggestions for analysts who could serve as consultants or peer reviewers were welcomed, acknowledging that a diverse range of perspectives is essential for a thorough assessment.
- A WG member expressed concerns regarding the reliance on natural resources, citing that using these resources is often cheaper than pursuing more extensive development. Additionally, the member raised an issue about ongoing struggles with existing harbour infrastructure in Port Nolloth, mentioning a history of damage from tsunamis and a lack of response from the relevant authorities for repairs. They emphasised the need for serious attention to these challenges moving forward.
- A participant expressed concerns about the adequacy of consultation efforts, emphasising that while some actions, such as briefings, are positive, they do not constitute meaningful consultation with communities. They requested concrete dates for upcoming meetings, highlighting the importance of timely information for NGOs to effectively engage communities and allow them to prepare for participation. The speaker expressed apprehension that the SEA might shorten the timeframe for EIA, potentially limiting community input. They stressed the need for a framework that ensures communities are informed and can meaningfully contribute to discussions beyond receiving project updates.
 - It was clarified that the purpose of the SEA is not to “downgrade” EIAs to Basic Assessments, as has been the outcome from some other national-scale SEAs. Instead, this SEA aims to inform planning and decision-making by providing the developers with

a clearer understanding of high-risk areas and limitations on development activities. This enhanced insight is expected to improve the quality of future EIAs.

- Regarding the point about public participation, it was suggested that NCEDA and TNPA provide a brief outline of their plans for public consultation, including timelines and locations, to provide clarity to WG members on upcoming engagements.
- Concerns related to biodiversity were highlighted, particularly focusing on the seal colony and endangered bird species. The need for assessments in the SEA regarding marine soundscapes were emphasised, noting that increased ship traffic from port development could impact these areas. Consideration of the shallow water subtidal zone, up to 50 meters deep, to complement existing assessments of rocky and sandy shores were also highlighted.
- Concerns regarding beneficiaries of the land claims project were expressed, indicating that these individuals fear being dispossessed again after recently regaining ownership of their land under the Communal Property Associations Act. It was highlighted that the complainants feel threatened by developments such as mining and green hydrogen projects, emphasising inadequate consultation processes. It was further added that the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE) is issuing licenses in areas where land has been restored, potentially leading to railway and pipeline developments on their land. The need for the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) to actively investigate claims of potential violations of human rights related to land claims and development projects was emphasised. It was pointed out that discussions surrounding these projects often overlook human rights considerations, which is a significant concern.
 - It was explained that the TNPA team is engaging with the Richtersveld Communal Property Association (RCPA) on land discussions. This approach was deliberate to ensure that consultations were comprehensive and did not exclude any party. The RCPA serves as a structured association representing all four communities involved, with decisions made during their annual general meetings. While the team recognised concerns from some individuals about not being adequately consulted, they emphasised their commitment to engaging with the RCPA to maintain a clear communication channel.
 - It was emphasised that the Northern Cape provincial government recognised the critical role of the Human Rights Commission and the South African Constitution in protecting people's rights, especially concerning land dispossession. It was highlighted that the project had been in the concept phase for many years, dating back to the 1960s, and was currently in the early stages of facility assessments. The representative from the Northern Cape Provincial Government encouraged ongoing engagement with the SAHRC, stating that the provincial government was committed to responsible consultation and transparency throughout the process. The concerns from community members regarding perceived lack of consultation and objectivity in the project were acknowledged. Assurance was given that government would increase consultations and engage with affected communities to ensure a holistic approach that preserved local cultures and lifestyles. Furthermore, it was mentioned that the National Department of Rural Development and Land Reform was coordinating with the RCPA for engagement regarding land ownership and development impacts.

5) **SEA Status update (Appendix B):**

- Babalwa Mqokeli (CSIR) gave an update on the progress on the SEA.
- The appointment process for the expert team to serve as research partners on the SEA was finalised. Fieldwork is underway for the WP1, including terrestrial ecology, heritage, fisheries & coastal livelihoods, marine ecology, bats and surface water features.
- A plenary session was held with the Project Steering Committee and specialists on 30 September 2024, aimed at facilitating knowledge sharing regarding the assessment of proposed development impacts.
- The specialists are now moving forward with developing the baseline environmental descriptions, alongside sensitivity analysis and mapping.
- The process for public participation was highlighted, with ongoing efforts to include diverse perspectives in the SEA. The WG members were requested to provide nominations for additional representatives (using the form provided), including local community organisations, to enhance its representation. A link was provided to the online form.
- Stakeholder engagement was initiated through site notices at key locations, advertisements in local newspapers, and a radio interview to explain the SEA and encourage public participation. An SEA website has been launched (<https://www.csir.co.za/boegoebaai-port>) that includes several background documents. Plans for several in-person public briefings were also mentioned, with details to be shared later through engagement channels and with WG representatives.

6) **Additional feedback / discussion points:**

- A WG member acknowledged the importance of public participation, noting that previous discussions indicated a certain direction regarding consent for the port and SEZ development project. It was emphasised that there appeared to be a misunderstanding among landowners regarding the role of the CPA, and the responsibility of project proponents to ensure adequate consent from the entire community, rather than relying solely on a small representative body. Additionally, concerns about the effectiveness of the CPA in facilitating engagement and consent within the community were raised, highlighting that the project's consent process should encompass the community as a whole. The member questioned how these consent issues would be addressed.
 - NCEDA and TNPA were asked to consider the consent issue related to the project and provide a response at the next WG meeting.
- A WG member emphasised the importance of clearly stating in the terms of reference and on the website that the SEA will not diminish the necessity for thorough environmental impact assessments for projects such as railways or ports. They identified additional economic drivers relevant to the region beyond those listed, including mining (both legal and illegal), paper transactions related to mining, and environmental consulting for applications for rights in various sectors, especially in the Richtersveld area. The member noted the need for access to records of the Richtersveld CPA's previous meetings and Annual General Meetings, highlighting that issues of leadership within the CPA could impact the community's interests. Furthermore, they raised concerns about potential conflicts of interest and the influence of political affiliations within the CPA leadership, which might not represent the broader community's

interests. They concluded by emphasising the historical context of economic challenges in Namaqualand and the potential negative impact of upcoming projects on the region's cultural, environmental, and social fabric. They requested that documents be made available in Afrikaans.

7) **Closure and Next Steps:**

- Updates on the next steps for the project were provided, including addressing feedback regarding additional authors and expertise for the various chapters presented.
- Over the following seven months, the SEA team will work closely with the specialists/authors.
- The next WG meeting will be scheduled in January/February 2025, where specialists will provide updates on the fieldwork and draft results from the ongoing studies.

The Chairperson closed the meeting and reminded participants of the following:

- Working Group survey - <https://forms.office.com/r/MsaHPyW62t>
- General stakeholder registration - please also feel free to fill this one out, and distribute within your networks: <https://forms.office.com/r/QpQBnpCNdm>
- SEA webpage - All documentation and info (including WG presentations, notes, SEA reports etc.) will be made available on the dedicated webpage here: <https://www.csir.co.za/boegoebaai-port>

Key Actions

Action	Responsibility
1. Key meeting notes and slides to be shared with all attendees	CSIR
2. Check whether the socio-economic benefit study report can be shared with the WG.	TNPA
3. Documentation and studies to be shared with the WG - <u>upon TNPA's confirmation of confidentiality / what can be shared (action 2)</u> : a. Environmental Screening Study; b. Socio-economic Study.	CSIR, via TNPA
4. WG members can comment on Specialists Plans of Study and Specialist teams composition.	WG
5. Update the Background Information Document to clearly state the SEA does not intend to “downgrade” EIA processes for proposed port and SEZ development.	CSIR
6. Translate the BID to Afrikaans and upload to the project website.	CSIR
7. Consider adding a fisheries science aspect as a resource to the Fisheries & Coastal Livelihoods Chapter a. CSIR to engage with Author team on this b. Stephen Lamberth to liaise further with CSIR and recommend a relevant expert(s) for this aspect	CSIR Stephen Lamberth
8. NCEDA and TNPA to consider the issue of consent regarding the port and SEZ development and provide a response at the next WG meeting.	NCEDA & TNPA
9. Share a concise outline of future stakeholder engagements on the port and SEZ development (TNPA, NCEDA), and SEA (CSIR). Dates for engagement sessions and public briefings to be shared timeously.	CSIR / TNPA & NCEDA

Appendix A: Working Group meeting 1 attendance

Note: There were approximately 66 separate log ins during the course of the meeting. Some participants had several people with them for the meeting. For example, Henk Smith said he was sitting with 20 people in the room.

Organisation	Name and Surname
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR)	Paul Lochner
	Greg Schreiner
	Luanita Snyman-Van der Walt
	Lizande Kellerman
	Babalwa Mqokeli (Project Manager)
	Abulele Adams (Chairperson)
	Rinae Tsedu
	Susan Taljaard
	Johan Maritz
Michelle Audouin	
Northern Cape Economic Development Trade and Investment Promotion Agency (NCEDA)	Arlene Le Grange
	Hastings F Nel
South African National Energy Development Institute (SANEDI)	Mandisa Nkosi
Transnet National Ports Authority (TNPA)	Thulisa Zukulu
	Jabulani Maluleke
	Yastheel Sheochand
	Aphelele Tomsana
Department of Forestry Fisheries and Environment (DFFE): Climate Change and Air Quality Management	Hendrik Louw
DFFE: Oceans and Coasts	Gerhard Cilliers
DFFE: Oceans & Coast (Coastal Pollution Management)	Lona Nondaka
DFFE: Fisheries Research and Development	Stephen Justin Lamberth
DFFE: Policy Support and Strategic Programme Implementation	Dee Fischer
DFFE: Integrated Environmental Authorisations (IEA)	Sabelo Malaza
Department of Economic Development and Tourism (DEDAT)	Hendrik Louw
Department of Science and Innovation (DSI)	Cosmas Chiteme
	Mandy Mlilo
Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (the dtic)	Shaun Moses
Infrastructure South Africa: Provincial Lead	Avik Singh
Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs, Rural Development and Land Reform (DAERL)	Louise Geldenhuys
Namakwa District Municipality	Gareth Cloete
South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)	Natasha Higgitt
South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI)	Tsamaelo Malebu
	Dewidine Van Der Colff
	Hlengiwe Mtshali
	Domitilla Raimondo
Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT)	Zanne Brink
	Lizel Tolken
South Africa Wind Energy Association (SAWEA)	Siyabonga Mhlongo
SLR Consulting	Stephan Van Den Berg
Zutari	Reuben Heydenrych
Department of Cooperative Governance, Human Settlements and Traditional Affairs	Livhuwani Tshilate

Birdlife South Africa	Samantha Ralston-Paton
Conservation South Africa	Christopher Oviés
	Philip Barnard
Green Connection	Liz McDaid
Liz Day Consulting	Liz Day
Kleinzee Holdings	Deidre Karstens
Vedanta Zinc International	Cindy Mogotsi
VVVT - Namakwaland	Anthony Wyngaard
AfriAvian Environmental	Albert Froneman
Anchor Environmental	Barry Clark
TREES at NWU for Tourism	Elmarie Slabbert
Richtersveld World Heritage Site	Abe Koopman
Private	Pieter Van Wyk
GEOSS Groundwater Consultants	Zita Harilall
Natural Justice	Dean Palmer
	Wandile Zondo
	Andries Maarman
	Amelia Heyns
University of Stellenbosch	Calumet Links
	Rob Smith
ASHA Consulting	Jayson Orton
KDF	Doreen Atkinson
Aukotowa Fisheries Primary Co-op	Walter Steenkamp
Amethyst	Catherine Ward
Ekotrust	Gretel van Rooyen
Alliance for Law in Development	Maria Smith
	Henk Smith

Appendix B: Brief overview of proposed developments and infrastructure (including SEA Status Update and Closure and Next Steps) presentation

Refer to separate attachment

Appendix C: Overview of the selection process for Boegoebaai as the preferred site presentation

Refer to separate attachment

Appendix D: Strategic Environmental Assessment Overview and Scope and Methodology for the Specialist Studies presentation

Refer to separate attachment