

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

MEETING DETAILS

Meeting	1681 Motuoane ER386 EA 12/3/386 - Public Meeting		
Meeting Venue	Harmonie Primary School, 2 Vondeling Road, Virginia	Date	2025/05/28
		Time	16:00-18:00
<p><i>A Public Meeting was scheduled with Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs). The aim of the meeting was to provide feedback regarding the findings of the Scoping Report to members of the public and key I&APs. During the public meeting which took place between 16h00 and 18h00, a presentation of the project description, impact assessment, and updates was delivered to all attendees of the meeting by Environmental Impact Management Services (EIMS) Pty (Ltd). A presentation was delivered by Mr Vukosi Mabunda from EIMS in English and after the presentation was delivered, a question and answer session was opened and facilitated by Mr Liam Whitlow from EIMS where attendees asked questions or expressed their comments regarding the project. The attendance register has been attached as an appendix to this document.</i></p>			

AGENDA

Item
1. EIMS Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Opening and Welcome</i> <i>b. Safety Note / Announcements</i> <i>c. Purpose of Meeting</i> <i>d. Project Overview and Description</i> <i>e. Legislated Requirements</i> <i>f. Summary of Scoping Report / Findings</i> <i>g. Involvement of Interested and Affected Parties</i> <i>h. Project Timelines (Anticipated)</i> <i>i. Questions and Answers</i>
2. Questions and Answers

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

MINUTES

Item No	Item
1.	EIMS Presentation
	<p><i>The meeting commenced with Welcoming and Introductions by Mr Vukosi Mabunda and Mr Liam Whitlow. EIMS requested if the meeting could be conducted in English to which the attendees agreed as they all understand English and no translation is required. All attendees were requested to sign the attendance register. Presentation from EIMS (Appendix 1) was delivered as per the agenda above to the meeting attendees. It was indicated that the meeting would be recorded for the purposes of accurate minute-taking and submission to the competent authorities. The attendees were encouraged to submit their comments and concerns through filling in the comment forms provided. Ground rules for the meeting were outlined and members were encouraged to state their names before commenting for minutes-taking purposes.</i></p> <p><i>Following the presentation, the floor was opened for a discussion and the attendees were encouraged to bring up any questions or concerns they had about the project.</i></p>
2.	Questions and Answers
	<p>The following is a summary of the comments and questions that were recorded during the proceedings of the meeting and the responses provided.</p>
a.	<p>IAP 1</p> <p>How does EIMS engage the Interested and Affected Parties?</p> <p>Response – Mr Vukosi Mabunda</p> <p>Mr Mabunda provided a summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process to date. Vukosi highlighted that the pre-application phase commenced in March 2025 and included initial stakeholder engagement through faxes, emails, and registered letters. Notices were published in newspapers and the Government Gazette, and 99 site notices were placed in and around the project area.</p> <p>A draft Scoping Report was prepared and available for public review and comment until the 18th of June 2025. Copies of the report were placed at the Virginia, Welkom and Phomolong public libraries and made available on the EIMS website.</p> <p>The public meeting forms part of the public participation process for the scoping phase. It was noted that an additional public meeting will be held during the EIA phase. Stakeholders will be notified in advance, and the next meeting is likely to be held at the same venue unless alternative venues are proposed by I&APs. This upcoming meeting will include more detailed information about the project and associated impacts including detailed mitigation measures and findings from the Specialist.</p> <p>He further encouraged the participants to bring forth their suggestions in relation to the impacts and mitigation measure to ensure they are considered for the EIA phase report. After the EIA phase and everything has been submitted to the authorities, I&APs will be notified of the decision from the</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

Item No	Item
	<p>authorities and an opportunity as well as the process to appeal will also be given in the notification. The decision can either positive or negative.</p> <p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>Mr Roberg indicated a concern on the admin side of the public participation process; he noted that he had not received the email invitation to the public meeting. He stated that he only received the Call to Register email, and the public meeting reminder SMS sent on Monday (26/05/2025)</p> <p>Response - Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>In response to the Mr Roberg's concern, Mr Whitlow asked him and other stakeholders in attendance how they had received the notification to attend the public meeting, whether via SMS, email, or fax. He further enquired whether Mr Roberg had submitted a formal request to be registered as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) and to have their contact details included in the project database. Mr Whitlow indicated that the matter will be assessed by EIMS to ensure I&APs receive the project notifications.</p>
b.	<p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>Asked for the size pole that goes into the borehole after it has been identified.</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx – Response</p> <p>In response, Mr FJ Marx noted that, the pole is called a wallet, and it has valve on top and it can open and close with a pressure gauge on top. The pole is only 1 metre long.</p> <p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>He raised a concern about the visibility of the structure/pole, questioning whether the current measures are sufficient. He noted that if vegetation grows around it and given its small size, it could easily be missed, potentially resulting in it being accidentally struck by a tractor or similar equipment.</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx – Response</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx responded by stating that the borehole infrastructure has been developed in a manner that ensures safety and high visibility with a fence around the standpipe. He invited stakeholders to visit the Motuoane offices, where he could show examples of the equipment used to provide further clarity.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow - Response</p> <p>Mr Whitlow explained that during the first phase, when drilling is taking place, a drill rig and truck are present, and the area is fenced off to ensure visibility and safety. From a fire safety perspective, grass around the site is cleared, making the setup clearly visible.</p> <p>During the exploration phase, when only a standpipe remains, the surrounding area would also be cleared. He acknowledged the concern raised and confirmed that it would be noted. Appropriate control measures will be implemented to ensure such infrastructure remains visible and is not accidentally damaged, such as being driven over.</p> <p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>Mr Roberg shared a concern based on their own experience, stating that their drilling activities were completed in 2014 and they are still waiting for authorisation. He noted that the markers, poles and</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

Item No	Item
	<p>other related infrastructure have been in place for over ten years, highlighting potential delays in the process and his concern on safety.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow - Response</p> <p>He invited input from participants, suggesting they may have valuable insights to contribute. He asked whether there have been any past issues with people driving into poles or similar infrastructure in the area.</p> <p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>He explained that they have not experienced such issues, as the drilling activities have taken place on property they personally own and manage. However, they noted that if the infrastructure had been located on other farms, this could have presented a significant risk or challenge.</p>
c.	<p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>Asked if they are any existing blowers in the area?</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx – Response</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx confirmed that identifying historical gas blowers is a key component of their exploration model, which is guided by geological assessments. He noted that the team works closely with the mining sector and has access to data on most of the historical wells drilled during the 1970s and 1980s. This historical data plays an important role in identifying potential gas-rich areas, often referred to as "easy gas holes."</p> <p>Follow-up Question from Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>He enquired whether there are currently any active gas blowers in the area that are visibly releasing gas.</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx – Response</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx confirmed that there are indeed several active gas blowers in the area. He welcomed input from stakeholders and encouraged them to speak with him directly if they are aware of any such sites. He emphasized that he is the point of contact in the area for this information.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow recalled a past project involving Elma and Peter Price, noting that in several cases, gas was discovered through wells originally drilled by mining companies for prospecting or by local farmers searching for water. In some instances, gas began escaping from these boreholes, which poses environmental and safety concerns.</p> <p>He emphasised that if any stakeholders are aware of wells or boreholes currently releasing gas, it would be helpful to report them. This would allow the project team to assist in securing them, potentially by installing a flange, tap, or valve, as an interim measure.</p> <p>He also noted that mining operations often face similar challenges with underground gas. In some areas, mines have installed dedicated drainage wells to extract gas from their workings, which is then either flared or otherwise managed to address safety concerns.</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

Item No	Item
	<p>Mr FJ Marx – added to Mr Whitlow’s point</p> <p>Mr FJ Marx highlighted the high unemployment rate in the area and explained that local individuals often become familiar with the locations of gas blowers. In some cases, they ignite the gas to burn off insulation from copper cables in order to extract and sell the copper.</p> <p>He emphasised that, from both an environmental and safety perspective, it is important to locate and properly seal these wells. Identifying the exact locations of active gas blowers is also valuable for the geological team, as it contributes significant data points to their exploration model.</p>
d.	<p>Mr Elmar Roberg</p> <p>Mr Elmar Roberg expressed confusion about why, if there is so much gas available locally, a company like Sasol would go 3,000 kilometres away to source it. They mentioned the Beatrix Mine as one of the first sites to have experienced a gas blow of some significance. He recalled a visit to the mine, during which they were told that representatives from Tetra4 had arrived and claimed the gas as theirs. However, he mentioned they were not aware of any really substantial gas finds in the area, especially considering the thousands of boreholes drilled.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow - Response</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow responded by saying that this is likely the reason why D3 or Renegen is currently exploring, they are still trying to understand what gas resources are present. He explained that Renegen seems to have found something they believe can be commercialised, whereas D3 is still in the exploration phase. He stressed the importance of distinguishing between exploration and production: D3 is only applying for exploration rights at this stage. They are not allowed to extract or sell any gas yet. If they do find gas and believe it’s commercially viable, they will have to start a whole new process. This would involve applying for a production right and undertaking a new Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Someone would then need to return and assess the environmental impact related specifically to production. Mr Whitlow emphasised that without exploration, it’s impossible to know what gas is actually there.</p>
e.	<p>Ms Lerato Matebese</p> <p>She asked for clarity on the project timeline for Water Use application. She noted that the process is currently in Phase Two and that Phase Three will be the final decision-making stage. She requested confirmation on when the 30-day period for a decision begin.</p> <p>Mr Vukosi Mabunda</p> <p>Mr Vukosi Mabunda clarified that, at this stage, no water use application is required for the project. The current activities fall outside of regulated buffer zones, so water use authorisation is not needed at this time.</p> <p>However, he noted that if any future activities are planned within regulated areas, then a formal water use application process will need to be followed. This includes setting up an application meeting, conducting site visits, and determining whether a general or specific authorisation applies. Only after submission of the final application and reports, do authorities then have 30-days to make a decision for</p>

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

Item No	Item
	a General Authorisation application and 90-days for Water Use License. He emphasised that currently, only the EIA process is active.
f.	<p>Mr Thabang Mafatle</p> <p>Mr Mafatle expressed concern over the lack of local leadership present at the meeting. He noted that it was disappointing to see such low community attendance, fewer than 10 people again - similar to a previous meeting. He warned that in many cases, local leaders and others who create confusion in the community only begin to show interest when projects are in the final stages. He urged caution and vigilance from the developers and community moving forward.</p> <p>Mr Mafatle asked how the project would generate economic activity and employment opportunities, specifically in the areas of Lejweleputswa District Municipality, Matjhabeng Local Municipality and surrounding communities. He highlighted that local gold mines such as Harmony and Sibanye are nearing the end of their life spans, with licenses expiring around 2030. Given the current high unemployment, he stressed the need for clarity on how this new project would benefit the local workforce.</p> <p>He pointed out that many of the areas identified for development do not fall under municipal control, they are owned by mining companies (Harmony and Sibanye) or private individuals. He questioned how local communities would benefit when they do not have ownership or direct access to this land.</p> <p>Mr Mafatle asked whether the company plans to operate like Tetra4, a gas company currently operating in the area. He sought clarification on whether all identified sites would be developed individually, or if the gas would be piped to a central facility.</p> <p>Lastly, he questioned the company's long-term intentions. If Motuoane receives a 9-year operating license, what will happen after those nine years? Will the company renew and continue operations, and how will the community be affected during and after that time? He asked what mechanisms would be put in place to ensure lasting benefits for the local people.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow – Response</p> <p>Mr Whitlow responded by addressing the concerns about community benefits and the project's long-term plans. He began by explaining that the current phase of the project is exploration, not production. This means that the company still does not know whether there is gas present, how much gas there is, or whether it will be viable to develop a full-scale plant like Tetra4.</p> <p>He clarified that before any decisions can be made about how gas will be processed or transported, whether through small plants, a central facility, or pipelines, Motuoane must first conduct exploratory drilling. This involves testing the ground, collecting data, and closing the sites afterward. Only after this exploration, and if the results are positive, will the Motuoane return to apply for a production right and conduct a full EIA. That is the stage where more detailed plans and commitments can be discussed with the community.</p> <p>In terms of economic and employment benefits, Mr Whitlow was honest in saying that during the exploration phase, there are almost no direct benefits to the local community. The work is highly technical and will be handled by a small number of specialised personnel using one or two trucks. These jobs are unlikely to go to local residents. He emphasised that he did not want to mislead the community with unrealistic promises of jobs or benefits at this stage.</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

Item No	Item
	<p>However, if the exploration proves successful and the project moves into the production phase, there will be legal obligations on the company to involve and benefit the local community. These include Social and Labour Plans (SLPs), Local Economic Development (LED) initiatives, and commitments to create local employment opportunities. These requirements are built into South Africa's regulatory framework for mining and energy projects.</p> <p>Mr Whitlow concluded by stressing that right now, the company is investing large sums of money into exploration without any guarantee of return. If no gas is found, the investment is lost. But if viable resources are discovered, the company will return to the community with more concrete plans, and at that point, meaningful community engagement and benefit-sharing can begin.</p> <p>Mr Whitlow also responded to concerns about the absence of local leadership at the meeting. He explained that a clear effort was made to inform the relevant Ward Councillors ahead of time. The EIMS Public Participation team reached out directly and requested that they attend. However, EIMS cannot force these leaders to attend the meetings.</p> <p>Mr Thabang Mafatle</p> <p>He acknowledged that, at this stage, the community does not stand to benefit directly from the exploration activities, as the company is still in the early stages of searching for gas. Nonetheless, he expressed hope that something valuable would eventually be found. He emphasised that multiple companies, not just Motuoane and Tetra4 are exploring for gas in the area, including international companies like Rhino Gas from Australia, which previously operated in the region using drone-based technology.</p> <p>He expressed concern over the long timeline of the exploration and environmental approval process. Drawing from his experience attending similar meetings and understanding the procedures, he pointed out that the process seems unnecessarily slow. He explained that, typically, once an application is lodged, it should take about six months to compile the environmental report, followed by three months for public consultations and presentations, a total of approximately nine months.</p> <p>He found it unusual and concerning that the current process is projected to extend as far as 2026, suggesting that this could lead to wasted resources and financial loss for the company if the project is ultimately not approved. He concluded by questioning the efficiency of the environmental approval process, suggesting that it should not take this long.</p> <p>In addition</p> <p>Mr Mafatle hopes the project would ultimately benefit residents, especially in the long term, perhaps through initiatives that bring alternative energy solutions like gas and solar power to local households. He sees a future where selected homes in each township could transition away from electricity to cleaner energy sources like gas for cooking, following global trends seen in other countries.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow – Response</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow explained that it is still too early to say exactly what will be done with the gas, as this depends on the outcomes of the current exploration phase. He noted that several possibilities exist, such as supplying it locally, transporting it via pipelines or trucks, or using it to generate electricity, but final decisions can only be made once the company understands the volume and quality of the gas resource.</p>

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

Item No	Item
	He emphasised that detailed planning and decisions will follow after the initial exploration phase is completed.
g.	<p>Mr Khopolo Molibeli</p> <p>He directed his question to Mr FJ Max in relation to the status of the drilling activities that were happening previously.</p> <p>Mr FJ Max – Response</p> <p>Mr. Max confirmed that three wells were drilled under the approved EIA ER315. These activities were completed successfully, and an amendment was subsequently submitted for additional 10 wells. This application is still in process. He noted that the project received the necessary environmental approval in November 2024. However, progress has been delayed due to an appeal that was lodged, seemingly not by a local stakeholder, but by a stakeholder in Cape Town. As a result, Motuoane is currently waiting for the outcome of the appeal. Once the matter is resolved, operations on the additional wells will proceed.</p>
h.	<p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr. Liam Whitlow asked for feedback on the Public Participation Process. He wanted to understand how participants first found out about the project, whether they received a direct email invitation, saw an advert, or came across site notices.</p> <p>Participants</p> <p>Participants indicated that they had been notified by someone in Welkom, received an SMS, Email. Mr Mafatle suggested that the public meeting for the EIA phase should be held closer to the communities of Welkom such as Bronville or Thabong to cater for these communities as travelling to Virginia is expensive and/or time consuming for some locals. EIMS acknowledged the suggestion and indicated that it will be considered to have one or more meeting in those communities or area.</p>
i.	<p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Thanked everyone for making the time to attend the Public Meeting and the meeting was adjourned.</p>

APPENDICES

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix 1 – Public Meeting Presentation Appendix 2 – Attendance Register
--

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

MEETING DETAILS

Meeting	1681 Motuoane ER386 EA 12/3/386 – Focus Group Meeting		
Meeting Venue	Microsoft Teams	Date	2025/06/06
		Time	09H30 – 10H30
A Focus Group Meeting was scheduled with representatives from Harmony. The aim of the meeting was to engage Harmony representatives as part of the public participation process for the Motuoane ER386 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Specifically, the session aimed at discussing the Scoping Report, clarifying the project's consultation and Scoping Report commenting timelines, and addressing the need for land access to conduct baseline environmental studies.			

MINUTES

Item No	Item
1.	Questions and Answers
	The following is a summary of the comments and questions that were recorded during the proceedings of the meeting and the responses provided.
a.	<p>Ms Khazi Mashamaite</p> <p>Asked for clarity on the timeline of public communication efforts. Specifically, they wanted to know when Harmony was first informed about the project whether any notification had been sent out and when that first engagement took place.</p> <p>Mr Vukosi Mabunda – Response</p> <p>He responded that the first notifications were sent out on the 14th of March 2025. The notifications were sent out to John and Ashley, as they were the only individuals listed on the database.</p> <p>Mr John Van Wyk</p> <p>He sought clarity on two key points. First, the environmental process triggered by the notification received regarding the exploration right application. They understood that this is the current phase being discussed.</p> <p>Secondly, he referred to a separate issue concerning the mining right application that had been submitted to the DMRE. They asked whether there had been any consultation with Harmony, either by the project team or by Motuoane regarding that mining right application. Mr Van Wyk asked for confirmation that his understanding of the questions posed by Mashamaite was correct.</p> <p>Ms Khazi Mashamaite – Response to Mr John</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite confirmed that John's understanding was correct and clarified that the environmental and mining right processes are interlinked.</p>

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

Item No	Item
	<p>She explained that, under Section 79(4) of the regulations, once the regulatory agency accepts an application, the applicant is required to consult with the landowner, lawful occupier, and interested or affected parties. The outcomes of this consultation must then be included in the environmental report.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite understood that the project team is still in the consultation phase, working towards finalising the environmental report with the necessary input.</p>
b.	<p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr Whitlow requested the group's consent to record the meeting. He explained that this session forms part of the consultation process required under the EIA regulations. He highlighted the importance of including landowner engagement as part of the official record, as outlined in the acceptance letter conditions. Mr Whitlow noted that the attendees are key stakeholders in the process and offered two options for their input: either allow the session to be recorded and treated as a focus group discussion, or alternatively, submit their comments in writing for inclusion in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite – Response</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite clarified that Harmony's only written submission would be their formal objection. She indicated that the responsibility to record the meeting and maintain a consultation record lies with EIMS and its team, as part of their procedural obligations. However, she added that if Harmony is specifically asked to provide comments on how the project may impact them, they are willing to submit input on that matter.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Requested that Mr Van Wyk distribute the recording once the session concludes. He confirmed that his team would also be taking their own notes but emphasised the usefulness of having the recording for their records.</p>
c.	<p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr Whitlow revisited the importance of landowner consultation as part of the environmental scoping and impact assessment process, which is a requirement outlined in the project's acceptance letter. He acknowledged that an initial round of engagement had taken place through the Call to Register notifications, where landowners were contacted and invited to submit their registration and comments.</p> <p>However, he noted some uncertainty around whether any input was received from Harmony and indicated that this would need to be verified. He emphasized that if any comments were submitted, they should have been included in the scoping report. Mr Whitlow concluded by asking if anyone from Harmony's team, specifically John or his colleagues, had submitted any comments during the earlier consultation phase.</p> <p>Mr John - Comment</p> <p>Mr John explained that their first real involvement in the process began after receiving a phone call from the project team, informing him about the upcoming authorisation process. During that conversation, he was asked who else from their side should be involved, and he recommended Ashley and members of their legal team.</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

Item No	Item
	<p>He recalled receiving the first formal communication, a notification letter inviting participation in the impact assessment process, on 14 March. This was followed by a request in April for access to site information, which marked the next phase of engagement. He noted that these were the key points of interaction he had experienced with the project team up to this point.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow - Response</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow explained that the standard procedure involves sending out a notification before finalising the scoping report to invite I&APs to review and submit comments on the Scoping Report. Any comments received during this early stage are considered and incorporated into the final EIA report. If certain feedback is not reflected in the final report, it likely means no input was received during the that public participation phase, according to their records.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite and Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite enquired about how many stakeholders still need to submit their comments on the scoping report, including any views, objections, or concerns. Mr Whitlow confirmed that Harmony can still submit their comments as the commenting period would be ending on 18 June 2025. Ms Mashamaite requested that no access or consent should be granted at this stage. She highlighted the importance of allowing Harmony, as an interested and affected party, the opportunity to review and provide a comment on the scoping report before any decisions are made.</p>
d.	<p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow explained that while Harmony have control over surface rights, there are two key components to consider regarding the EIA process. Firstly, the standard EIA process requires input and feedback from landowners and stakeholders on any concerns about the proposed exploration activities. Secondly, the project team also needs access to the property to conduct baseline environmental studies, such as vegetation assessments. He clarified that the request for property access is specifically to carry out these environmental baseline investigations, which are an important part of the overall EIA process.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite Response</p> <p>She noted that, would it be more feasible for Harmony to first be given the chance to review and comment on the scoping report by the deadline of 18 June. She emphasised that Harmony needs to understand how the proposed exploration right might affect not only the land they own but also their broader mining rights. Therefore, she felt it would be premature to consider granting site access for baseline studies before Harmony has had the opportunity to provide their formal input on the scoping report.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite and Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>She elaborated referring to Table 39 of the Scoping Report, where it is acknowledged that the proposed drilling areas fall within Harmony Gold mining operations. She highlighted that the report itself notes a high risk of the drilling intersecting mine shafts or disrupting current mining activities. Based on this, the report classifies the cumulative impact on existing land use as medium high and negative without mitigation. She emphasised that this was the project team's own assessment within the report.</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

EIMS Ref

1681

Project Name

MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

Item No	Item
	<p>Mr Whitlow and Ms Mashamaite discussed the relationship between exploration activities and baseline specialist studies. They clarified that while the two may seem separate, baseline studies are not conducted in isolation, they are an integral part of the Environmental Authorisation (EA) application process. Mr Whitlow explained that the baseline assessments are necessary to inform the EA, much like needing access to land to conduct studies before proposing a tailings facility. He emphasised that these studies must be done first to feed into the EIA process, even though full project approval has not yet been granted.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite further explained that her concern lies in the timing and logic of the request for land access. She noted that the scoping report itself identifies the proposed exploration activities as posing a high risk to existing mining operations. Given that, she questioned whether it is reasonable to expect Harmony Gold to grant access for baseline environmental studies, particularly when those studies are meant to support an environmental application for activities that may negatively impact their operations. She highlighted the difficulty in justifying such access internally when the exploration poses significant potential risks.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>He stated that granting access for baseline studies doesn't commit Harmony to approving the project. He questioned why access is being linked to project approval, noting Harmony can still say no later.</p>
e.	<p>Mr Vukosi Mabunda – Comment of clarification</p> <p>He emphasised that the scoping report outlines up to 11 potential drilling sites, but this does not mean all of them will be used. Drilling may only occur in one or a few of these areas.</p> <p>He explained that the current request is only to conduct baseline environmental assessments, not to drill. These studies are essential for identifying potential environmental impacts to inform the EIA.</p> <p>Access to land is crucial for these baseline studies, and without it, the entire process is delayed.</p> <p>Once final drilling locations are confirmed (based on smaller assessed footprints), there will still be further engagement with landowners required, such as Harmony Mine before any actual drilling occurs.</p> <p>Even if the baseline assessments are completed, it does not mean drilling is automatically approved. There are still additional steps, including confirming that the drilling will not interfere with existing infrastructure such as mine shafts.</p> <p>In summary, he indicated that, the current activities are non-invasive assessments to inform the EIA, and there will still be opportunities for input and objections before any final drilling decisions are made.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite – Response</p> <p>She acknowledged the points raised and emphasised that Harmony also requires assurance and clarity before moving forward. Referring to Mr John's earlier statement, she noted that Harmony does not want to make decisions that could lead to future issues. Although it may cause delays, the Harmony team needs sufficient time to ensure they are fully comfortable with the process. She concluded that this will be Harmony's final position on the matter for now.</p>

MINUTES OF MEETING

<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------

Item No	Item
f.	<p>Ms Mashamaite</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite sought clarity on a mitigation measure proposed in the scoping report. She referred specifically to EIMS's recommendation that Motuoane, as the mitigation manager, should finalise a formal written access agreement with Harmony before any drilling or exploration activities begin. She asked whether this requirement still stands.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow – Response</p> <p>He explained that the project is currently in the scoping phase, where potential issues and suitable mitigation measures are still being identified. The suggestion for a formal access agreement with Harmony was a preliminary recommendation.</p> <p>He highlighted that stakeholders are welcome to submit comments or alternative suggestions by 18 June, which will be considered and included in the final scoping report submitted to the relevant authority</p> <p>Once the scoping report is approved, the next phase will involve compiling a full EIA report and Environmental Management Programme (EMPr), where the final mitigation measures will be defined. He noted that the regulations require early-stage conceptual mitigation measures, with more detail to follow during the EIA phase</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite – Comment</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite confirmed that Harmony typically takes the opportunity to submit formal comments on scoping reports or draft Basic Assessment Reports (BARs) as part of their standard process.</p>
g.	<p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow highlighted two key issues. First, he noted the importance of receiving Harmony's comments on the exploration activities, which are needed to finalise the EIA and EMPr. Second, and more urgently, he raised the need for access to Harmony's property so specialists can complete baseline environmental studies. He mentioned that similar studies have already been completed for other affected landowners, and any further delays in access could hold up the overall process. He requested that Harmony consider this and provide comments on access as soon as possible.</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite</p> <p>Ms Mashamaite asked whether Harmony is legally obligated to grant access before 18 June, and if delaying access or finalising comments until that date would place Harmony in breach of any regulation or legislation.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow – Response</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow responded that the 18th of June is a deadline for input into the scoping report, but access arrangements can be agreed on either before or after this date. He emphasised the need for consent from the surface rights holder to conduct baseline studies, which are important for the EIA report and public review. While delays in access will extend the timeline, it is not currently on the critical path. The aim is to complete baseline studies by early August after the scoping report is finalized and submitted for agency decision.</p>

		MINUTES OF MEETING	
<i>EIMS Ref</i>	1681	<i>Project Name</i>	MOTUOANE ER386 EIA

Item No	Item
h.	<p>Mr Van Wyk</p> <p>Mr. Van Wyk confirmed that the key discussion was about reviewing the scoping report and providing comments by the deadline of the 18th. He emphasised the importance of carefully considering all identified risks in the report before granting consent to access the property. To avoid future legal or objection issues, consent will likely only be given after the 18th, once the risks have been fully assessed and feedback provided. He also noted the limited time left for review and asked if everyone, including Ashley, was aligned and covered on this plan.</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow - Response</p> <p>Mr Whitlow expressed his satisfaction with the discussion and thanked everyone for their time. He emphasized the importance of receiving input on the scoping report, especially from key landowners like Harmony, to ensure their concerns are properly understood and addressed.</p>
i.	<p>Mr Vukosi Mabunda, Mr John, Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>He enquired if Harmony was aware or came across an organisation by the name Concerned Group. Mr Liam Whitlow mentioned a recent unexpected objection letter from a new interest group (Concerned Women) in the area. He noted that this group claims to represent community interests, which adds a new dynamic to the discussions.</p>
j.	The discussion was concluded, and the meeting was adjourned.

APPENDICES

<p>1. Appendix 1 – Attendance Register</p> <p>Harmony Gold Mining Company:</p> <p>Mr John Van Wyk</p> <p>Ms Ashley Miller</p> <p>Ms Khazi Mashamaite</p> <p>Environmental Impact Management Services Pty Ltd</p> <p>Mr Liam Whitlow</p> <p>Mr Vukosi Mabunda</p>
