

MINUTES OF MEETING

CLIENT : Goldfields
PROJECT : Beatrix EMP Amendment
PROJECT No : J31417
PURPOSE : Discussion on the EMPr Amendment
PLACE : DMR – Welkom
DATE & TIME : 29 November 2012
MINUTE TAKER : Sanusha Govender

NAME	REPRESENTIN G	E-MAIL ADDRESS	DISTRIBUTION
PRESENT			
Hennie Pretorius (HP)	Goldfields	Hennie.pretorius@goldfields.co.za	1
Tshipiwa Makhokha (TM)	DMR	Tshifhiwa.makhokha@dmr.gov.za	1
Meshack Madau (MM)	DMR	Meshack.Mudau@dmr.gov.za	1
Sukie Paras (SP)	GIBB	sparas@gibb.co.za	1
Sanusha Govender (SG)	GIBB	sgovender@gibb.co.za	1
Patricia Makhuvele (PM)	DMR	Patricia.makhuvele@dmr.gov.za	1

Attendees at the meeting are required to take their own notes and act on these rather than await the arrival of the minutes. The minutes serve as a record of events at the meeting.

DESCRIPTION
ACTION DEADLINE
1. 1. INTRODUCTION

1. 1.1. Meshack Mudau (MM) commenced the meeting and introduced the Department of Mineral Affairs – Environment team. MM noted his appreciation that the proposed development would be presented to his team as this facilitates an expedient process, and eliminates confusion going forward.

1. 2. DMR REQUIREMENTS FOR THE EMPR UPDATE

1. 2.1. Sanusha Govender briefly described the proposed development, and presented the EMP to the DMR. Hennie Pretorius detailed the functioning of the proposed Co- generation Facility.

MM informed GIBB that there is a new template for the EMPR that may be required, and that 7 copies of the EMP must be submitted to the DMR.

SG noted that the EMPr was submitted with the Draft Basic Assessment Report as an appendix to that report. MM clarified the EMPr must be submitted as the main document with 7 copies in order for the department to review and make a decision with regard to the updated amended EMPr.

MM further advised that in review of the proposed development the updated EMPr should be reflected as an amendment not an addendum.

SP

Sukie Paras (SP) confirmed that the EMPr would be resubmitted to the DMR with 7 copies with the EMPr as the main report.

DESCRIPTION

ACTION DEADLINE

1. 3. **TIMEFRAMES**

- 1. 3.1. SG questioned whether the DMR would review and assess the EMPr prior to the Draft BAR being finalised.

MM noted that report BAR process would not affect the timeframe.

- 1. 3.2. MM noted the DMR would require 120 days to review and approve/reject the amended EMPr. The timeline would begin when the DMR receives the 7 copies of the amended EMPr for review.

- 3.3. SG noted that the proposed development was unfortunately delayed by 6 months by the Department of Environmental Affairs, and requested the DMR be cognisant of the urgency of this application.

MM stated that the DMR would take that into consideration however the 120 days would be the maximum time that would be taken. He further noted that the signatory approving the application sits in Welkom, therefore there is a possibility that the response from the DMR may be expedited.

1. 4. **WAY FORWARD**

- 1. 4.1. MM to confirm the EMPr format required by the DMR which needs to be submitted.

MM

- 1. 4.2. SP would resend 7 copies of the document to the DMR – Welkom

SP

- 1. 4.3. HP suggested that the DMR environment team should have a site visit at the mine to fully understand the proposed development. MM agreed to the team site visit. HP agreed to organise the visit.

HP