

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Emma Afrika

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Dit maak ons visse en spesies dood. Dit het n nadelig uitwerking op on seeplante. Ons sal ook nie ons strand kan geniet nie. Die visse kan wegtrek en dan kan ons honger kry want ons lewe uit die see uit. Die gasse kan ons laat siek raak.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Kendyl Wright

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

We would like to state upfront that we are extremely concerned about the proposed exploration activities that pose a serious risk and threat to marine biodiversity and livelihoods of coastal communities on the coast of South Africa. Therefore, we do not support this kind of exploration activity at the proposed sites and recommend that this application not be supported. The applicant notes that the area has not been well studied and is ‘data deficient’, and together with the extreme depths (~3000m) at which the proposed drilling is planned to occur surpasses the risk to the environment, marine resources, and ecosystem services that the people of South Africa rely upon. ENVIRONMENTAL & ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS Having reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR) and its associated information, our opinion is that this proposal has fatal flaws, in that the survey area is directly adjacent to the Orange Shelf Edge MPA, Child’s Bank MPA and Benguela Muds MPA. Furthermore, it was identified that there is overlap and expected impact on the large pelagic longlining fishery, whilst also putting migrating turtles, resident and migrating cetaceans, and seabird populations at risk. In our opinion as detailed below, the proposed mitigation measures do not adequately mitigate the risk of probable impacts on critically endangered species in nearby marine protected areas and marine ecosystems from accidental, operational, and unplanned oil spills and the associated seismic survey activity that is done before the exploration phase. The reasons outlined below are a strong indication that the proposed oil and gas exploration poses an unacceptable risk, from seismic survey activities and possible oil spills to the nearby MPAs surrounding the area of interest (AOI), to threatened ecosystems and species, and to the livelihoods of communities. WILDTTRUST is of the view that the Environmental Authorisation should not be issued. FISHERIES The Pelagic Longlining fisheries are expected to be impacted by the proposed exploration activities during all phases of the project. The following impacts on fisheries are identified: 1. Temporary safety zone around the drilling unit 2. Permanent exclusion around abandoned wellhead(s) 3. Release of drill cuttings into the marine environment 4. Noise emissions during drilling 5. Noise emissions during

Response

Comment noted. The potential impact on the marine biodiversity and the coastal communities both during planned and unplanned events have been identified and assessed in the EIA. The EIAR cites the relevant available information sources that informed the studies. A detailed assessment of the risks and impacts associated with the receiving environment, with due consideration of the best available information, the assumptions and limitations, and the residual risks associated with the proposed project has been provided in the EIAR and associated specialist studies. Section 8 of the EIAR presents the location of the planned operations and AOI in relation to the MPA’s and other sensitive areas. Section 9.3 of the EIAR presents and assesses the identified potential impacts during both planned and unplanned events. Section 3.3 of the EIAR describes the planned activities. It is noted that whilst site specific vertical seismic profiling is intended to take place, there is no intention to implement a broader 2D or 3D regional seismic survey. A broader 2D or 3D regional seismic survey is not permissible under the current Exploration Right or EIA. Section 9.3.2 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impact on the fisheries from planned and unplanned events including the pelagic longline fisheries. With reference to Section 9.3.2.1.1 of the EIAR, the fishing exclusion area is only for the duration of drilling activities immediately around the drilling rig. Section 9.3.1 of the EIA identifies and assesses the potential impact of planned and unplanned discharges on the surrounding sensitive receptors. The extent and potential impacts associated with a blowout are currently being revisited and supplemented. The findings of this assessment together with updated impact assessments (where relevant) will be made available to the I&APs prior to final submission to the Competent Authority for decision making. The EIAR cites the relevant available information sources that informed the studies. A detailed assessment of the risks and impacts associated with the receiving environment, with due consideration of the best available information, the assumptions and limitations, and the residual risks associated with the proposed project has been provided in the EIAR and associated specialist studies. Regarding the comment on drilling impacts to sensitive habitats, an environmental baseline survey is usually undertaken prior to

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Kendyl Wright

Vertical Seismic Profiling 6. Noise emissions during sonar surveys. While the potential impacts of unplanned (accidental) events were identified as: 1. Low-volume release of diesel or hydraulic fuel from vessels or drilling unit. 2. Large-scale, uncontrolled blow-out of hydrocarbons at the well due to a failure of pressure control systems. 3. Loss of equipment to sea. MARINE PROTECTED AREAS (MPAs) AND ECOLOGICALLY AND BIOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS (EBSAs) The MPAs in South Africa form a network that covers 5.4% of the EEZ around South Africa. These areas are recognised and have documented special features, including representative, unique and sensitive ecosystems, their importance for providing sanctuaries for threatened species and their essential habitats, and their role in supporting rebuilding populations of over-exploited fish species. Eight MPAs are at risk of impact from the exploratory drilling. There is a significant risk of pollution from minor operational leakages and spills, and although less likely there is a risk of a major oil spill if there is a blow-out that would cause catastrophic harm. The Orange Shelf Edge MPA, Child's Bank MPA, and Benguela Muds MPAs, are at higher risk and in the vicinity of the AOI, while the Namaqua National Park MPA, Rocher Pan MPA, West Coast National Park, Namaqua Fossil Forest MPA, and Cape Canyon MPA are still in proximity to the AOI, with perhaps a lower risk. There are also six Ecologically and Biologically Sensitive Areas (EBSAs) in the vicinity of the AOI, namely: the Childs Bank and Shelf Edge EBSA, Orange Cone transboundary EBSA, Orange Seamount and Canyon Complex EBSA, Namaqua Fossil Forest EBSA, Namaqua Coastal Area EBSA, and the Cape Canyon and Associated Islands EBSA. The principal objective of EBSAs is the identification of features of higher ecological value that may require enhanced conservation and management measures. Even though EBSAs currently carry no legal status, it is our opinion that drilling activities could have a detrimental impact on these areas, which would ultimately negate the purpose of these areas. An evaluation of each of these MPA's and EBSA's has been completed in the ESIA, and their sensitivities and critical ecosystem functions have been identified, however, given that the AOI does not overlap considerably with any of these areas, there is no concern acknowledged, it remains unclear why this would be the case given the oil spill and noise emission modelling shows impact in these areas, and that these areas could potentially be impacted by a blow-out, minor or operational spills. In addition, the worst case as outlined in Appendix 4.9 (Oil Spill Modelling Report) is based on a condensate-only spill potentially further underestimating the potential impacts. Further concern is raised about the impact of drilling on sensitive habitats. It is acknowledged in the DEIAR that much of the area is data deficient and it is unclear why the area was not surveyed as part of the EIA process to allow for the decision-makers to adequately assess risk. In addition, the assignment of a 1000 m exclusion zone around vulnerable habitats (e.g. hard grounds), species (e.g. cold corals, sponges) or sensitive structural features (e.g. rocky outcrops) (page 357) does not contextualise how this exclusion zone was determined. It also does not provide sufficient clarity on who the expert decision maker is on deciding whether a habitat is sufficiently vulnerable. It is our opinion that marine experts within the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) must be consulted in this regard and the

exploration well drilling once the location(s) of the well(s) have been finalised. This typically involves the collection of sediment and macrofauna samples, ROV footage or sledge camera to determine seabed type and mobile epifauna etc. The 1000m buffer around hardgrounds has become an accepted standard but is dependent on the depth of the well and the technical ability of the ROV to survey around the selected well site. In certain cases, and specifically deep water environments, the 1000m buffer is sometimes not achievable due to infrastructure/ equipment constraints. Should such footage reveal the presence of VMEs and hardgrounds consultation with experts from DFFE would be undertaken. Section 9.3.1 of the EIA identifies and assesses the potential impact of planned and unplanned discharges on the surrounding sensitive receptors. The basis for the statement that these impacts have been 'discounted' is not provided and no detail is provided on the specific records being referred to. Section 12.14 of the EMPr lists the specific management and mitigation measures applicable to waste management and discharges. With reference to Section 8.5 of the EIAR the proximity to sensitive areas is noted and consequently the defined AOI avoids overlap with any MPA's or EBSA's. The AOI lies well offshore in oceanic waters where the abundance of phytoplankton and ichthyoplankton is expected to be low. The risks of small operational spills is outlined in Section 9.3.1.3.3 of the EIAR, which identifies the toxic nature of diesel spills. Operational vessels typically run on marine gas oil (MGO – which is similar to diesel fuel, but has a higher density) or Very Low Sulfur Fuel Oil (VLSFO) following the new legislated MARPOL fuel standard that came into effect in 2020, which requires sulphur content to be a maximum of 0.5%. The use of Heavy Fuel Oil has therefore become much reduced. The Brussard et al. (2016) paper deals with spills of crude oil from tankers and is therefore not applicable to the current project where transfer of crude will not take place. Should offshore ship-to-ship transfers of fuel be necessary, this would most likely involve VLSFO. It is recognised that VLSFO is highly toxic and would negatively affect any marine fauna it comes into contact with. This has been outlined in the relevant sections of the specialist report. Section 9.3 and 9.4 of the EIAR identify and assess the potential impacts and cumulative impacts respectively, on the marine ecology from planned and unplanned events. It is unclear from the comment on what basis and to what extent the magnitude, responsibility and costs involved in managing these protected species and habitats should be considered in this project specific EIA. Section 3.3 of the EIAR describes the planned activities. It is noted that whilst localised vertical seismic profiling is intended to take place, there is no intention to implement a broader 2D or 3D regional seismic survey. The drilling operations will not drill all 5 wells at the same time. The operator will drill one well and if that proves promising they may return to drill more. The assessment methodology used in the ESIA by its nature already considers past and current activities and impacts. In particular, when rating the sensitivity of the receptors, the status of the receiving environment (benthic ecosystem threat status, protection level, protected areas, etc.) or threat status of individual species is taken into consideration, which is based to some degree on past and current actions and impacts (e.g. the IUCN conservation rating is determined based on criteria such as population size and rate of decline, area of geographic range / distribution,

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Kendyl Wright

findings made available to all interested and affected parties prior to exploration drilling. **IMPACT FROM OPERATIONAL AND MORE MINOR SPILLS** It is our opinion that the significance and impacts of daily/weekly/monthly operational spills caused by routine activities such as pipe couplings and un-couplings, have been discounted and inadequately quantified despite records available about this at other sites around the world. Minor spills and their frequency are significant in terms of assessing the impact of biodiversity within areas of significance such as Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Ecologically and Biologically Sensitive Areas (EBSAs) where marine fauna and flora are concentrated and extremely vulnerable to oiling. Literature that provides evidence about the impact of small spills has not been adequately considered in the specialist reports. For example, Brussard et al. (2016) recorded immediate ecotoxicological effects of short-lived oil spills on marine biota including a decline in certain plankton species, and concluded that recurrent small spills are likely to affect marine ecosystem functioning. This is of particular concern for the threatened and endangered species, and within an area that supports concentrations of both plankton and other fauna (fish, birds, cetaceans) up the food chain which are a key feature within this area. Since operational and other minor spills will not invoke the deployment of vessels or an aircraft to attempt to mitigate impacts, there is a high probability of sporadic but frequent oil occurrences in the coastal areas indicated as the highest risk in both oil spill reports. **SPECIES CONCERNS** The various species lists within the DEIAR, naming over 200 species is evidence of the massive number of species that noise emissions, large unplanned spills, minor spills, and operational spills can severely affect and impact. Further to this South Africa has over 30% species endemism, while many of our species are under severe threat of extinction and are protected from exploitation due to their vulnerability. The magnitude, responsibility and costs involved in managing these protected species and habitats by the DFFE are not being accounted for. **Cetaceans** The schedule for seismic surveys and well exploration is not yet confirmed, however, the earliest anticipated date for commencement of drilling is the third quarter of 2024 (Q3, 2024) and is expected to take approximately 90 days per well. Therefore, the time frame of this project is expected to be about 15 months (start around July 2024 – September 2025), should a total of five exploratory wells be drilled. Our concern is that this period overlaps with the peak in numbers of the southern right whales on the West Coast (Table Bay to St Helena Bay) between February and April of 2025 – page 343. The ESIA highlights cetacean occurrences and likely encounters of various species, all of which are protected in South African waters, within the AOI. Cetacean species from both continental shelf and deep oceanic environments may be found on the continental slope between 200 – 2 000 m, making this a species-rich area for cetaceans and relatively high in density. The cumulative impacts of noise, operational spills, and other disturbances on cetaceans will likely have implications for various species. A major concern is with the increased offshore anthropogenic activities, including offshore mining, which is likely to generate additional energy costs for migrating humpback whale populations (Braithwaite et al 2015 and southern right whales. Therefore, energy related to reproduction would be

and degree of population and distribution fragmentation). Thus, past and existing offshore activities (including shipping, prospecting, mining, exploration, production, commercial fishing, etc.) have been taken into account in the assessment of potential impacts related to the proposed project. Your comment relating to the presence of olive ridley and hawksbill species in the area is specifically noted. Please can you provide relevant references in respect of these species so that the team can consider this further. During VSP standard internationally accepted protocols are followed. The additional literature provided in this comment will be considered and where applicable the report updated. It is important to note that the exploration activities and many of the associated impacts are of a localised extent and short duration. Thank you for your comment. The following mitigation measure has been included as a recommendation of the EIAR and a requirement in the EMPr: “The OSCP and BOCP must include an oiled wildlife contingency plan or any wildlife response strategy developed in consultation with specialist wildlife response organisations (e.g. SANCCOB). Such plan must consider and align with international best practice, including the IPIECA Wildlife Response Preparedness Guidelines.”. The OSCP must also be approved by PASA / DFFE and SAMSA before drilling can commence. Section 3.3 of the EIAR describes the planned activities. It is noted that whilst localised vertical seismic profiling is intended to take place, there is no intention to implement a broader 2D or 3D regional seismic survey. Section 9.3.1.2.6 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with the various underwater noise sources. Section 9.4.1.2 of the EIAR assesses the potential cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are considered in the acoustic modelling study and dealt with in the EIAR and Marine Ecology Specialist Study . Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential environmental impacts in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA and its associated regulations. In all instances a precautionary approach has been taken as required by law, with due consideration to the limits of current knowledge and the potential consequences. The level of confidence in the assessment of each impact has also been stipulated. The application of the precautionary principle (in terms of a risk-averse approach) is triggered by two conditions namely: a threat of serious or irreversible environmental damage; and scientific uncertainty as to the nature and scope of the threat of environmental damage. Ultimately the competent authority will determine whether these conditions are triggered. This is in line with WWF v Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. It is also important to note that the aversion of all risks alone is not the only criteria for EAs, and the competent authority has been mandated to make decisions based on the principles of sustainable development and not in isolation of singular potential impacts. As such, the EIA has complied with the requirements set forth in the applicable legislation, regulations and guidelines, such that an informed decision can be made by the competent authority. The proposed exploration activities are not extractive but rather exploratory and are not likely to result in economic dependencies within the local communities. In the event that production (extraction) proceeds within the Block there will be new and separate studies to identify and assess all related environmental (including socio-economic) impacts through a separate environmental impact assessment process. This will

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Mr Kendyl Wright

jeopardized because the energy demand would be funnelled into other related survival activities such as having to travel greater distances to avoid an area and changing swimming speeds. While local disturbances to behaviour may be minor, the costs of repeated disruptions may accumulate over a long journey (such as migration) and thus collectively have a major impact on the energy stores of the whales. Given the historical anthropogenic pressure (whaling) on the humpback and southern right whale populations, it is a concern that exploration will be occurring in their migration channels, thus disturbing, and changing the behaviour of the population, at an unknown cost. Turtles Three species of turtle occur along the West Coast, with the leatherback being the most likely to be encountered in the offshore waters of west South Africa. It is our opinion that Marine Mammal Observers (MMOs) as a mitigation measure is inadequate, as would only occur on a “good” sighting day (Beaufort 0-1), which are seldom within this region. The ESIA notes that “Satellite tagging of loggerheads suggests that they seldom occur west of Cape Agulhas (Harris et al. 2018; Robinson et al. 2018). A sighting of a loggerhead turtle in the Deep Water Orange Basin Area has, however, been reported by an MMO (CapFish 2013). In our opinion, evidence of a single loggerhead turtle is not necessarily an indication of low numbers because visually recording turtles by an MMO is extremely difficult. Observations of turtles at the surface are unreliable in sea states above Beaufort 1 and detection rates decrease with increased distance from the vessel. Additionally, it is currently not possible to detect turtles below the surface where they might be most vulnerable to both noise emissions and other infrastructure (Weir, 2007). Detection of turtles relies on human effort (diligence, skills, and concentration), which is subjective and inevitably varies among MMOs, many of whom have little previous experience in detecting and identifying turtles at sea (Nelms, et al., 2016). Furthermore, there is no way of detecting turtles at night or in poor weather conditions. Turtle dive times can also be long, further limiting sightings, especially in the case of leatherbacks. It is our opinion that MMO’s are not an appropriate mitigation method to reduce risk to turtles. “The Benguela ecosystem, especially the northern Benguela where jellyfish numbers are high, is increasingly being recognized as a potentially important feeding area for leatherback turtles from several globally significant nesting populations in the south Atlantic (Gabon, Brazil) and southeast Indian Ocean (South Africa) (Lambardi et al. 2008, Elwen & Leeney 2011; SASTN 2011). Both green turtles and loggerhead turtles are known to be found feeding on inshore reefs on the south and east coasts and are expected to only occur as occasional visitors along the west coast. In the open sea their diet includes jellyfish, flying fish, and squid ([www.oceansafrica.com/turtles.htm](http://www.oceansafrica.com/turtles.htm)), while satellite tagging of loggerheads suggests that they seldom occur west of Cape Agulhas (Harris et al. 2018; Robinson et al. 2019). However, more recent data suggests otherwise. Satellite-tracked turtle data of captive turtles (various species) released from Two Oceans and uShaka aquariums shows the St Helena Bay to approximately Groen River mouth area are popular turtle areas, both inshore and offshore (to ~200 km), suggesting this as a refuge or preferred feeding area. In addition to the presence of loggerhead and green turtles, evidence suggests that olive ridley

include comprehensive stakeholder consultations and will require approval by the Competent Authority. It is therefore our view that the proposed exploration project is not dependant on the results of a comprehensive evaluation of diversification strategies. This application only pertains to exploratory drilling, which is a short term process. It is estimated that no more than 5 wells will be drilled over a period of 3-4 months per well. As such and given the distance that the activity will be from shore, it is not estimated that there will be an influx of people or changes in land use at the exploration phase. Should the exploration phase find oil and gas deposits, and a company decides to apply for a production right, it will be subjected to a new EIA process. Potential social impacts of any possible future production phase will be identified and mitigated during the Production Right EIA process and will include an influx management strategy. A detailed cultural heritage assessment has been conducted focussing on the first nations, but it must also be considered that the West Coast communities are not homogenous, and that there has been a significant influx of people into the area already. There has been significant consultation with the different West Coast communities to ensure that they understand where in the process the current application fits in, and what they think the impact will be on them. Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR provides a description of the stakeholder engagement process. This includes written engagements as well as direct virtual and face to face engagements. Illiteracy and lack of access to technology have been considered and accounted for in the engagement process. It is noted that the project involves exploration only and not production (or extraction). The initial Oil Spill Drift Modelling Technical Report modelled the impact and response of a condensate hydrocarbon spill. The modelling results from this report were used to inform subsequent economic information and considerations. Given the condensate nature of the spill (assessed in the initial oil spill drift model), coupled with its temporary nature and considerable distance from onshore communities, the financial burden on communities in the form of increased insurance premiums was considered to be negligible, if any, because there are no communities in the immediate vicinity of the oil spill area of impact. The potential of such a spill occurring accompanied by the type of spill and temporary nature of the spill negate financial repercussions generally associated with crude oil spills and onshore spill effects. Furthermore, the condensate and temporary nature of the modelled spill, limits the potential health risks that such a spill could possibly have on communities and oil spill recovery workers. The oil spill scenarios modelled indicated no condensate or related matter could reach the shoreline and that deterministic modelling shows that almost no oil will be present on the surface of the ocean because of evaporation. Therefore, in an onshore environment health related issues such as respiratory problems, skin issues, and related health concerns will not emerge for communities or oil spill recovery workers and consequently will not contribute to an added burden on local healthcare resources. Additionally, the oil spill drift model report advises that a capping only response would be most effective in such a scenario because of the dispersed nature of the release, therefore limiting the need for additional oil spill recovery workers. Oil spill recovery workers addressing capping processes are trained specialists that are duly compensated and

Mr Kendyl Wright

and hawksbill species have migrated to these areas as well, sometimes taking temporary residence, before moving up or down the coast. New technology is showing us that we know so little about our marine species and the marine environment, especially in these areas where little to no sampling has been undertaken. This should be kept top of mind when the implications for noise disturbance and oil spill threats in this environment are considered. New research has confirmed our concern for the presence of sea turtles including locally endangered loggerheads (*Caretta caretta*) and critically endangered leatherbacks (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the AOI throughout the year (explained below). Nesting of both leatherback and loggerhead turtles occurs between October and March, with a peak from December to January (Table 1; Nel et al. 2013; Le Gouvello et al. 2020). This is followed by hatching between January and March when hatchlings enter the ocean (Table 1; Nel et al. 2013; Le Gouvello et al. 2020). Tracking of these post-hatchling sea turtles poses significant challenges due to their elevated mortality rates, small size, and rapid growth, complicating the attachment of tracking devices, resulting in what is termed the “lost years”- where it is unclear where sea turtles <10 years occur before returning to their shallow water foraging grounds (Musick and Limpus 1997). Further challenges to tracking these post-hatchling sea turtles include their movement from the coast into the pelagic-offshore environment and difficulty in visually spotting them due to their small size (Musick and Limpus 1997). However, a recent scientific investigation by Le Gouvello et al. (2024) employed modelling techniques to examine the trajectory of neonate turtles (><1 year) from hatching to one year using high-resolution ocean models in conjunction with particle tracking simulations. Juvenile turtles, both loggerhead and leatherback, leaving the iSimangaliso Marine Protected Area and Ponta do Ouro take approximately 200-365 days to reach the AOI (Fig. 1; Le Gouvello et al. 2024). This means that due to the annual introduction of new hatchlings between January and March, and the time taken for these turtles to reach the AOI, there is a very high likelihood that juvenile sea turtles will occur throughout the year (Table 1). Their presence coupled with an inability to mitigate the risk of seismic surveys means that juvenile sea turtles are at significant risk of harm. Furthermore, unpublished satellite tracking data of stranded, rehabilitated and released sea turtles of larger sizes (juvenile to sub-adult) and other species (including green turtles and hawksbills) confirms their presence in the AOI year-round (Fig. 2; Two Oceans Aquarium Foundation unpublished data). Table 1. Coloured blocks showing the presence of sea turtles on southern African nesting beaches and in the area of interest (AOI) throughout the year based on local literature. Fig. 1. Dispersal maps showing one-year long trajectories of 5000 particles released from the respective nesting sites (white circles) in 2017 (-i) and 2018 (-ii), (q-r) loggerheads, 2 rookeries; and (s-t) leatherbacks, 2 rookeries. Colours (blue to red) indicate the number of days since release, and grey text gives the month of release. Fig. 2. Satellite tracks of three stranded, rehabilitated and released sea turtles (immature green turtles and loggerheads) in the AOI. Given that many of our marine species, including all cetaceans and turtles are protected and/or regarded as threatened (critically endangered, endangered, or vulnerable), while also being a signatory of the

aware of risk. The extent and potential impacts associated with a blowout is currently being revisited and supplemented. The findings of this assessment together with updated impact assessments (where relevant) will be made available to the I&APs prior to final submission to the Competent Authority for decision making. Should there be a shoreline or near shore impact from an oil spill the potential impacts will be identified and assessed. The EIAR has identified and assessed the potential impact of the activities on other sectors within the area of influence. The majority of these can continue operating in tandem with the proposed exploration activities.



Mr Kendyl Wright

Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the resolution passed at the 67th International Whaling Commission (IWC) to conserve these species at an international level, it is unclear how South Africa can continue to fulfill their duties and obligations when this application will create significant disturbance for an extended period for these protected and threatened species.

**LACK OF OILED WILDLIFE RESPONSE PLAN** Although the DEIAR mentioned that species will be managed in the event of an oil spill, and even goes on to mention some role-players and entities, there is no Response Plan in place. This plan should be in place, drafted by all role players, with input from various stakeholders and being aware that they are expected to participate in the event of a spill.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS** There is an assumption that marine animals will adapt to the noise and behave accordingly during the seismic surveys and exploratory drilling phases based on the AOI being in a high vessel traffic area. However, this is not a credible comparison of noise impact because vessel traffic noise is not isotropic (i.e., it varies in different directions) (Erbe et al., 2019), whereas with subsurface surveys, a particular frequency is used at consistent intervals and the intensity and magnitude of exposure to marine animals are far greater than that to vessel traffic. In Environmental Assessments such as these, it is required that cumulative impacts, from all sound sources are adequately dealt with and investigated, including the additional impact that the proposed exploratory drilling surveys will add to the ‘already noisy soundscape’.

**PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH** Furthermore, it is our opinion that a precautionary approach should be applied, i.e., not to issue an Environmental Authorisation based on the DEIAR given the risk of oil pollution, need for further biological studies and the lack of effective mitigation measures, especially for noise emissions, that properly prevent harm to species and ecosystems, including many threatened and protected species.

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONCERNS**

**Dependency on the Extractive Industry** The absence of evidence in the report regarding assessments exploring strategies for economic diversification raises concerns about the resilience of communities overly dependent on the oil and gas sector. Without proactive measures to diversify their economies, these communities remain highly vulnerable to economic downturns. A comprehensive evaluation of potential diversification strategies is crucial to foster resilience, mitigate risks, and ensure sustainable development beyond the confines of a single industry. The report should urgently address this critical aspect to provide a well-rounded and robust framework for the economic stability of these communities.

**Social Cohesion and Cultural Disruption** The absence of an assessment regarding the impacts of extractive activities on local cultures and traditional ways of life is a critical oversight in the current evaluation. The influx of a transient workforce, coupled with changes in land use and community dynamics, poses a substantial risk to the preservation of cultural heritage. Without addressing this issue, the assessment fails to capture the potential social tensions and conflicts that may arise, neglecting the intricate connection between community identity and sustainable development. It is imperative to incorporate a thorough examination of the cultural dimensions to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the social implications of extractive projects.

**Community Engagement and Consultation - Meaningful Participation**

Mr Kendyl Wright

The assessment report lacks substantial evidence on how affected communities, particularly those with a significant number of illiterate individuals, have been adequately consulted and provided meaningful opportunities to participate in decision-making processes related to the extraction project. It is imperative to recognise that illiteracy and lack of access to technological advances can pose a significant barrier to accessing information through conventional channels such as emails or participating in virtual meetings via platforms like Zoom. **Property Values** The report fails to address a critical aspect of the potential consequences of oil spills or blow-outs: the adverse impact on property values by assuming the deposit is gas condensate and underestimating potential impacts. Properties in areas directly vulnerable to such incidents may experience a decline in value due to heightened concerns about environmental damage and associated health risks. This oversight in the report neglects the significant financial losses property owners may face, posing a substantial threat to the stability of the local real estate market. **Insurance Costs** The assessment notably overlooks the potential financial repercussions for businesses and individuals in oil spill-prone areas. The heightened risk of spills could result in increased insurance premiums or, in extreme cases, challenges in securing coverage. Such consequences pose a considerable financial burden on local businesses and property owners, necessitating a comprehensive examination of the economic implications associated with the environmental risks presented in the assessment. Addressing this oversight is crucial for a more accurate understanding of the full spectrum of challenges faced by communities in oil spill-prone regions. **Healthcare Costs** The assessment lacks crucial evidence addressing the potential health implications of exposure to oil and its byproducts in affected communities, including oil spill recovery workers. Respiratory problems, skin issues, and other health concerns may emerge, placing an added burden on local healthcare resources. Without comprehensive acknowledgement of these health risks, there is a notable gap in understanding the true societal costs associated with extraction activities. The absence of this critical information undermines the assessment's ability to provide a holistic understanding of the impacts and underscores the need for a thorough examination of health-related consequences in future evaluations.

CONCLUSION

Oil and gas development activities represent significant risks for other sectors that require and benefit from functional marine ecosystems. These other sectors (fisheries, tourism, etc) simply cannot function without a healthy environment, while oil and gas can continue to profit from their activities regardless of the consequences to health of the marine environment. Of particular concern, is that the offshore oil and gas sector has already leased >90% of the EEZ for exploration.

For the reasons outlined above, it is our opinion is that the proposed oil and gas exploration poses an unacceptable pollution, ecological and socio-economic risk to South Africans. A major spill cannot be discounted as a low risk (in exploration or production), and smaller operational spills carry a high probability, with no effective mitigation mechanisms identified given the

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Kendyl Wright

location and the rate of movement of the oil slicks. Therefore, it is our view that the DEIAR does not provide a basis to issue an Environmental Authorisation.

Mr Martin Treadaway

Date 2023/09/19 Method Email

Comment

I wish to register as an interested party to the above Opportunity to participate in the application. I live in Shelley Point estate on the West Coast Peninsula adjacent to the proposed prospecting zone.

Response

Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been recorded and you have now been registered as an I&AP for this project.

Mr Dawid Markus

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A 1. Greetings. Herewith the objection on the proposed plans to drill within the blocks 3B/4B. B 2. The drilling will inevitably have a negative impact on the marine ecosystem, killing wildlife and soiling the coastline C 3. Oil contains high levels of toxic chemicals, including mercury, which can have dangerous effects on humans that come into contact or ingest oil. 4. People who eat seafood can also be exposed to traces of toxic chemicals, and swimming in beaches with high levels of oil poses a threat to human health 5. Oil spill-cleanup workers, for example, suffer from damaged immune, respiratory and cardiac functions and carry high levels of toxicity that have long-term consequences. D 6. COASTAL ECONOMIES 6.1. The destruction caused by oil spills affects the economic activities of locals, especially in the Global South. Fishermen in these regions lose income for several years after oil spills as marine ecosystems can take decades to recover. 6.2. In 2022, for example, 2,500 fishermen in Peru had their livelihoods ruined by a large crude-oil spill by Repsol, a Spanish refinery, and now find themselves without a source of income. 6.3. Similarly, the Dutch multinational Shell was recently ordered to pay \$15 million to compensate farmers in Nigeria after several oil spills destroyed their livelihoods between 2004 and 2007. E 7. HISTORICALLY LARGE OIL SPILLS 7.1. THE PERSIAN GULF OIL SPILL On 19 January, 1991, up to 2 billion litres of oil were purposefully spilled off the Arabian Gulf of Kuwait, spreading in a 10 centimetre thick layer over 10,000 square kilometres. 7.2. The Persian Gulf spill killed up to 90 percent of the fauna in the area, as well as 100,000 birds and destroyed the important mangrove forests on the coast of Kuwait. 7.3. THE BP OIL SPILL The infamous Deepwater Horizon Spill of 2010, in which an oil rig owned by British Petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico blew out, caused a major explosion that killed 11 people. Over the course of 85

Response

A Your comment/objection has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report. Please refer to the responses listed below. B Comment noted. The potential negative impacts have been identified as requiring further assessment in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase and will be the subject of Marine Ecological Impact Assessment. The results of this study will be included in the EIA Report and made available to the public for review and comment. C Comment noted. The toxicity of a potential oil spill has been proposed to be assessed as part of the marine ecological impact assessment. D Comment noted. The potential negative impacts have been identified as requiring further assessment in the EIA Phase and will be the subject of the following studies: • Marine Ecological Impact Assessment; • Fisheries Impact Assessment; • Economic Impact Assessment; • Social Impact Assessment; and • Oil Spill Modelling Study. The results of these studies will be included in the EIA Report and made available to the public for review and comment. E The potential for a well-blowout is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. In assessing the impacts associated with an oil spill, past oil spill events and other similar case studies will be considered to inform the magnitude and residual impacts associated with a potential future event. We thank you for



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Dawid Markus

days, 9.5 million litres of oil spilled daily, spreading a total of 775 million litres of oil which devastated the coastal environment. 7.3. Up to 50 percent of coral species in the area were found to have been damaged and experience population decline; between 600,000 and 800,000 seabirds were killed; and hundreds of dead dolphins washed ashore. 7.4. Coastal communities that survived off of fishing and recreational activities lost billions of dollars in revenue as marine life perished and coasts became unswimmable. 7.5. Though BP was forced to pay over \$144 billion in settlement fees, some of the damage done to the environment is irreparable. 7.6. The question that must be asked is it worth to be irresponsible towards the environment or must greed take center stange? 7.7. . EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL In March 1989, a large oil tanker off the coast of Alaska, United States, hit a coral reef, rupturing several cargo tanks and spilling 11 million gallons (41 million litres) of crude oil into the Gulf of Alaska. The outcome was catastrophic: the oil killed billions of salmon and herring eggs, 2,800 sea otters and about 250,000 seabirds. 7.8. Based on the above it is evident that the proposed plans to drill can do more harm than good. Prevention is Better than cure. F 8. MODUS OPERANDI The way the companies are doing things is a divide and concur approach by for example building a vegetable garden and handing out a school bag to get get cheap publicity. G 9. CAPACITY History has taught us that it is negative to drill the ocean and that the government don't have capacity to prevent a oil spill disaster.

bringing these specific cases to our attention. F Comment noted. Consideration of the social impacts and community perceptions will be assessed as part of the Social Impact Assessment proposed for the EIA Phase. G The negative impacts associated with the proposed exploration activities have been identified and included in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report for further assessment in the EIA Phase. A detailed assessment of the risks and impacts associated with the receiving environment, with due consideration of the available information, applicable legislation and policies, the assumptions and limitations, and the residual risks associated with the proposed project will be detailed in the various specialist studies as provided for in the Plan of Study for EIA.

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A. Greetings. I am staying in HondeklipBay. I do not support this application for an environmental authorization to explore for oil and gas on the West Coast. B. I respectfully request the DMRE to deny this application as it will be detrimental to the marine ecosystem as well as the livelihoods of the fishing communities.

Response

A. Greetings. I am staying in HondeklipBay. I do not support this application for an environmental authorization to explore for oil and gas on the West Coast. B. I respectfully request the DMRE to deny this application as it will be detrimental to the marine ecosystem as well as the livelihoods of the fishing communities.

Mr

Date 2024/01/15 Method Email

Comment

Offshore leak oil spill impacts marine mammals and impacts marine ecosystem. Gas flaring causes more pollution and causes climate change. Climate change more drought and heat wave [https://www.google.com/url?sa=i&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.greenmatters.com%2Fp%2Foffshore-drilling-affect-marine-life&psig=AOvVaw0FgtDOng4N3j587Rexln5C&ust=1705356501538000&source=images&cd=vfe&opi=89978449&ved=0CBMQjhqxqFwoTCJiR4p\\_y3YMDFQAAAAAdAAAAABAD](https://www.google.com/url?sa=i&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.greenmatters.com%2Fp%2Foffshore-drilling-affect-marine-life&psig=AOvVaw0FgtDOng4N3j587Rexln5C&ust=1705356501538000&source=images&cd=vfe&opi=89978449&ved=0CBMQjhqxqFwoTCJiR4p_y3YMDFQAAAAAdAAAAABAD)

Response

Apologies for the delay in response to your comments. This e-mail serves to acknowledge your comments and inform you that your details have been saved in our I&AP database. The delay in response was also due to changes to the EIA which have now warranted further engagement with the public. Please find attached a notification invited all affected to further engagement opportunities in the form of public meetings. A revised version of the EIA Report will be available as of the 8 April 2024. Should you need any further information regarding these opportunities,

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr

<https://www.nationalobserver.com/2022/09/13/news/newfoundland-labrador-oil-exploration-plans-bad-news-marine-life> [https://www.google.com/url?sa=i&url=https%3A%2F%2Fenvironmentamerica.org%2Ftexas%2Farticles%2Fimpacts-of-oil-drilling-in-the-gulf-of-mexico%2F&psig=AOvVaw2-SANwQ8bzKfUimu\\_0tsL9&ust=1705357703316000&source=images&cd=vfe&opi=89978449&ved=OCBMQjhxqFwoTCLiGjN723YMDFQAAAAAdAAAAABAD](https://www.google.com/url?sa=i&url=https%3A%2F%2Fenvironmentamerica.org%2Ftexas%2Farticles%2Fimpacts-of-oil-drilling-in-the-gulf-of-mexico%2F&psig=AOvVaw2-SANwQ8bzKfUimu_0tsL9&ust=1705357703316000&source=images&cd=vfe&opi=89978449&ved=OCBMQjhxqFwoTCLiGjN723YMDFQAAAAAdAAAAABAD) <https://www.wwno.org/2021-11-05/the-oil-and-gas-industry-is-pushing-misinformation-about-its-impact-on-climate-coastal-restoration-louisiana-politicians-are-repeating-it>

please feel free to contact us.

Ms Shadine Cloete

Date 2024/01/11 Method Other

Comment

Letter received from Namakhoi Local Municipality: "Trust that all is well. Please find the attached document."

Response

Receipt of email and attached letter acknowledged.

Anthony Andrews

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A We are the West coast Guriqua Council, representing the forgotten Guriqua |SAN Bloodline Families in the west coast of South Africa. We are of the traditional fishing communities staying for centuries along the West Coast and our main source of survival as we know it for centuries now is the sea. B The Ocean and coastal living are the only dependable source of income and food supply for the indigenous communities for centuries, that's the only way of life to us, and it form an integral part of our cultural traditions. Our communities are subsisting on fishing and other marine resources to supplement our livelihoods. C When oil spills in the ocean, it floats on the water and wreaks havoc on the animal population. One of its most devastating effects is on birds. Oil destroys the waterproofing abilities of feathers, and birds are not insulated against the cold ocean water. Thousands can die of hypothermia. Fish and marine mammals, too, are threatened by oil spills. The dark shadows cast by oil spills can look like food. Oil can damage animals' internal organs and be even more toxic to animals higher up in the food chain. The area identified is a sensitive fishing area, the protection area of fish and other species is in this area and it can't be overlooked that two marine protected areas is in close proximity and that the block overlaps with CBA 1 and 2, no consideration whatsoever for drilling can be done within the ecological support area, for the protection of our fish moving that line especially the

Response

A Comment noted. The West Coast Guriqua San Council has been registered as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) for this project. B Comment noted. The EIA will include dedicated specialist assessments to address the aspects relating to fisheries, social, economic and cultural heritage. C Comment noted. Potential oil spills have been identified as an impact for further assessment in the EIA Phase. The EIA will include dedicated specialist assessments to address the aspects relating to oil spill modelling and this study will inform the remaining specialists of the potential impacts relating to their respective fields of study. The proximity of the proposed area of interest to sensitive areas and fishing grounds has been detailed in Section 6 of the scoping report and will be taken forward as an alternative for consideration in the EIA Phase..

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Anthony Andrews

snoek migration.

Dr Jean Harris

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

## Comment

A Thank you for the opportunity for WILDOCEANS, a programme of the WILDTRUST, to review and comment on the draft Scoping of the Proposed Africa Oil South Africa Corp (AOSAC) Block 3B/4B Exploration right. We would like to state upfront that we are extremely concerned about the proposed exploration activities that pose a serious risk and threat to marine biodiversity and livelihoods of coastal communities on the coast of South Africa and cannot support this kind of exploration activity at the proposed site and therefore recommend that this application not be supported. The applicant notes that the area has not been well studied and is ‘data deficient’. This together with the extreme depths at which the proposed drilling is to planned to occur (~3000m), makes the risk, to both the environment and to the marine resources and ecosystem services that the people of South Africa rely upon, exceedingly high. A number of specialist studies are expected to be completed and made available in the Scoping Report, i.e.: • Marine Ecological Impact Assessment [including but not limited to cetacean, endangered pelagic sharks and turtle species impacts] • Fisheries Impact Assessment • Acoustic Modelling • Cultural Heritage Assessment • Social Impact Assessment • Air Quality and Climate Change • Oil Spill and Drill Cuttings Modelling • Economic Impact Assessment However, the Environmental Screening Report identified additional specialist studies which are not to be included in the Scoping Report, but are pertinent to this application including: • Avian Impact Assessment • Noise Impact Assessment • Radioactivity Impact Assessment • Climate Impact Assessment In addition, we have identified the need for two further studies: • Needs and Desirability Study • Marine Ecological Impact Assessment must include the potential impacts to cetacean, endangered pelagic sharks and turtle species All studies listed above (but not limited to) are required to ensure the potential impacts of the proposed activity are adequately assessed by the Environmental Impact Assessment Report. B 1. South African context It is our opinion that the environmental and economic risks, from both short-term impacts from pre-survey and drilling activities such as operational spills, to long-term impacts such as a deepwater blowout, far outweigh the benefits to the South African population. The Scoping Report states that it is unlikely there will be significant job creation for local people, while the argument that oil or gas produced will favour South Africans by securing cost-effective energy is very misleading. The nature of this oil or gas field being extremely deep, (between 1000-3000m), far offshore, and no clear understanding of the quality of the oil or gas, it is likely that these reserves will be too costly to exploit. Furthermore, there are no guarantees that the

## Response

A Your concerns and recommendation has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report. Please refer to the responses listed below. A detailed assessment of the risks and impacts associated with the receiving environment, with due consideration of the available information, the assumptions and limitations, and the residual risks associated with the proposed project will be detailed in the various specialist studies as provided for in the Plan of Study for EIA. In terms of the environmental screening report, it is our understanding that the screening tool did not identify any specific sensitivities as would be expected and owing to the offshore location, the screening tool was a generic output from the DFFE and has consequently listed all types of specialists assessments, and not necessarily those that are applicable to the proposed project or the study area. Further detail will be provided in the EIA Report as to the rationale for inclusion/ exclusion of the specialist studies detailed in the Screening Tool. However, with regards to the specialist studies referred to in your submission, the following: • Avian Impact Assessment: Avifauna will be considered as part of the Marine Ecological Assessment. • Noise Impact Assessment: As detailed in the scoping report, an acoustic modelling assessment will be undertaken. The results of this study will then be utilised by the Marine Ecology and Fisheries Specialists as part of their studies in order to determine the significance of the impacts – see section 9.3 of the scoping report for preliminary noise related impacts identified. • Radioactivity Impact Assessment: The material safety data sheets (MSDS) for the substances utilised as part of the exploration drilling activities will be scrutinised and toxicity of the chemicals to be used as part of the proposed drilling operations will be assessed as part of the marine ecological impact assessment. The resources in question are not expected to be naturally radioactive. In the case that radioactive materials are encountered or utilised during exploration activities, volumes are expected to be low. Management of these activities would be undertaken as per the requirements of the relevant legislation and guidelines for the management of radioactive sources. • Climate Impact Assessment: A climate change assessment has been included in the Plan of Study for EIA and detailed in Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report. • Needs and Desirability Study: A needs and desirability analysis was undertaken in line with the “Guideline on need and desirability in terms of the EIA Regulations (Notice 819 of 2014)” and included in Section 5 of the Scoping Report. • Marine Ecological Impact Assessment: Will include the potential impacts to cetacean, endangered pelagic sharks and turtle species. B Please refer to the response provided

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jean Harris

oil or gas will remain within South Africa, and be made available to locals at a favourable rate. That aside, South Africa as a signatory of the Paris Climate Agreement has committed on the global stage to reduce Greenhouse gas emissions in an attempt to limit climate change. This has resulted in a domestic National Climate Change Response White Paper which further details South Africa's plans to shift away from fossil fuels. South Africa is required to thoroughly evaluate what the real need for oil and gas in the South African context, i.e. through the no-go option, as well as to assess and quantify the impacts the emissions released during the exploration phase will have going forward and in the context of South Africa's international obligations. Therefore, two pertinent studies are required: 1) a Needs and Desirability Study by an independent consultant, and 2) a Climate Impact Assessment, which takes into consideration South Africa's Nationally Determined Contributions, while planning to shift away from fossil fuels. C 2. Pre-drilling surveys It is our understanding that the project is for an Exploration Right including: 1) Pre-drilling surveys (sonar surveys, echo sounders, sub-bottom profilers, piston coring, and box coring), followed by 2) drilling. No reference has been made to undertaking new seismic activities throughout the draft Scoping Report, but it does note that reprocessing of existing seismic surveys which has been undertaken to identify areas of interest. It does however state that "[Sub-]Bottom profilers emit an acoustic pulse at frequencies ranging between 2 and 16 kHz, typically producing sound levels in the order of 200-230 db re 1µPa at 1m." From our understanding single channel, seismic reflection is referred to as Sub Bottom Profiling (SBP), thus the project proposal is misleading and includes seismic activities that are of a significant concern for the management of South African biodiversity. The volume of 200-230 db, exceeds 160 db where impacts on both behaviour and physiology occur. In addition, while the impact of sub-bottom profiling is identified in Table 39, including "disturbance/behavioural changes to marine fauna (cetaceans, turtles, etc); Physiological effects on marine fauna, Masking or interfering with other biologically important sounds", the impacts are not assessed in Table 40: Preliminary impact assessment. However, in the Environmental Authorisation Application form, under Section 9: Draft Environmental Management Programme, the "Displacement, injury and death of marine fauna" requires the need for Marine Mammal Observers (MMOs) and Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM), as well as to "Ensure exploration activities are scheduled during appropriate times" [of cetacean migrations] to mitigate risk to these animals, is included in the draft Scoping and EMP. The "appropriate times" are not reflected in the draft Scoping Report where it is stated that: "[Sonar] surveys would not be limited to a specific time of the year but would be of short duration (around 15 days or shorter per survey) and focused on selected areas of interest within the block". No additional time frames were given for sub-bottom profiling i.e. seismic surveys, and it is our opinion that seismic surveys pose serious risks to biodiversity and there are no significant ways for mitigating all the risks to the various species that occur in the area. There is limited information available for our deep-sea habitats. To fully understand the risks to the environment, the EIA process requires an applicant to understand and contextualise the

in #A above. The comment regarding the current uncertainty in respect of the nature and extent of potential oil or gas reserves is noted. It is the intention of the exploration activities to obtain a clearer understanding of the resource to inform future planning. This application relates to exploration phase only. C The operating frequencies of the single beam and multi-beam sonar falls into the high frequency kHz range, and is thus beyond the low frequency hearing ranges of fish species and sea turtles (from below 100 Hz to up to a few kHz). The high frequency active sonar sources, however, have energy profiles that clearly overlap with cetacean's hearing sensitivity frequency range, particularly for cetaceans of High Frequency and Very High Frequency hearing groups, and would be audible for considerable distances (in the order of tens of km) before attenuating to below threshold levels. However, the noise emissions from the MBES sources are highly directional, spreading as a fan from the sound source, predominantly in a cross-track direction. The noise impact would therefore be highly localised for the majority of marine mammal species. Only directly below or within the sonar beam would receive sound levels be in the range where exposure results in trauma or physiological injury. As most pelagic species likely to be encountered within the area of interest are highly mobile, they would be expected to flee and move away from the sound source before trauma could occur. Furthermore, the statistical probability of crossing a cetacean, pinniped or turtle with the narrow moving multi-beam fan several times, or even once, is very small. Unlike the noise generated by airguns during seismic surveys, the emission of underwater noise from geophysical surveying and vessel activity is therefore not considered to be of sufficient amplitude to cause auditory or non-auditory trauma in marine animals in the region. As surveys using single- and MBES sources have much lower noise emissions compared with seismic airgun sources, no specific considerations have been put in place in developing assessment criteria for MBES sources. Despite the low significance of impacts of geophysical sonars, the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) provides a list of guidelines to be followed by anyone planning marine sonar operations that could cause acoustic or physical disturbance to marine mammals. These have been revised to be more applicable to the southern African situation and are included as mitigation measures for the pre-drilling surveys. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include ROV surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. D The potential impact on the deep-sea habitats has been identified in the Scoping Report and will be assessed by the specialist in the EIA Phase. The potential acoustic impacts have been identified in the Scoping Report and will be assessed by the specialist in the EIA Phase.

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jean Harris

habitat they will be impacting. Therefore, a baseline study of the proposed area is required (not a desktop assessment) in order to identify sensitive habitats and species. This will ensure that the risks to species and ecosystems are fully understood. A key concern for deepwater habitats is that impacts may persist for many years as deep-sea ecosystems can be slow to recover (Williams et al. 2010; Vanreusel et al. 2016) thereby giving them a low resilience to anthropogenic activities (Schlacher et al. 2014; Clark et al. 2016). This is particularly relevant to sensitive habitats like cold-water corals (Cordes et al. 2016), and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VME's), which we know occur in this area, likely in higher numbers than identified in Figure 32 due to a lack of adequate data sets for the area. We strongly suggest that should the project be authorized, an appropriately skilled scientist from the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment be onboard to ensure that the placement of the well does not encroach on sensitive habitats. D 3. Drilling While it is anticipated that the area of cuttings accumulation is small, on average 50-150 m<sup>2</sup> from the wellhead (Jones and Gates 2010), there are still concerns due to the inadequacy of data of the area and the prolonged time periods that impact can occur in these deep-sea habitats. In addition, ecological changes typically occur at a wider scale, on average 200-300 m from the wellhead (Currie and Isaacs 2005; Gates and Jones 2012), but should sensitive species be present then this can extend to 1-2km (Paine et al. 2014). Impacts such as physical disturbance, smothering and the introduction of chemicals can result in a variety of changes including depletion of oxygen, organic enrichment and increased hydrocarbons. While increased concentrations of metals can result in harmful biogeochemical processes. Increased noise is also a concern during the drilling process. While not as acute as seismic activities, prolonged high levels of noise over the anticipated three to four-month drilling period, can potentially have significant impacts on species who utilise sound to communicate, reproduce and feed. While reference is made to the area of interest falling within a main vessel traffic route, which already has an elevated soundscape, these noise sources are transitory. Drilling acoustics are prolonged and have been known to cause disturbance up to 34 km (which equates to ~3 630km<sup>2</sup>) from the sound source. Furthermore, cumulative impacts, i.e. drilling in addition to shipping noise, could potentially have a larger physiological impact than anticipated, and these should be assessed. In addition, the Environmental Assessment Practitioners (EAPs) opinion that the population 'comeback' both of the Southern right and Humpback whales have occurred despite anthropogenic sound sources in the marine environment, including seismic surveys, is unfounded. Cetacean populations were completely decimated by whaling in the 19th century by extraction, and although the C1 humpback population is recovering well, while the southern right population is not recovering well, these populations are also indicating some serious population-wide cause for concern related to their feeding grounds, their body condition, and mother and calf ratios. E 4. Operations The risk of a deepwater blowout, although identified in the Impact Assessment Matrix, is underestimated. Research has shown that a blowout is anticipated to occur roughly every 17 years (Eckle et al. 2012, Cordes et al. 2016). These risks increase as we explore areas

The acoustic sound modelling study undertaken as part of the project will be identifying the range of PTS and TTS of drilling noise and VSP for various marine faunal groups. Drilling noise impacts will continue for no more than 3-4 months, and although cumulative impacts with existing marine sound may result in behavioural effects on some marine mammal species, this potential behavioural disturbance must be seen in context with the high ambient noise expected in the Area of Interest for drilling due to its location within the main shipping routes around southern Africa. E Thank you for your comments. These aspects will be considered by the EIA and Specialist Team in the EIA Phase. F Thank you for your comments. These aspects will be considered by the EIA and Specialist Team in the EIA Phase. G Thank you for your comments. The majority of the impacts will be assessed further in the EIA Phase. The detailed mitigation measures will be discussed and presented in greater detail in the EIA Report and associated specialist reports. H Your recommendation has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report. Please refer to the responses listed below.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jean Harris

previously not considered due to the difficulty of access. In a study on the Macondo Well, in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, it was found that of the 5 million barrels of oil released at a depth of ~1500m (Joye et al. 2016; McNutt et al. 2012), only half of the oil reached the surface with a subsurface plume extending for ~50km (Camilli et al. 2010). Surface oil interacted with plankton and mineral particles, falling as marine snow and impacting the benthos for ~3.2km from the site, with impacts being recorded on the benthos as far as 45km (Chanton et al. 2014 Valentine et al. 2014 Montagna et al. 2013; Baguley et al. 2015). The impact of a loss of well control needs to be explored thoroughly, not only from an environmental perspective but also from a socio-economic perspective, should oil impact fishery operations or when it reaches the shore after a blowout. An accurate Oil Spill Model is required to properly assess these impacts. Light pollution is an overlooked but significant concern. Artificial light caused by electric lighting and gas flares can affect many natural processes including the vertical diel migration of plankton (Moor et al 2000), while lighting at night attracts species including large predatory fish and birds (Longcore and Rich 2004). The impact of light pollution must be assessed, within the Marine Ecological Impact Assessment. F 5. Decommissioning Concerns exist around the plugging and abandoning of the wellhead, without the need for ongoing monitoring. While this may be best international practice, this does not mitigate the risk of leaks impacting the surrounding environment. Given there is little information on these habitats and the species which occur there, there should be ongoing monitoring of abandoned wells. Best practice, for example in Norway, includes post-production monitoring of wells every three years (Iversen et al., 2011). G 6. Mitigation Risk In Table 40: Preliminary impact assessment, it gives the Pre- and Post-mitigation risk, with no context of what the proposed mitigation is except for a very brief description in the “Draft EMPr” in the Environmental Authorisation application form. This makes it exceedingly difficult for us to comment on whether we agree that the proposed mitigation reduces the risk in line with the assessment of the EAP. H Even though, the draft scoping requires more information and clarity to be fully considered, the WILDTRUST believes that, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed oil and gas exploration poses an unacceptable pollution, ecological and socio-economic risk to South Africans.

Rentske Smook

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Rentske Smook

whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the

relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

### Rentske Smook

conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated

regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Rentske Smook

		substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.	
Date	2024/02/29	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
FYI ***See P Pickford Letter and Comment***		Thank you for your email. This email serves to acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford’s letter. Your details have been recorded in our I&AP database for this project.	

Prof. Merle Sowman

Date	2023/08/31	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
Dear Lucien Please can you register me as an I&AP and send the relevant environmental assessment reports for this application. Kind regards Merle E. Prof Merle Sowman		Dear I&AP, We can confirm that your details have been included in our database for this project. For further information and documents related to the project, please visit the following link: <a href="https://www.eims.co.za/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/">https://www.eims.co.za/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/</a>	

Lourens Steyn

Date	2024/02/08	Method	Other
Comment		Response	
1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all		1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in	

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Lourens Steyn

potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as wilfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can

the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this



## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Lourens Steyn

be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to



Lourens Steyn

ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

### Madelein Burger

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

#### Comment

1. Die Olie in die oseaan gaan 'n groot impak het op ons daaglikse spesies. Dit visspesieson plante selfs seediëre sal uiteroei word. 2. Mense sal siek word van gasse wat vrygeste word in die lug. 3. Seediëre (bv. haaie, kan verhuis) dit kan 'n target (gevaar) wees vir ons daaglikse visser-manne en toerisme (veral swemmers) teen die kus. 4. Seeplante kan uitgeroei word en visspesies kan trek na ander areas of selfs doodgaan. 5. Die gedreun of geraas van masjiënere binne die oseaan kan die groei van visspesies belemmer.

#### Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

### Mr Jan Taljaard Marx

Date 2023/06/30 Method Email

#### Comment

Dear Lucien Herewith is the I&AP registration for the St Helena Bay Water Quality Trust for the proposed oil and gas exploration project. Please keep us updated on the progress. Kind regards Jan Marx

#### Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been included in our I&AP database.

### Mr Mike Davies

Date 2023/06/26 Method Email

#### Comment

Hello - please add as an IAP for this project Thanks

#### Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that you've been added to the project's I&AP database.

### Ms Nozipho Mkhabela

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

#### Comment

Please share with me shapefile of Block 3B4B.

#### Response

Thank you for your email. Please find attached a KML of Block 3B/4B as requested.

### Mr Andy Pienaar

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Andy Pienaar

## Comment

A I herewith wish to express my opposition to the efforts to apply for a permit to drill for oil and gas along the West Coast of South Africa on the following grounds. B The company that proposes to apply for the right or even PASA for that matter has not conducted a thorough and impacting community based awareness raising in the communities where I live and at best their processes has excluded those of us with definite and opposing opinions to the proposed project. The company contracted to do the said awareness and to an extend PASA has shown to be not completely impartial and to be biased in favour of the project. C I believe that this project will have a further negative impact on the economic prospects of the Namaqua people who is already been downtrodden on by an unscrupulous mining sector. The prospects for access to our traditional fishing waters and a share of marine life, already halved by international policy that favours multi national fishing companies. D I also cannot related to the fact that their will be little or no direct beneficiation even through job creation, for the local communities while we would have the burden of the risk associated with the drilling for oil, like spillages. E I am also concerned about the destruction of our way of life, our cultural heritage which has been constant for many hundreds of years and myself and my community would hate it to be relocated because of the destruction of our natural environment, our heritage. F I conclude by asking the powers that be to look into the many alternatives abundantly available in our vicinity to source the required energy needs, to consider their international commitments, in particular those that protects the environment and seek to slow the progression towards negative climate change.

## Response

A Your comment/objection has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report. B EIMS can unfortunately speak on behalf of the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA). We are EIMS has been appointed by the Applicant as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to prepare and submit the EA application, Scoping and EIA Reports, and undertaking a Public Participation Process (PPP) associated with the proposed exploration activities. In terms of Regulation 13 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, an independent EAP, must be appointed by the applicant to manage the application. EIMS is compliant with the definition of an EAP as defined in Regulations 1 and 13 of the EIA Regulations, as well as Section 1 of the NEMA. This includes, inter alia, the requirement that EIMS is: • Objective and independent; • Has expertise in conducting EIA's; • Comply with the NEMA, the environmental regulations and all other applicable legislation; • Considers all relevant factors relating to the application; and • Provides full disclosure to the applicant and the relevant environmental authority. It should be noted that the public participation has been done in compliance with the requirements set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014, as amended. This included the following: • placement of various adverts in local, regional and national newspapers; • placement of approximately 150 site notices along the coast and interior; • identification and communication with the relevant organs of state, community based organisations (amongst them the Kobush Ontwikkelingsvereniging), non-governmental organisations, etc. Over and above the requirements of the EIA Regulations, 2014, the following was also undertaken: • A series of radio adverts were run on local and regional radio stations; • Undertaking of approximately 1200 surveys in key local communities regarding the project and the perceptions of the project from a community point of view. This was undertaken by an independent company, Abalobi Express, who employed a host of community consultants and field workers from the local communities. • Pamphlet Distribution in the following towns with the towns in your immediate surrounds in bold: o Redhill / Simonstown, o Fishhoek, o Vrygrond, o Lavender Hill, o Retreat, o Grassy Park, o Strandfontein, o Mitchell's Plain, o Hanover Park, o Phillippi, o Manenberg, o Langa, o Gugulethu, o Macassar, o Khayelitsha, o Kraaifontein, o Cape Town Central, o Bloubergstrand, o Melkbosstrand, o Yzerfontein, o Atlantis, o Mamre, o Darling, o Hopefield, o Stompneusbaai & The cove, o Laingville, o Laaipek & Noordhoek, o Langebaan, o White City, o Diazville & Louwville, o Paternoster, o Elandsbaai, o Leipoldville, o Redelinghuys, o Lambertsbaai, o Graafwater, o Doringbaai, o Pappendorp, o Ebenhaezer, o Hondeklipbaai, o Lepelfontein, o Garies, o Kheis, o Klipfontein, o Kharkams, o Kamieskroon, o Soebatsfontein, o Spoegrivier, o Concordia, o Carolusberg, o Bersig, o Nababeep, o Okiep, o Bulletrap, o Buffelsrivier, o Komagas, o Koingnaas, o Kleinsee, o Tweerivier, o Steinkopf, o Eksteenfontein, o Lekkersing, o Alexanderbaai, o Sendelingdrift and o Kuboes. C Comment noted. A detailed Economic Impact

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Andy Pienaar

	Assessment has been proposed for the EIA Phase that will include a detailed assessment of all of the sectors operating within the receiving environment. Furthermore, the fishing sector was identified as a key sector and was proposed as the focus of a dedicated study, a Fisheries Impact Assessment, for completion during the EIA Phase. D It is agreed that exploration activities typically require highly skilled employment. However, where feasible, it is anticipated that the use of local labour could be utilised, but it is anticipated that this will be extremely limited, if at all. The potential for a pollution events (e.g. oil spills) is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. E The impacts on cultural and intangible heritage, as well as social impacts (e.g. sense of place, uncertainty, etc.) were identified in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Additionally, it was recommended that these be assessed further in the EIA Phase and, as such, Cultural Heritage and Social Assessments were recommended as part of the Plan of Study for EIA (See Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report). It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant. No relocation of people or communities as a result of offshore exploration is envisaged/proposed. F Your comment/objection has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report.
--	---

Mr John Selby

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

I received the documentation on the Block 3B4B exploration program and noted that I should register as an I&AP. My name is John Selby and I am a member of the Langebaan Residents and Ratepayers Association. As such we are interested in any project which may impact the west coast. For future reference I am qualified geologist and hold a Master degree in Environmental Management.

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Date 2024/01/17 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Are you directly impacted by the project? No. Are you a user of the application area or directly adjacent areas? ... Resident of the West coast and impacted potentially by any industrial

Response

Questionnaire and responses captured. Comments of the I&AP were considered as part of the final EIA report.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr John Selby

activity Are you aware of any communities/organisations/community groups etc... the fishing community of the West coast Large scale shipping into and out of Saldanha Port Are you aware of any tribal authorities, indigenous peoples, or ethnic and culturally distinct groups... The coloured community of the West coast depend on their fishing activities Are you aware of any other stakeholders who need to be notified/ engaged? Please provide detail and possible contact details? Saldanha Sakekamer Pioneer Fishing, Seaharvest, Compass Fishing Hannesbaai Fishing. please can you provide us with a high-level description of the aspects of the environment upon which the project may directly or indirectly be impacted?.... Fishing, shipping, Are you aware of any other activities (current or proposed) within, or adjacent to the application area... Several companies are requesting permission to drill and explore for oil/gas on the west coast. Are you aware of any cultural or heritage resources (including intangible resources)... No Please describe any bio-physical and/or socio-economic impacts that you believe should be considered during the study? Impact on fish abundance, pollution of areas around the sites. Do you have any other specific concerns, comments or objections to the proposed project? Many of the smaller scale fishers are unaware of the EIA process so may not come forward. EIMS should be proactive in gaining their input.

Date 2024/01/28 Method Email

Comment

1. There seems [sic] to be some confusion on the amount of seismic work using air guns. Some of the delegates said there was no air gun use while others said there was a limited amount. This should be clarified. 2. It was stated that no seismic exploration was to [sic] be done, as it had already been completed. Clarification please. 3. It was noted that the marine expert stated that air gun use could permanently [sic] damage the hearing systems of fish and maritime mammals. 4. It was stated that the exploration drill holes would be at a sufficient distance from the shore not to impinge on the fisher's activities. However, it was also stated that the long line and trawling fishers would not be allowed close the drilling rigs as their tackle could become snared in the drilling equipment. This surely means that areas around the drilling rig would be out of bounds for those types of commercial fishing and therefore the available area for fishing would be limited. 5. Discussion on the social aspects revealed that there was an insurance policy to allow fishers to claim for any damage done to their equipment and their catch [sic] quantity, however they would be required to prove that any catch reduction was caused by the drilling activities probably somewhat difficult to prove!

Response

Thank you so much for your participation in Saldanha Bay. We really enjoyed engaging with everyone. I have made a note of your comments, and these will be addressed soon. Should you need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact us.

James Malgas

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

James Malgas

Comment	Response
Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Die negatiewe effet van werkloosheid bemoeilik eieneenskaps werk Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Ons ko-ordineer werksgeleenthede in the omgewing deur midder van die Richtersveld chamber of commerce Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Daar was baie gedoen om die plaaslike gemeenskap Is u bewus van enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? Die normale: Richtersveld (CPA), Nama, Khoisan Kan u asseblief vir ons 'n hoëvlakbeskrywing gee van die aspekte van die omgewing waarop die projek direk of indirek geraak kan word? (insluitend gebruike soos visvang, skeepvaart, mynbou; topografiese kenmerke; Infrastruktuur; sensitiewe flora/fauna) Ons is bewus van alles, waar ons hoop dat die voordele die nadele kan oorskry	Comments noted

Louise Geldenhuys

Date	2023/06/21	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Good day, May I please request to be registered as and I&AP for the project number 1570 (Exploration - Block 3B and 4B). Please may I also request all EIA documentation in order to comment on. Regards,	Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been included in our I&AP database for this project. All information regarding the project can be accessed at: <a href="https://www.eims.co.za/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/">https://www.eims.co.za/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/</a> At the moment, a Background Information Document (BID) as well as the notification letter sent out, and digital copy of the site notice are available online for your perusal.		

Ms Jennifer Olbers

Date	2023/06/14	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Two requests: 1) Please can you add myself (Jennifer Olbers) with this email address to your I&AP list. The WILDTRUST is a Conservation NGO. 2) Please can you send me the GIS files (.shp files) of the block as well as the Area of interest?	Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below. As requested please find attached the shapefiles for the block as well as the area of interest.		
Date	2024/01/15	Method	Email



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jennifer Olbers

Comment		Response	
Is there another link to register for the online public participation meeting on 1 Feb? The link provided seems to be giving an error (see attached).		I&AP was provided guidance and support. Full communication captured in Correspondence document as quoted here: "I have just checked the link myself now. It appears to still be working. I've copied the link in below: ***** A good way to get into the registration page is log in through your web browser, either Chrome, Edge, or Safari. I think the access issue may be related to the fact that your system is not allowing Third Party links on MS Teams itself. Just let me know if the above link works through a web browser, hopefully that should allow you to register. "	
Date	2024/01/16	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
Thank you Lucien, used a different device to register successfully.		Response from I&AP confirms that the I&AP was able to register for the virtual meeting.	

Ms Nicole Lomberg

Date	2023/06/14	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
Kindly register myself as an I&AP to the project.		Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.	

Dr Jackie Sunde

Date	2023/08/21	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
A 1. Need and Desirability: 1.1 South Africa has the 14th highest carbon emissions in the world and is the worst polluter in Africa ( <a href="https://www.statista.com/statistics/486073/co2-emissions-south-africa-fossil-fuel-and-industrial-purposes/#:~:text=South%20Africa%20was%20the%20fourteenth,country's%20reliance%20on%20coal%20energy">https://www.statista.com/statistics/486073/co2-emissions-south-africa-fossil-fuel-and-industrial-purposes/#:~:text=South %20Africa%20was%20the%20fourteenth,country's%20reliance%20on%20coal %20energy</a> ). South Africa is currently not meeting its climate commitments and its progress is “insufficient” according to the latest update from the Climate Tracker (See South Africa   Climate Action Tracker accessed 21 August 2023). On grounds of need and desirability this indicator is clear – South Africa cannot afford any further fossil fuel extraction and any further applications are not desirable for the country or the earth and should be denied. This scoping report fails to adequately assess the need and desirability of the project, in the context of the current climate emergency and available scientific evidence on the social and ecological cost of this sort of extractive fossil fuel		A It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant. Any subsequent authorisation would be restricted to these specifically assessed activities. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration or production activities which are not addressed in the current Environmental Authorisation (EA) application, there would be a consequent need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for an Exploration or Production Right as well as a new EA. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment and public consultation prior to approval. It is premature to assess the likely impacts of further invasive exploration activities or production activities as the extent, duration, location, and magnitude applicable to these activities are unknown at this stage. The NEMA EIA Regulations make a clear distinction between the exploration, and production	

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jackie Sunde

prospecting, save arguing that the project aims to identify oil and gas resources. It limits its discussion to the exploration activities and does not adequately describe the need or desirability for an energy project of this nature or its potential climate change impacts. Nor does it provide a comprehensive assessment of the full carbon and social costs. In doing so, it fails to take cognizance of the Makhanda High Court decision in the case now referred to as the Wild Coast Shell decision, where a full bench stated in its judgement that a comprehensive assessment of the need and desirability of such a project is required as each stage in the process is linked. Quoting the Save the Vaal case, the judges made it clear that there is a clear obligation on behalf of the parties to discuss the need and desirability of the whole, long term aims of the project, and the EIA cannot limit itself to the exploration activities only and ignore the longer term intentions of the project in the context of South Africa's and the international carbon emissions reduction commitments. In the context of the current climate crisis this division between exploration and production is an illusory one. This country cannot afford to ignore the very real interlinkages between these two stages and currently best available evidence, confirmed by two courts, is that these processes must be considered together. This scoping report fails to indicate how the EIA will do this. The South African Constitution obliges our courts to consider international law where relevant. In this instance, for South Africa to risk the health and well-being of the ocean commons and knowingly follow a path that will push up its GHG emissions in contravention of numerous commitments goes against our Constitution, the ethical principles underpinning indigenous San communities of the Cape, the principles guiding our National Environmental Management Act, our Marine Living Resources Act and the African Charter of Human Rights. The United Nations has repeatedly indicated that all countries should refrain from further fossil fuel extraction. It is not desirable. This comes from the best available scientific evidence on climate change (UN IPCC Report 2022). South Africa is a member of the United Nations. The Scoping Report is ethically neglectful in its failure to cite this current, best available scientific evidence, legislative and policy guidance. B 1.2 The Scoping Report needs to address the vulnerability of the South Africa population to climate change impacts. It is noted that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Working Group 11 Report to the Sixth Assessment Report (IPCC March 2022) states "Loss of ecosystems and their services has cascading and long-term impacts on people globally, especially for Indigenous Peoples and local communities who are directly dependent on ecosystems, to meet basic needs (high confidence): Vulnerability of ecosystems and people to climate change differs substantially among and within regions (very high confidence), driven by patterns of intersecting socioeconomic development, unsustainable ocean and land use, inequity, marginalization, historical and ongoing patterns of inequity such as colonialism, and governance (high confidence) (Section B.2:pp 14); and confidence) (Section B 2.1:14); and Vulnerability is higher in locations with poverty, governance challenges and limited access to basic services and resources, violent conflict and high levels of climate-sensitive livelihoods (e.g., smallholder farmers, pastoralists, fishing communities) (high confidence). (Section B.2.4:

activities in that these are listed as distinct and separate listed activities. There is provision in law for these activities to be assessed on their merits as and when they are proposed. Please refer to Section 5 of the Scoping Report in regard to the need and desirability for the proposed activities. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. The definition and development of National policy on climate change falls beyond the scope of the EIA process as an Integrated Environmental Management Tool. The NEMA Principles of Sustainable Development must be considered by the relevant Authorities in the development of South Africa's policy and strategies related to Climate Change. The Earthlife Africa case (Save the Vaal) referred to relates to the EA issued to construct and operate a new coal fired power station, which bears little resemblance to offshore exploration. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. Scope 3 emissions and emissions associated with the potential future extraction and exploitation of the resource will not be considered further in the EIA Phase, as the project only relates to exploration activities, and it would not be possible to accurately determine size of the resource at this stage. Once exploration is complete and a resource has been defined, the Scope 3 emissions could be considered during a potential future production right application. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. B The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report as part of the Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment proposed as part of the EIA Phase (refer to Section 9.3 and Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report). The results of the Air Quality and Climate Change assessment will provide an estimate of the overall contribution to climate change as a result of the proposed exploration activities associated with this project. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists' assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts

Dr Jackie Sunde

page 14)”. Ranked as the most unequal country in the world, South Africa has extremely high levels of inequality, conflict, violence and reflects most of the indicators present in the above findings by the IPCC notably inequity marginalization, historical and ongoing patterns of inequity. This vulnerability should be addressed in the Scoping Report. This makes fossil fuel extraction not only not desirable, but negligent and deliberately harmful in this context. The Scoping Report must reflect awareness of and reference to the IPCC Working Group 11’s Report on understanding of risk and its complexity and this should be included in the next phase of the EIA process so that the multiple scales and complex, cumulative and interactive nature of risks can be adequately calculated. 1.3 Best available scientific evidence using climate modelling and historic developments indicates that human activities are altering the climate in ways that are already having drastic impacts on natural resources and the environment and will become extreme for future generations. Children’s rights and the rights of future generations are being violated when the impact of actions that are known to impact child health are not considered. It is now recognised that children will suffer the most extreme consequences of climate change (A WHO-UNICEF-Lancet Commission ‘A future for the world’s children?’ (2020) 5.;Children and climate change | UNICEF Global Development Commons; E Boshoff ‘Protecting the African child in a changing climate: Are our existing safeguards adequate?’ (2017) 1 African Human Rights Yearbook 23 27-28. 13; ‘Children’s rights and climate change’ in C Fenton-Glynn (ed) Children’s rights and sustainable development: Interpreting the UNCRC for future generations (2019) 216-220. J Guillemot & J Burgess ‘Children’s rights at risk’ in UNICEF The challenges of climate change: Children on the front-line (2014) 47). It is clear that children are especially vulnerable in this context and climate change impacts will result in a variety of health and other impacts on children with girl children in Africa particularly vulnerable. Given the extreme anthropomorphic climate changes already being experienced, such as extreme temperature events, changes in ocean temperatures and sea-level rise and other ocean-interactive and linked changes in weather patterns, it is clear that the ocean as an important component of climate mitigation must be protected at all cost in order to fulfil the duty to protect children who are the least able to participate in policy decision-making or have agency to protect themselves. The state and the private sector has obligations to ensure and protect the rights of the children in this context. 1.4 The right to a healthy environment, recognised both in the Constitution of South Africa, Section 24 and in the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights is directly linked to other human rights. This was confirmed in October 2021 when the UN Human Rights Council adopted a resolution that recognised that ‘the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment’ is important for the enjoyment of all human rights. The obligation of the state to protect this right and to balance it with sustainable development in the context of climate change has been confirmed in Earthlife Africa v. the Minister of Environmental Affairs 2017. The Scoping Report fails to address the impact of the application on the right to a healthy environment in the context of whether or not it is needed and desirable. C 1.5 In addressing the question 1: ‘Securing ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources’

related to their fields of study, where applicable. However, it should be noted that the cumulative impact assessment is limited and constrained by the method used for identifying and analysing cumulative effects. As it is not practical to analyse the cumulative effects of an action on every environmental receptor, the list of environmental effects being considered to inform decision makers and stakeholders should focus on those that can be meaningfully assessed (DEAT 2004). The social impacts as highlighted in the comment and in the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, have been identified as specific impacts for further assessment in the EIA Phase by the Social Specialists (refer to Section 9.3 and Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report). Thank you for highlighting the impact related to the children’s rights, which will be conveyed to the Social Specialists for their further consideration in the EIA Phase. As noted above, the assessing of impacts will be limited to those related to the exploration activities proposed as part of this project. The right to a healthy environment is recognised in the guiding principles of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 1.7 of 1998 – NEMA), as amended (please refer to Section 4.3 of the Scoping Report. As stated in Section 4.1 of Scoping Report, The Bill of Rights in chapter 2 section 24 of the Constitution of South Africa Act (Act No. 108 of 1996) makes provisions for environmental issues and declares that: “Everyone has the right - a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that: i. prevent pollution and ecological degradation; ii. promote conservation; and iii. secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development” The Scoping and EIA process as well as associated impact mitigation actions are conducted to fulfil the requirement of the Bill of Rights. C Reference is made to the preliminary impact assessment section (Section 9.2) of the Scoping Report. In Section 9.3 the cultural heritage impact is described as follows: “Any impact on the integrity of the coastal and marine ecosystem through disturbance, pollution, noise, etc. could impact various aspects which makes up people’s intangible cultural heritage (indirect negative impact). Groups may also contest the importance of specific cultural heritages. Because of South Africa’s cultural diversity there are a diversity of beliefs and religious symbolism associated with the coast. The right to culture and to cultural expression is also enshrined in the South African Constitution.” However, the comment will be provided to the Cultural Heritage Specialist and this will be considered further in the EIA Phase. Consideration has been given to the relevant impacts of a project of this nature on the various ecosystem services in the identification of the impacts on the marine environment, fishing industry, social-economic environment, and the cultural landscape and traditional uses. The NEMA EIA regulations define EIA as ‘a systematic process of identifying, assessing and reporting environmental impacts associated with an activity’. EIA as an integrated environmental management tool is therefore inherently project focused. D Comment noted. The comment will be provided to the Applicant for their consideration. E EIMS has been appointed by the Applicant as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to prepare and submit the EA application, Scoping and EIA Reports, and undertaking a Public

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jackie Sunde

the report fails to address the issue of cultural values of the ecosystem in the list provided on page 42. This is also not addressed in any depth in the Cultural Heritage Assessment. The Scoping Report needs to address the full range of ecosystems services in the receiving environment and in the indirect impact area with particular attention to the role played by the ocean in mitigating climate change, thereby protecting human and more than human health and wellbeing. D 1.6 In terms of South Africa's ethical responsibility to human and more than human, fossil fuel extraction from the ocean should no longer be pursued. Africa Oil CORP and its partners are requested to demonstrate their commitment to a sustainable Earth future and their ethical standing by withdrawing this application for environmental authorization until such time as a Strategic Environmental Assessment and adequate cumulative impact assessment has been conducted for this region of the ocean. E 1.7 EIMS, as an environmental consultancy, is requested to consider their ethical commitment to a sustainable environment and withdraw their support for and work on this application pending the completion of a Strategic Environmental Assessment for this region. F 2. Legislative and policy frameworks: This Scoping Report and the application for environmental authorization to conduct exploration activities in 1570 3B4B should be put on hold until the Marine Spatial Plans for this region have been developed through a consultative process in terms of the Marine Spatial Planning Act of 2018 and a Strategic Environmental Assessment has been conducted for this region. G 3. Need for a precautionary approach: 3.1 Inability to undertake a reliable assessment of the potential cumulative environmental impacts. The Scoping Report itself states that it is not possible to undertake a reliable assessment of the potential cumulative environmental impacts" (1570 Scoping Report 2023:293). It states that "While it is foreseeable that further exploration (seismic and well-drilling) and future production activities could arise if the current application is granted, there is not currently sufficient information available to make reasonable assertions as to nature of such future activities....the possible range of the future prospecting, mining, exploration and production activities that could arise will vary significantly in scope, location, extent, and duration depending on whether a resource(s) is discovered, its size, properties and location, etc. As these cannot at this stage be reasonably defined, it is not possible to undertake a reliable assessment of the potential cumulative environmental impacts" (1570 3B4B Africa Oil Scoping Report). In the light of this, a precautionary approach must be considered and the proposed application withdrawn or the company must make more effort to ensure that it undertakes a comprehensive assessment of the cumulative impacts. H 3.2 Impact on Critical Biodiversity. Whilst the proposed drilling activity itself might be outside of the Critical Biodiversity Areas No.1 (CBA 1) identified through the SA National Biodiversity Institute's work on identifying such critical biodiversity, on page 218 the Scoping Report states that "most of the ecosystem types in Block 3B/4B (i.e. Southeast Atlantic Upper, Mid and Lower Slopes, Cape Basin Abyss) are currently considered 'not protected' or 'poorly protected' and further effort is needed to improve protection of these threatened ecosystem types (Sink et al. 2019)." As the proposed drilling site remains in dangerous proximity to these areas and given both the

Participation Process (PPP) associated with the proposed exploration activities. In terms of Regulation 13 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, an independent EAP, must be appointed by the applicant to manage the application. EIMS is compliant with the definition of an EAP as defined in Regulations 1 and 13 of the EIA Regulations, as well as Section 1 of the NEMA. This includes, inter alia, the requirement that EIMS is: • Objective and independent; • Has expertise in conducting EIA's; • Comply with the NEMA, the environmental regulations and all other applicable legislation; • Considers all relevant factors relating to the application; and • Provides full disclosure to the applicant and the relevant environmental authority. F It is important to consider that the offshore activities are proposed and authorised within a framework of existing legislation, policies and management plans, such as those described in detail in Sections 4 and 8.5 of the Scoping Report. The current legislation in South Africa does not prescribe a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken as a precursor to a project receiving EA. It should further be noted that this project does not relate directly to the development of the resource that may potentially be located offshore, but the exploration for such a resource. While a SEA would provide an additional framework within which the potential future development of the resources should be considered, such a SEA would rely on the outcome of the exploration to define the nature and extent of the potential resource. Without this information an SEA for development of the resource would be purely speculative. G It appears that the quote paragraphs were taken out of context. Cumulative impacts are identified and described in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report. For the purposes of this Scoping and EIA process, consideration will be given to existing permits/rights and/or permits/ rights that have been applied for along the west coast and which would reasonably be expected to be considered as part of an application of this nature. Section 9.4 does make clear mention of the fact that "there are a number of current reconnaissance permit applications for proposed seismic surveys off the northern West Coast of South Africa (as of December 2022), and within the Deep Water Orange Basin," and further states that "it is unlikely that all these will be undertaken as they are targeting a similar area." However, it should be noted that the cumulative impact assessment is limited and constrained by the method used for identifying and analysing cumulative effects. As it is not practical to analyse the cumulative effects of an action on every environmental receptor, the list of environmental effects being considered to inform decision makers and stakeholders should focus on those that can be meaningfully assessed (DEAT 2004). It should further be noted that the assessment of cumulative impacts will be an ongoing process as the environment changes or more information becomes available. Future EIAs will have to consider such changes and the competent authority will need to consider these cumulative impacts at the time of adjudication. H The Marine Ecology Study will be based on a very wide literature search. The baseline descriptions used for such specialist assessment reports is continuously updated to include new information from the peer-reviewed literature or from research reports in the public domain. In the case where information gaps exist, or detailed data on populations is lacking, this is identified, and the sensitivity of individual receptors is subsequently considered as part of the impact assessment. The approach

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jackie Sunde

numerous unknowns and gaps in available science and the fact that the applicants by their own admission stage that its not possible to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of other developments and activities, a precautionary approach should be taken. I 4. Section 8.7 Cultural and heritage resources Whilst it is acknowledged that cultural heritage is dynamic, diverse and plural expressions of tangible and intangible cultural heritages exist along the South African coast and not all of these examples can be included in a CHA, it is suggested that more detailed descriptions of some of the different types of tangible and intangible cultural heritage currently expressed and described by coastal communities living in the receiving area are provided. As it stands this section of the report provides a general historical description but is very vague and does not provide a rich description of the existing, diverse expressions of cultural heritage by diverse groups. Attention should be paid to expressions of cultural heritages such as the intangible cultural heritage of particularly marginalised women fishers. Where there are very well known and established Traditional and Khoisan Leadership structures who are active in ocean governance and use, such as the West Coast Guriqua Council, and the Cochoqua, the CHA Expert should reach out to these indigenous governance structures and ensure that they are consulted directly, particularly with regard to their perspectives on the project and to possible impacts and mitigation thereof. The Scoping Report is not clear on how the rights of these leadership structures to adequate consultation on issues pertaining to cultural and heritage resources will be ensured.

adopted in the marine ecology specialist assessment will utilize and apply the precautionary principle to account for all species historically known to be present, as well as species for which suitable habitat may have existed within Block3B/4B, instead of relying on ‘snapshot’ insights that would have been obtained from a once–off survey. The precautionary principle requires action to prevent serious and irreversible damage even before harm can be scientifically demonstrated. This approach is especially important due to the seasonal migratory behaviour of many of the species, as well as the fact that some species numbers have been affected greatly historically. The precautionary principle assumes the presence of species and the marine ecological study will assess impacts on this basis. I Comment noted. Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This has been updated on the Scoping Reports impact description for this impact, as well as the plan of study for EIA, and will be considered further in the EIA Phase.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

## Comment

Please can I confirm my registration as an interested and affected party for the 1570AOSAC 3B4B Exploration application

## Response

We confi rm that you are registered as an Interested and Aff ected Party for this project.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

## Comment

I wish to raise my concerns regarding the inadequacy of the DEIR on two critical issues: 1. Inadequacy of attention to the devastating long-term impacts of climate change on the rights of children, on future generations and on coastal fishing communities. The Report on Climate Change impacts fails to address the issue of the known devastating impacts of climate change on the health and well-being of children, on the rights of future generations and also on coastal fishing communities. There is now extensive scholarship on this and the report just ignores these vulnerable groups entirely. 2. Weaknesses and Gaps in the Appendix 4.9 Report OIL SPILL DRIFT MODELLING TECHNICAL REPORT An oil spill will be devastating for all marine life, potentially impacting social and economic livelihoods and impacting cultural heritage. The oil

## Response

Section 8.11 of the EIAR report presents the predicted changes in weather patterns as a result of climate change within the region. Projected changes to the baseline environment are also included in various sections or the EIAR. Section 9.3.7.2 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential climate change impacts associated with the proposed exploration. The specialist assessment concludes that the climate change impacts associated with the exploration activity are anticipated to be low. The extent and potential impacts associated with a blowout are currently being revisited and supplemented. The findings of this assessment together with updated impact assessments (where relevant) will be made available to the I&APs prior to final submission to the Competent Authority for decision making. The impacts associated with

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Dr Jackie Sunde

spill drift modelling technical report does not take into consideration the latest scientific evidence emerging on the issue of oil spills and ongoing oil leakage ([www.uk.oceana.org](http://www.uk.oceana.org) April 2023). Chronic oil pollution is released in waste water and in small but routine oil spills often illegally underreported and unreported (IUU). Use of satellite imaging in the Report In Deep Water (Oceana 2023), using FOI data shows that many marine species are subjected to a constant flow of small oil fills. The report reveals how oil and gas production harms marine life through toxic chemicals, microplastics and extreme noise pollution through seismic blasting. In the UK alone it has been revealed that just under 13 000 tonnes of oil have been released into UK waters by the oil and gas industry in the last five years. Exploration, drilling and decommissioning of oil and gas infrastructure also lead to the release of toxics chemical, including PAGs and mercury which can cause death and extreme harm to individual species across species populations and whole ecosystems (UK Oceana.org April 2023). The ESIA fails to take cognisance of this type of underreported and under- studied area of risk. In the light of this new, emerging evidence a precautionary approach must be adopted. Secondly, and very importantly, the report only assumes the finding of condensate. This is an assumption and the risks of only assuming this are not adequately explored or addressed. The report should assess the worst case scenario and identify the risk if heavier oil than condensate is found. This is a critical omission and must be rectified.

potential operational discharges and unplanned spills is identified and assessed in Section 9.3.1 of the EIAR. Relevant management and mitigation has been included in the EMPr.

Mr Adrian Pole

Date 2023/06/19 Method Email

Comment

Dear Lucien We would be grateful if you register The Green Connection c/o Adrian Pole Attorneys as an I&AP. Kind regards

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Ms Angila Joubert

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

Kindly register myself as Interested and Affected Party for this proposed EA application, representing Bergrivier Municipality as the Environmental officer.

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Date 2023/07/20 Method Email

Comment

Response



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Angila Joubert

Please note below comments of concern relating to the proposed Offshore Exploration Project – Block 3B/4B: Draft Scoping Report- Proposed Africa Oil South Africa Corp (AOSAC) Block 3B/4B Exploration right application (17/07/2023) 1) The presence and operation of drill unit and support vessels (including waste management, water intake, air emissions and discharges to sea) May result and highly likely to cause: • Increase in underwater noise levels • Disturbance / behavioural changes to marine fauna (cetaceans, turtles, • Impacts on the fishing sector catch rates (tuna pole and large pelagic longline. • Cultural heritage impact of drilling block 2) Routine discharges to sea (e.g. deck and machinery space drainage, sewage and galley wastes) and local reduction in water quality May result and highly likely cause: • Physiological effect on marine fauna • Increased levels of E.coli in the water • Fish aggregation and increased predator - prey interactions 3) Lighting from drill unit May result and highly to cause: • Light emissions in marine environment • Disorientation and mortality of seabirds • Attraction of plankton and increased risk to fish, turtles and cetaceans 4) Well drilling (including ROV site selection, installation of conductor pipes; well head, BOP and riser system, well logging, and plugging) May result and highly likely to cause: • Disturbance of sediment due to equipment installation • Disturbance of seabed and benthos • Increased underwater noise levels • Disturbance / behavioural changes to marine fauna 5) Operation of helicopters May result and highly likely to cause: • Increase in ambient noise levels • Disturbance of coastal and marine fauna in sensitive and protected areas • Faunal avoidance of key breeding areas (e.g. coastal birds and cetaceans) • Abandonment of nests (birds) and young (birds and seals) 6) Discharge of cuttings and drilling fluid, and residual cement May result and highly likely to cause: • Accumulation of cuttings and cement on seafloor and sediment disturbance • Smothering disturbance and mortality of benthic biota • Toxicity and bioaccumulation or other physiological effects on marine fauna • Reduced physiological functioning of marine organisms • Sediment plume and water column disturbance • Increased water turbidity, reduced light penetration and • Physiological effects on marine fauna 7) Unplanned Activities May result and highly likely to cause: • Faunal strike and mortality by collision with marine fauna • Accidental hydrocarbon spills / releases (minor) (e.g. vessel accident) • Loss of hydrocarbons to Sea • Effect on faunal health (e.g. respiratory damage) or mortality (e.g. suffocation and poisoning) • Loss of well control / well blow-out • Uncontrolled release of oil / gas from well • Effect on health of marine fauna (e.g. respiratory damage) or mortality (e.g. suffocation and poisoning) • Physiological effect on marine fauna

Thank you for your email. Your comments have been received and will be recorded.

Date 2024/01/10 Method Email

Comment

Block 3B/4B Exploration project. EIMS Reference number: 1570 Bergrivier Municipality comments on Draft Environmental impact assessment report available for public review and

Response

Apologies for the delay in response. Thank you for your comments. This e-mail serves to confirm that your comments have been received and will be included in this project’s Final EIA Report.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Angila Joubert

comment. As indicated at point 12.6 at section titled: Economic on page 476 within the EIMS Environmental Impact Assessment Report – AOSAC Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration Right: Economic impacts created as a result of the normal operation of the exploration activity: The impact identifies that the proposed exploration activity could drill 5 wells in the designated areas of interest of the project over a 20-month period (starting date undefined). Also indicated on page xxxiii under Well drilling Operation section: The well will be created by drilling a hole into the seafloor with a drill bit attached to a rotating drill string, which crushes the rock into small particles, called “cuttings”. After the hole is drilled, casings (sections of steel pipe), each slightly smaller in diameter, are placed in the hole and permanently cemented in place. Bergrivier Municipality comment on the above two sections from the report: Drilling may result and highly likely to cause: • Disturbance of sediment due to equipment installation • Disturbance of seabed and benthos • Increased underwater noise levels • Disturbance / behavioural changes to marine fauna • Impacts on the fishing sector catch rates (tuna pole and large pelagic longline) • Spillages of drilling fluid and cuttings will cause increased levels of E.coli in the water and have a negative physiological effect on marine fauna • Spillages also result in a smothering disturbance and mortality of benthic biota and sediment plume and water column disturbance (all these are ripple effects of each impact) As indicated on page xxxix under Light emissions section: Operational lighting will be required on the drilling unit and supply vessels for safe operations and navigation purposes during the hours of darkness. Bergrivier Municipality comment on the above section from the report: Lighting from the drill unit may result and highly likely to cause: • Light emissions in marine environment • Disorientation and mortality of seabirds • Attraction of plankton and increased risks to fish, turtles and cetaceans As indicated on page xxxii under Helicopters section within the report: Transportation of personnel to and from the drilling unit would be provided by helicopter from Springbok Airport (fixed wing trip from Cape Town) using local providers. It is estimated that there may be up to four return flights per week between the drilling unit and the helicopter support base at Springbok (i.e. 17 weeks (~120 days) x 4 = 68 trips per well). Bergrivier Municipality comment on the above section from the report: The operation of helicopters may result and highly likely to cause: • Increase in ambient noise levels • Disturbance of coastal and marine fauna in sensitive and protected areas • Faunal avoidance of key breeding areas (e.g. coastal birds and cetaceans) • Abandonment of nests (birds) and young (birds and seals)

Further, please take note that and updated and revised EIA Report will be available for public review from 8 April 2024. Please see the attached notification including more information.

Ms Danne Joubert

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

Can you please register me as an I&A party for this exploration right project (Reference no:

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Danne Joubert

1570).

this process with the details below.

Date2023/07/20

Method

Email

Comment

My comments below for the scoping report for Block 3B/4B offshore exploration project: - Alterations and damages are caused to the seafloor by the drilling operations. Drilling fluid and cuttings are discharged into the ocean from drilling activities. - This results in pollution of the ocean and affecting the health of marine animals. - There will be a disturbance to ecosystems with the damages caused to the seabed by drilling Block 3B/4B. - The spawning of fish species as well as other marine species will be negatively affected by the drilling operations. - The following is mentioned in the Scoping report under cumulative impacts: - A significant adverse residual environmental effect is considered one that affects marine biota by causing a decline in abundance or change in distribution of a population over more than one generation within an area. - If a disturbance displaces a species from an important feeding or breeding area for a prolonged period, impacts at the population level could be significant. Therefore these are great concerns for this drilling project at Block 3B/4B and Cederberg Municipality obejects to this project.

Response

Thank you for your email. Your comments have been received and will be recorded.

Date2024/01/09

Method

Email

Comment

Cederberg Municipality comments on Draft Environmental impact assessment report available for public review and comment. Following sections referred to in DEIAR and applicable comments: - Page xxxi and page 23. Pre-drilling activities are proposed: Sonar surveys, echo sounders, piston coring, box coring sub-bottom profilers, seabed sediment coring. - Page xxxi & page 24 & 26. The applicant proposing to drill five exploration wells within Block 3B/4B. A notional well depth of 3500m below the seafloor is assumed at this stage. The applicant’s strategy for future drilling is that drilling could be undertaken throughout the year (i.e. not limited to a specific seasonal window period. The well will be created by drilling a hole into the seafloor with a drill bit attached to a rotating drill string, which crushes the rock into small particles, called ‘cuttings’. After the hole is drilled, casings ( sections of steel pipe) each slightly smaller in diameter are placed in the hole and permanently cemented in place. - Comments on these points above: There is a high risk of oil spills that results in the killing of wildlife and cause long-lasting damage to marine ecosystems. Drilling fluids injected into the wells for lubrication – known as ‘mud’ - are supposed to be captured in lined pits for disposal. However they often leak and are splashed around drilling holes flowing directly into the ocean. - Offshore exploration drilling causes disruption of migratory pathways, degradation of

Response

Apologies for the delay in response. Thank you for your comments. This e-mail serves to confirm that your comments have been received and will be included in this project’s Final EIA Report. Further, please take note that and updated and revised EIA Report will be available for public review from 8 April 2024. Please see the attached notification including more information.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Danne Joubert

important animal habitats and oil spills – which can be devastating to the animals and humans who depend on these ecosystems. Damage to the seabed where the drilling operation is taking place. Drilling fluid and cuttings flow into the ocean polluting the natural marine environment and causing marine animal diseases and potential deaths. - Offshore exploration drilling cause numerous spills of crude oil, natural gas liquids, diesel and hydraulic fluids into the environment. Oil breaks down into components that accumulate through the food chain, poisoning whales, dolphins, turtles, birds, fish and shell fish. Oil and related chemicals cause damages to the immune and reproductive systems of exposed birds, fish and shellfish, lowering populations of affected species and denying food to the predators that depend on them.

Date 2023/07/20 Method Email

Comment

Your Reference Number: 4970776 We Acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 2023-07-19 regarding PROPOSED AFRICA OIL SA CORP BLOCK 3B/4B OFFSHORE EXPLORATION PROJECT and confirm that the correspondence is being referred to the relevant Department for attention. Reference Number: 4970776

Response

Noted with thanks

Date 2023/08/07 Method Email

Comment

We Acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 2023-08-02 regarding SCOPING REPORT AVAILABILITY & ONGOING PUBLIC MEETINGS: PROPOSED AFRICA OIL SA CORP BLOCK 3B/4B OFFSHORE EXPLORATION PROJECT and confirm that the correspondence is being referred to the relevant Department for attention. Reference Number: 4974823

Response

Noted

Date 2023/08/07 Method Email

Comment

We Acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 2023-08-04 regarding NOTIFICATION: BLOCK 3B/4B EXPLORATION PROJECT CAPE TOWN AND HOUT BAY MEETING CANCELLATION and confirm that the correspondence is being referred to the relevant Department for attention. Reference Number: 4975754

Response

Noted

Date 2024/01/09 Method Email

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

### Comment

We Acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 2024-01-09 regarding NOTIFICATION: PROPOSED AFRICA OIL SA CORP BLOCK 3B/4B OFFSHORE EXPLORATION and confirm that the correspondence is being referred to the relevant Department for attention.

Date 2024/01/29 Method Email

### Response

Correspondence acknowledged.

### Comment

We Acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 2024-01-08 regarding PROPOSED AFRICA OIL SA CORP BLOCK 3B/4B OFFSHORE EXPLORATION and confirm that the correspondence is being referred to the relevant Department for attention. Reference Number: 5069531

### Response

Comment received and recorded

### Mr Dave Japp

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

### Comment

Ref. 1570, I wish to register as an interested party to this process. I am assisting the DeepSea Trawling Industry Association (SADSTIA) relating to Oil and gas offshore developments. Contact Details : David Japp : mobile: \*\*\*\*\* Email. \*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com

### Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Date 2023/08/17 Method Email

### Comment

I am making enquiries on behalf of the South African Deepsea Trawling Industry Association (SADSTIA) regarding the status of this process. I participated in the recent virtual meetings and am aware this is at scoping stage. Any update on process and timelines would be appreciated as I am reporting back to the SADSTIA executive.

### Response

Thank you for your email. Your request for information has been noted. As a registered I&AP, you will be notified about the progress of this project. Please note that the Draft Scoping Report is currently available for public review. Should you wish to access this, please follow the link below: <https://www.eims.co.za/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/> Deadline for the submission of comments on the Scoping Report is 21 August 2023

### Ms Phumla Ngesi

Date 2023/09/01 Method Email

### Comment

A 1. The financial provision related to the decommissioning of the proposed wells must be determined as per the Regulations Pertaining to the Financial Provision for Prospecting,

### Response

A Comment noted. This requirement will be complied with during the EIA Phase. B It is our understanding that Activity 18 from Listing Notice 2 is the only applicable listed activity: Activity

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Phumla Ngesi

Exploration, Mining or Production Operations, 2015. A specialist must be appointed to determine the said quantum. B 2. Only listed activity 18 from the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations: Listing Notice 2 of 2014 (EIA Regulations: Listing Notice 2) is listed in the scoping report. Other potential listed activities that may be triggered by the proposed drilling activities from the EIA Regulations: Listing Notice 1 and EIA Regulations: Listing Notice 2 must specifically be included in the scoping report. In our assessment, Listing Notice 1 activities 14, 17, and 19A, including Listing Notice 2 activities 4, 6, 7, and 14 may be triggered. Should they be triggered, these must be included in the scoping report. The EA application must also be amended. C 3. The Area of Interest (AOI) illustrated in figures 14 and 134-152 does not correspond with the AOI indicated in the EA application. Please ensure that the AOI's in the Scoping Report and EA application are aligned. D 4. Minor errors requiring corrections are as follows: a. Table 6 refers to a "proposed co-disposal facility", instead of proposed drilling activity. b. Table 41 refers to seismic exploration activities and reconnaissance permit, instead of the proposed drilling activity and exploration right.

18 states the following: "Any activity including the operation of that activity which requires an exploration right in terms of section 79 of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, as well as any other applicable activity as contained in this Listing Notice, in Listing Notice 1 of 2014 or in Listing Notice 3 of 2014, required to exercise the exploration right,". Based on interpretations received from the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) it is our understanding that the underlined section was included in the Listed Activity 18 in order to ensure that it would not be required to apply for the "other applicable activity as contained in this Listing Notice, in Listing Notice 1 of 2014 or in Listing Notice 3 of 2014, required to exercise the exploration right". We have updated the Scoping Report with a statement that the legal interpretation will be clarified and should it be required, additional listed activities as referred to in your comment will be included in the EIA Report and the Application form updated accordingly. C The AOI indicated in figures 14 and 134-152 are the same areas as indicated in the Application, with the difference being that the areas falling outside of the Licence Block 3B/4B having been "cut out" in the figures shown in the application form. No activities are proposed to be undertaken outside of the Licence Block 3B/4B area. Figures 14 and 134-152 will be updated to show the "cut out" AOI and this will be included in the EIA Report. D Thank you for bringing these to our attention. These errors have been corrected in the Scoping Report.

Bryan Chennells

Date 2023/10/06 Method Email

Comment

Please will you kindly remove me from your mailing list and posting list. I do not wish to any longer be provided with any updates on this Environmental Impact Assessment project/matter. Please let me know if you require anything further from me to ensure the above request is concluded.

Response

I can confirm that you have been removed from the mailing list of the Block 3B/4B Exploration Project. You should no longer receive communication regarding the project. Should you need anything further in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Elinor Lipschitz

Date 2023/08/18 Method Email

Comment

My name is Elinor Lipschitz. I am an architect and environmental activist living in Hout Bay Cape Town. Please register me as an interested and affected party. I object to AfricaOil developing block 3b/4b on the following grounds: 1) It is unnecessary to prospect for more fossil fuels when the environment is already dying because of the harm being caused by the currently extracted fossil fuels. 2) We need to protect our natural environments and animals, and keep

Response

Thank you for your email. We can confirm that you have been registered as an I&AP for this project. Your comments have also been received and noted.



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Elinor Lipschitz

their habitat safe and clean for them to thrive. 3) Only a few already rich people benefit from these developments, the majority remain poor, or worse, they have their livelihoods harmed.

John Van der Hoevr

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A Why don't the elected leaders of local, provincial, or national government not joining these consulting firms and address communities regarding these high risks economic development which comes and brings with them the degrading of the seabed and the environment. B Mitigation of birds in masses is not considered, the affects of the artificial lights shining from onboarded vessels around the rig and all the radio waves mixed with the noises of all heavy-duty industrial machinery, energy and manoeuvring equipment should be considered. C The mud and gravel which will be displaced by the drilling process is a major concern on itself after displacement and disturbance of the seafloor sediment.

Response

A EIMS can unfortunately speak on behalf of the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA), the competent authority or elected officials. Invitations were sent to all the relevant stakeholders. B Thank you for your comments. These aspects will be considered by the EIA and Specialist Team in the EIA Phase. C Thank you for your comment. A drill cutting modelling assessment was proposed to be undertaken during the EIA Phase as per Section 10.3. The results of this study will be presented in the EIA Report.

Elaine Mills

Date 2023/08/22 Method Email

Comment

A This is a comment on the Draft Scoping Report for a proposed exploration right for Africa Oil South Africa Corp (AOSAC), that will allow it to drill one exploration well and up to four additional wells in Block 3B/4B, approximately 120km west of St Helena Bay and approximately 145km south-west of Hondeklip Bay off the West Coast of South Africa. B As it stands, the report is flawed. It has to be broadened to include the full climate change impacts of Africa Oil's proposed drilling, its harmful effects on marine life and ecosystems, as well as its social costs and external liabilities. C The EIA needs to examine to what degree the planned drilling will disturb fish and marine species, destroy their breeding grounds, interrupt their migratory patterns and cause serious or irreversible harm to individual species and marine ecosystems. The scoping report states that the colossal squid and the giant squid may be encountered in the project area. Growing in excess of 10m in length, they are the principal prey of the sperm whale, and are also eaten by beaked whales, pilot whales, elephant seals and sleeper sharks. The report further states that the fish most likely to be encountered in the offshore waters of Block 3B/4B are the large migratory pelagic species, including various tunas, billfish and sharks, many of which are considered threatened according to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), primarily due to overfishing. Additionally, it is likely that juvenile

Response

A Comment noted. B It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant (i.e. exploration only). Any subsequent authorisation would be restricted to these specifically assessed activities. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration or production activities which are not addressed in the current Environmental Authorisation (EA) application, there would be a consequent need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for an Exploration or Production Right as well as a new EA. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment and public consultation prior to approval. It is premature to assess the likely impacts of further invasive exploration activities or production activities as the extent, duration, location, and magnitude applicable to these activities are unknown at this stage. The NEMA EIA Regulations make a clear distinction between the exploration, and production activities in that these are listed as distinct and separate listed activities. There is provision in law for these activities to be assessed on their merits as and when they are proposed. C Comment noted. A detailed Marine Ecological Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the marine ecology related impacts. D Comment noted. The significance of the identified impacts will be determined during the EIA Phase and

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Elaine Mills

great whites, right whales and whale sharks would migrate through Block 3B/4B. D Unless satisfactory mitigating measures can be proposed to offset the proposed drilling's harmful effects on marine life, which is unlikely, the EIA process and the project should be abandoned. E The report must clearly identify and map out fishing grounds used by small-scale or artisanal fishers to ensure that Africa Oil's project activities will not interfere with fishers' livelihoods. F Due to the licence area being located within the main vessel traffic routes that pass around southern Africa, ambient noise levels will be naturally elevated. This, together with additional noise associated with the proposed exploration project, would have a cumulative impact on marine fauna. G In addition to the increased noise impacting marine fauna, a big concern is oil spills which will have a devastating impact on the local environment. H The proposed project will likely result in decreased fish and marine species populations in the area, which will impact the small-scale and commercial fishing, tourism and aquaculture sectors. It will negatively impact communities residing on the coastline and relying on the ocean in or close to the area of interest. I Also, the project is unlikely to result in increased employment opportunities for the local community near the project site. Jobs will be for highly skilled people, and there will be few of them. J If Africa Oil finds and exploits oil and gas, it will increase the amount of greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions in the atmosphere, which will only deepen the climate change crisis and harm human health and well-being as well as the environment. It will contribute to more extreme weather conditions that will adversely affect food availability and affordability and result in loss of property due to sea-level rise, along with the direct impacts of catastrophic weather events and the associated deterioration in physical and mental health and well-being. Environmental impacts are likely to include increased temperatures, worsening and prolonged droughts, longer and more intense heatwaves, increases in extreme weather events, increased ocean acidity, decline in ecosystems and habitat, and increased rates. Given all this, the exploitation of oil and gas resources, and specifically in Block 3B/4B, is not needed or desirable. Globally, the proven reserves of oil and gas far exceed what can be used without causing catastrophic climate change. There is already sufficient proven oil to supply over double the GHG emissions consistent with 1.5°C, whilst already proven gas resources are nearly three times more than the 1.5°C budget. As a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement, South Africa has committed to limiting the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C. South Africa is not, however, on track to meet these commitments. According to the Climate Action Tracker, "South Africa's climate policies and commitments need substantial improvements to be consistent with the Paris Agreement's 1.5°C temperature limit." If all countries followed South Africa's "insufficient" approach to climate mitigation, "warming would reach over 2°C and up to 3°C." Pursuing more oil and gas projects, including offshore exploration and production, would push South Africa further away from achieving its international climate commitments. The phase-out of oil and gas is urgently needed to avert the climate crisis, to protect and promote the state's obligations to provide

where possible, the mitigation measures will be identified in an attempt to reduce the significance. The recommendation as to whether the project should proceed will depend on the final post-mitigation significance ratings. E The fishing grounds of the small-scale fishing sector are detailed in Section 8.4.5 of the Scoping Report. F A detailed Acoustics Impact Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. The cumulative impacts associated with noise have been described in Section 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report. The results of the acoustics model will be used by the fishing and marine ecology specialists to inform impacts on the associated aspects. Impacts have been identified for further investigation in the EIA Phase and are detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists' assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. G The potential for a well-blowout is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. H Comment noted. A detailed Marine Ecological Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the marine ecology related impacts. I It is agreed that exploration activities typically require highly skilled employment. However, where feasible, it is anticipated that the use of local labour could be utilised, but it is anticipated that this will be extremely limited, if at all. J Please refer to the responses given to #B above. A detailed Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment has been proposed as per Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. K Please refer to the responses given to #D above. L Thank you for your comments. We confirm that you are registered as an Interested and Affected Party for this Scoping and EIA process.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Elaine Mills

basic necessities such as water, food and shelter. Given this, the exploitation of oil and gas is not needed, is undesirable, is locally and globally irresponsible, is contrary to South Africa’s international climate change and biodiversity commitments, and contravenes the state’s obligations under section 24 of the Constitution, which states: “Everyone has the right to: an environment which is not harmful to their health or well-being.” Block 3B/4B is just one of countless hydrocarbon exploration and extraction applications offshore South Africa that will have hugely detrimental implications for people’s constitutional rights – their livelihoods, heritage and health rights – but also for marine life and ecosystem. K If all the pros and cons in terms of the impact to the people, the environment and on climate change are properly considered, the inevitable conclusion is that oil and gas resources must stay in the ground. L Please acknowledge receipt and register me as an interested and affected party.

Solene Smith

Date 2024/02/08 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Ek is baie bekommerd dat die projek in Blok 3B/4B want ek sien geen bewys in verslag dat die DMRE op \*\*\* ‘n stragetiese omgewings assesering plan nie (SEA vir die streek in ocean waar hulle mynbou werk in see wil doen dit is ‘n groot gaping en beteken dat al see department nie die CBF target se alle regerings moet seker maak hulle doen \*\*\* in die streke en gedeelte van ocean om seker te maak dat enige ontwikkeling in ocean sal volhoubaar wees Suid Afrika het dit nog nie gedoen nie. Ek glo in terme van grond wet artikel 24 is dit onwettig want hoe kan hulle die ekonomiese en omgewings gedeelte balanseer as hulle nie onkoste uitgewerk het nie. Belegging in meer fossiel brandstefte \*\*vererger die klimaat krisis sodra dit \*\*\* word sal olie en gas die hoereelheid kool\*\*\* (rest of sentence illegible). Die atmosfeer verhoog wat by \*\*\*\* tot klimaat verandering dit sal ‘n groot impak het op kleinskaal vissers gemeenskappe. Visvang is ons kultuur ons lewensbestaan. Die projek gaan impak op see die vis voels en diere \*le. Die see is een groot system ons is almal \*\*\* aan die oseaan vir \*\*\* en water. Dis ‘n groot risiko en ons wil nie he regering moet speel met kinders se toekoms nie dit kan ook verkies van meer R184.1 miljoen werknemers van nasionale ekonomie en verkies van 362 miljoen huishoudelike inkomste as gevolg van tidelike ontwigting ons het reg tot ons kultuur hoe? Kan regering voortgaan is hulle weet dat gaan n impak op ons kultuur het. Ons inheemse het die reg tot free prior informed concent ek het glad nie my concent gegee nie.

Response

As the comment is an objection and did not need specific responses towards points made, the I&AP was thanked for their comment, and told that their comment will be included in the final EIA Report. Dankie vir u e-pos. Ons kan bevestig dat u besonderhere is op ons database opgeneem. U kommentaar sal in ons finale verslag aangeteken word.

Johannes Walter Steenkamp

Date 2023/08/21 Method WhatsApp

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Johannes Walter Steenkamp

Comment	Response
I am a fisherman from Port Nolloth. Stop oil and gas exploration in our ocean. This will destroy our ocean and marine living resources	Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

Date	2023/06/14	Method	Email	
Comment	Response			
I received notification of an upcoming public participation process for the exploration project reference 1570. I would like to request you register the following people within your database of interested and affected parties: *****@naturaljustice.org *****@naturaljustice.org *****@naturaljustice.org Please confirm receipt of notice	Thank you for your email. We confirm that the members below have been registered as interested parties for this process with the details below.			

Date	2023/08/21	Method	Email	
Comment	Response			
A INTRODUCTION These submissions are made by Natural Justice and the Green Connection in response to the Draft Scoping Report published for comment by Environmental Impact Management Services (Pty) Ltd for the proposed exploration and environmental authorisation applications for Block 3B/4B on 19 July 2023. Comments are due on 21 August 2023. Natural Justice: Lawyers for Communities and the Environment is a non-profit organisation specialising in environmental and human rights law in Africa – with a focus on the pursuit of social and environmental justice for local and indigenous communities. Natural Justice offers direct support to local and indigenous communities impacted by the ever-increasing demand for land and natural resources. The Green Connection is a registered non-governmental organisation, that believes that economic growth and development, improvement of socio-economic status and conservation of natural resources can only take place within a commonly understood framework of sustainable development. The Green Connection aims to provide practical support to both the government and non-governmental/civil society sectors, which are an integral part of sustainable development. The organisations have an interest in this project, in the interests of the protecting the environment, in the interests of protecting the local and indigenous peoples and communities who will be impacted, as well as in the public interest. B OBJECTION TO THE EXPLOITATION OF OIL AND GAS RESOURCES The extraction, processing, storage, transport and end-use of oil and gas from the proposed exploration operations, and intended eventual exploitation, will result in unacceptable significant emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs), increasing atmospheric GHG levels and resulting in increased adverse impacts on human health and well-being and on the environment (species and ecosystems). Impacts on	A Comment noted. B It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant. Any subsequent authorisation would be restricted to these specifically assessed activities. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration or production activities which are not addressed in the current Environmental Authorisation (EA) application, there would be a consequent need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for an Exploration or Production Right as well as a new EA. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment and public consultation prior to approval. It is premature to assess the likely impacts of further invasive exploration activities or production activities as the extent, duration, location, and magnitude applicable to these activities are unknown at this stage. The NEMA EIA Regulations make a clear distinction between the exploration, and production activities in that these are listed as distinct and separate listed activities. There is provision in law for these activities to be assessed on their merits as and when they are proposed. Please refer to Section 5 of the Scoping Report in regard to the need and desirability for the proposed activities. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country’s energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa’s energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The			

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

human health and well-being are likely to include (among others) impacts from increased adverse environmental effects, impacts on food availability and affordability, loss of property due to sea-level rise, direct impacts of catastrophic weather events, and deterioration in physical and mental health and well-being. Environmental impacts are likely to include (among others) increased temperatures, worsening and prolonged droughts, longer and more intense heatwaves, increases in extreme weather events, increased ocean acidity, decline in ecosystems and habitat, and increased rates of species extinction. These impacts are significant and unacceptable. The exploitation of oil and gas resources, which is intended as the eventual outcome of this process, is not needed or desirable. Globally, the proven reserves of oil and gas far exceed what can be used without causing catastrophic climate change. There is already sufficient proven oil to supply over double the emissions consistent with 1.5°C, whilst already proven gas resources are nearly three times more than the 1.5°C budget. As a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement, South Africa has committed to limiting the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C. South Africa is not, however, on track to meet these commitments. According to the Climate Action Tracker, “South Africa’s climate policies and commitments need substantial improvements to be consistent with the Paris Agreement’s 1.5°C temperature limit.”<sup>1</sup> If all countries followed South Africa’s “insufficient” approach to climate mitigation, “warming would reach over 2°C and up to 3°C.”<sup>2</sup> Approving more oil and gas projects, including offshore exploration and production, would push South Africa further away from achieving its international climate commitments. As the public trustee of the environment generally, of biological diversity, of protected areas, and of coastal public property, the State must take measures to ensure that our oceans are used, managed, protected, conserved and enhanced in the interests of the whole community, for the benefit of present and future generations. The phase out of oil and gas is urgently needed to avert the climate crisis, to protect and promote the State’s obligations to provide basic necessities such as water, food, shelter and an environment that is not harmful to health or well-being. Given this, the exploration and exploitation of oil and gas is not needed, is undesirable, is locally and globally irresponsible, is contrary to South Africa’s international climate change and biodiversity commitments, and contravenes the State’s obligations under section 24 of the Constitution. Natural Justice and the Green Connection object to the authorisation of the proposed exploration activities. C COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT Notwithstanding the above, we provide further comments on the Draft Scoping Report. In our view, upon full and proper assessment, the impacts associated with exploration will be found to be highly significant and unacceptable, and the environmental authorisation should be refused. 1. Inadequate consideration of the appropriateness of opening an offshore area to hydrocarbon exploration 1.1. For the reasons stated above, the project is unnecessary, undesirable, and contrary to South Africa’s climate change commitments. The Scoping Report fails to consider the project’s impacts holistically, in the context of its contribution to climate

proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. The definition and development of National policy on climate change falls beyond the scope of the EIA process as an Integrated Environmental Management Tool. The NEMA Principles of Sustainable Development must be considered by the relevant Authorities in the development of South Africa’s policy and strategies related to Climate Change. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. C Please refer to the responses given to #B above. In terms of the Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment, the following will be undertaken, and this has been updated in the Scoping Report: The GHG emission inventory will be conducted according to the National Greenhouse Gas Emission Reporting Regulations (GN No. 275) which were published in terms of Section 53(aA),(o) and (p) of NEM:AQA on 3 April 2017, with amendments published on 11 September 2020. The purpose of these Regulations is to implement a single national reporting system for the transparent reporting of GHG emissions. Updated, methodological guidelines for quantification of GHG emissions were issued on 7 October 2022. For oil and gas exploration activities no specific thresholds have been set, which means that the Regulations require that carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) levels be reported annually via the South African Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reporting System (SAGERS). Although the Regulations have no specific local emission factors for oil and gas exploration, the appropriate Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) emission factors will be used, as quoted in the latest South African guidelines. Scope 1 GHG emissions will be assessed further in this Scoping and EIA process. Furthermore, it is proposed to employ the IPCC Tier 2 emission methodology, provided all information required to employ this approach is available. Tier 2 is a mass-balance approach. Flare GHG emission factors are also included in the Australian National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting (Measurement) Determination 2008 (Section 3.44 Method 1 – oil or gas exploration): The Climate Change Impact Assessment will be provided against the background of the GHG emission inventory, and it will include impacts against benchmarks for well testing facilities (if available) as well as the impact on the National GHG Inventory. All air emissions from the project would also include criteria and non-criteria pollutants such as sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>=NO+NO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), particulate matter (PM) and black carbon (BC). These emissions would also be quantified. Since

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

change, as well as South Africa's policies and global commitments. While the Scoping Report repeatedly states the EIA will include an assessment of "air quality and climate change" impacts, no details are provided as to what the assessment will evaluate. The EIA must evaluate the project's acute air quality impacts (e.g., emissions of particulate matter and other pollutants from vessels and operations) independent from the project's climate impacts. The assessment must include a full life-cycle assessment of the climate impacts that would result not only from the exploration process, but also from the exploitation and downstream combustion of hydrocarbons that would be produced should the project move forward into its next phases. D 1.2. The Scoping Report further fails to consider how the project might aggravate the impacts of climate change in the area, both on people and marine and coastal ecosystems. Impacts of the project beyond its eventual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions may operate as a threat multiplier, either reducing the resilience of communities to climate change, or exacerbating their challenges that climate change is making worse. For example, small-scale fishers may already be struggling with catches because of warming waters affecting fish spawning, recruitment, and fitness, while the project's planned noise pollution, drilling and produced water discharges, unplanned but catastrophic oil spill impacts may further reduce fish breeding and juvenile success. Importantly, the Benguela Upwelling Zone is home to several MPAs and CBAs that serve as nurseries for fish and shellfish. While the Scoping Report lists that the ESIA will include an Air Quality and Climate Change Impact Assessment, the brief Terms of Reference do not indicate that the specialist study will describe how the project will interact with and potentially exacerbate these vulnerabilities. The cumulative harm of the additional emissions on the natural environment and the livelihoods of people in South Africa who rely heavily on natural resources must be evaluated. E 2. The ESIA must comprehensively assess the cumulative impacts to marine life 2.1. Block 3B/4B lies within the Orange Basin, which extends from South Africa as far north as the Lüderitz Arch in Namibia. The Block has been subjected to multiple previous exploration activities, including 2D and 3D seismic surveys, and more than 38 exploratory wells have already been drilled on the shelf east of the Block. The Scoping Report acknowledges the possibility of future exploration in nearby blocks, including further proposed exploration well drilling near PEL39, in the Namibian extent of the Orange Basin. Beyond exploration, there is the intended realisation of production in Block 3B/4B if a significant discovery is made. The same holds true in other blocks in the Orange Basin in both South African and Namibian waters, meaning that the area could continue on a path to high offshore oil and gas industrialisation. 2.2. Despite the high volume of past, current, and potentially future oil and gas exploration activities in the region, the Scoping Report appears not to comprehensively assess the cumulative marine impacts of the project in conjunction with other activity the area and does not assess all "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future developments or impacts". The National Environmental Management Act, 107 of 1998 (NEMA), together with the EIA Regulations, requires that EIAs include, amongst other things, an assessment of the nature, extent, duration and significance of the consequences for or the

the well test operations would be relatively far removed from the public it is anticipated that air pollution concentrations may be low enough to be of any health concern. However, the option of predicting worst-case air concentration levels of the pollutants from the activities, and specifically along the coastline where these plumes could potentially reach the public, is included in the scope of works as an option. The USA Environmental Protection Agency's (US EPAs) Scipuff is the preferred model for estimating air pollutants. However, as an alternative, a screening level dispersion model could be considered, namely the US EPAs SCREEN3 model. Whilst this model does not have the same model capabilities as the Scipuff model of treating the land/sea air mass interface at the coastline, this requirement may not be particularly relevant due to the relatively long distance that the plume would have travelled from the operation ( $\geq 45$  km), i.e. the vertical dispersion of the elevated plume would've reached ground level at this distance and fumigation effects would be less significant. Criteria pollutant emission rates will similarly be quantified using appropriate emission factors such as those published by the US EPA's AP42 emission factor database, or other databases such as the European Environment Agency Emission Factor Guidebook 2019. For example, emission factors for NO<sub>2</sub>, CO and non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs) from flares are published in Table 3-3 Tier 2 emission factors for source category 1.B.2.c Venting and flaring, Well testing. Particulate matter including BC are from Table 3-1 Tier 1 emission factors for source category 1.B.2.c Venting and flaring, Flaring in oil and gas extraction. Combustion source emission factors will be sourced from the US EPA's database and/or the Australian National Pollution Inventory (NPi). Scope 3 emissions and emissions associated with the potential future extraction and exploitation of the resource will not be considered further in the EIA Phase, as the project only relates to exploration activities, and it would not be possible to accurately determine size of the resource at this stage. Once exploration is complete and a resource has been defined, the Scope 3 emissions could be considered during a potential future production right application. D The results of the Air Quality and Climate Change will provide an estimate of the overall contribution to climate change as a result of the proposed exploration activities associated with this project. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists' assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. However, it should be noted that the cumulative impact assessment is limited and constrained by the method used for identifying and analysing cumulative effects. As it is not practical to analyse the cumulative effects of an action on every environmental receptor, the list of environmental effects being considered to inform decision makers and stakeholders should focus on those that can be meaningfully assessed (DEAT 2004). E Please refer to the response provided to #B above. The specialist marine fauna assessment to be undertaken in the EIA phase will consider cumulative impacts on marine life. It cannot be said with absolute certainty that exploration within Block 3B/ 4B will necessarily lead to production within the same block. As an example of a recent case, the exploration drilling that took place in Block 2B did not yield a positive result for the holder of the right. The Scoping Report does provide a detailed description



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

impacts on the environment of that activity, including the cumulative impacts. 2.3. It does not even try. The Scoping Report declines to assess the cumulative environmental impacts that could arise from further exploration or production activities in the area. Instead, the Scoping Report maintains that “[a]s these cannot at this stage be reasonably defined, it is not possible to undertake a reliable assessment of the potential cumulative environmental impacts.” 2.4. It is reasonably foreseeable that the proposed exploration activities may lead to eventual production activities, as is their intent. Similarly, it is reasonably foreseeable that proposed or approved seismic surveys (TGS Orange Basin Reconnaissance Permit); exploration (Deep Water Orange Basin Licence Block 12/3/343; TotalEnergies EP South Africa Block 567; Sezigyn ER340; PEL39 in Namibian waters); and production (Sunbird and PetroSA Block 2A) could contribute, along with the proposed exploration, to additive stressors on marine life in the region. Inshore to Block 3B/4B in the Orange Basin, Eco (Atlantic) Oil & Gas has already commenced with exploratory drilling in Block 2B (as of October 2022). F 2.5. The cumulative impact of increased background anthropogenic noise levels in marine environments is an ongoing and widespread issue of concern. Impacts across large spatial scales or multiple species are rarely considered, but recent research indicates that repeat seismic surveys reduce cetacean occurrence across large marine ecosystems. Repeat seismic surveys may also disrupt fish migration patterns, as is suspected in Southern Namibian tuna fishing grounds, where catches have severely declined since 2011, and in 2017 dropped off to non-commercial catch rates. 2.6. The ESIA must assess the immediate and chronic impacts of cumulative sonar and seismic surveys and drilling activities in the area, not just from a singular exploration project. The ESIA must carefully examine the full footprint of impacts from sonar surveys and drilling activities in the context of their additive nature. 2.7. The ESIA must also evaluate the condition of existing well plugs. Concrete used in well casings and plugging degrades over time, especially in seawater. Consequently, the ESIA must account for the cumulative effects of the degradation of existing plugs resulting from prior exploration endeavours, as well as the degradation of this project’s well plugs over the years. These impacts should be taken into consideration alongside ongoing and forthcoming activities. 2.8. The ESIA must also provide a comprehensive explanation of the baseline environment, which includes analysis of past impacts and current threats in conjunction with the impacts that are likely to result from the proposed activities. Despite this requirement, the Scoping Report fails to list in the Marine Ecology terms of reference any analysis of the cumulative impacts of climate change in conjunction with the impacts of the proposed exploration activities. G 3. The project would carry an unacceptable risk of a catastrophic oil spill 3.1. Exploratory well drilling can have devastating, widespread consequences to marine life and coastal communities. 3.2. One of the greatest environmental threats from offshore drilling operations is a major spill of crude oil and/or natural gas occurring either from a loss of well control or blow-out. 3.3. Exploratory drilling carries an increased risk of blow-out. The risk of a catastrophic oil spill is highest at the exploratory drilling stage, and despite reassurances from regulators and companies, happen all too often. For

of the receiving environment, and then details the anticipated impacts – direct, indirect, residual and cumulative – identified based on the scoping of the receiving environment. The description of the receiving environment details the bio-physical, socio-economic and cultural aspects, as well as the existing and other uses of the offshore west coast environment. The past and present impacts are inherently described as a result of the description, while the identification of the anticipated aspects affected by the proposed project provides an indication of the future impacts. Cumulative impacts are identified and described in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report. For the purposes of this Scoping and EIA process, consideration will be given to existing permits/rights and/or permits/ rights that have been applied for along the west coast and which would reasonably be expected to be considered as part of an application of this nature. Section 9.4 does make clear mention of the fact that “there are a number of current reconnaissance permit applications for proposed seismic surveys off the northern West Coast of South Africa (as of December 2022), and within the Deep Water Orange Basin,” and further states that “it is unlikely that all these will be undertaken as they are targeting a similar area.” F A detailed Acoustics Impact Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. The cumulative impacts associated with noise have been described in Section 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report. The results of the acoustics model will be used by the fishing and marine ecology specialists to inform impacts on the associated aspects. Impacts have been identified for further investigation in the EIA Phase and are detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists’ assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. In terms of the evaluation of the condition of existing well plugs, the NEMA Polluter Pays Principle provides that the cost of remedying pollution and environmental degradation rests with those responsible for the pollution. The NEMA further provides that the holder of any mineral or petroleum right must set aside adequate financial provision for post closure activities, and any residual and latent environmental impacts. It is therefore understood that it is the responsibility of the specific holder to ensure that the condition and integrity of the well plugs and barriers are maintained and provide for latent effects. The assessment of cumulative impacts are an inherent requirement of the EIA Regulations (2014), as amended, and it is, therefore, not required to itemise these as part of the terms of reference for the marine ecologist. As stated above, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists’ assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. The specialists will, in the relevant assessments consider the implications of global climate change at a high level and how the exploration project may be affected by such change or exacerbate such change. G The potential for a well-blowout is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

example, the 2010 BP Deepwater Horizon was an exploratory well 1,500 metres deep that spilled 200 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico, with devastating impacts on ocean ecosystems, the livelihoods of coastal communities, and the tourism industry. The spill caused the massive killing of marine mammals, fish, and birds. The Gulf region experienced precipitous and long-term declines in fisheries and tourism revenue; in the 10 years after the spill, commercial and recreational fishing industries alone lost roughly 25,000 jobs and \$2.3 billion in industry output. BP and its partners have spent over 70 billion dollars to mitigate the disasters impacts. 3.4. The Deepwater Horizon disaster is not anomalous. At least 711 offshore blowouts and/or well releases have occurred world-wide since 1955, though this is certainly an underestimate given data gathering limitations and records, not to mention releases from abandoned wells. Other major well blowouts include the 126-million-gallon Ixtoc I exploratory well blowout in 1979 in the Gulf of Mexico, the Chevron Campos Basin well rupture in deep waters off the coast of Brazil in 2011, and the ongoing 19-year Taylor Energy spill, which continues to leak as much as 700 barrels (bbl) of oil each day into the Gulf of Mexico. 3.5. As energy companies increasingly move to drilling in deeper waters globally, they are creating even more risk of another catastrophic spill. Drilling in deeper waters raises the risk of accidents due to higher bottom water pressure as well as higher pressure within the oil and gas pockets. The deeper the well, the higher the likelihood of encountering high pressure/high temperature hydrocarbon bearing formations like that involved in the Deepwater Horizon disaster. By definition, a blowout is the uncontrolled release of crude oil and/or gas from a well after pressure control systems have failed. The higher hydrocarbon formation pressures faced in deep sea drilling mean pressure control systems must be stronger than those in many shallower drilling scenarios to withstand and counteract these extreme conditions. 3.6. While the Deepwater Horizon disaster occurred during “deep” exploratory drilling (800-2400 m depth), AOSAC’s plan in the Block 3b/4b is to drill up to five wells between 1000 and 3000 m, extending past the “deep” drilling range and into the “ultra-deep” range (below 2400 m depth). 3.7. The probability of industry-reported serious accidents, fatalities, injuries, explosions, or fires grows by 8.5 percent with every additional 100 feet (~30 m) of depth at which an offshore platform operates. This means that the risk from drilling the deepest well proposed for Block 3b/4b (3000 m) could increase the risk of a serious accident by over 450% compared to the well at issue in the Deepwater Horizon accident (given that the Macondo 252-1 well was in waters 1500 m deep). 3.8. High technological and logistical barriers to accessing and capping deep well blowouts or leaks also increase risks. Increasing depth means increasingly cold temperatures, increasingly higher pressures, and increasingly difficult working conditions that necessitate the use of specialised remotely-operated vehicles capable of withstanding high bottom water pressures (as would be the case in the deeper sections of the area of interest). 3.9. The Scoping Report incorrectly states that a well blow-out “can also be prevented by following the specialist mitigation measures,” but as experience has shown, no amount of caution can completely eliminate this risk. 3.10. The EIA must address all of the above considerations, along with

and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. In assessing the impacts associated with an oil spill, past oil spill events and other similar case studies will be considered to inform the magnitude and residual impacts associated with a potential future event. H Please refer to the responses given to #B above. Consideration has been given to the relevant impacts of a project of this nature on the various ecosystem services in the identification of the impacts on the marine environment, fishing industry, social-economic environment, and the cultural landscape and traditional uses. The NEMA EIA regulations define EIA as ‘a systematic process of identifying, assessing and reporting environmental impacts associated with an activity’. EIA as an integrated environmental management tool is therefore inherently project focused. I The Marine Ecology Study will be based on a very wide literature search. The baseline descriptions used for such specialist assessment reports is continuously updated to include new information from the peer-reviewed literature of from research reports in the public domain. In the case where information gaps exist, or detailed data on populations is lacking, this is identified, and the sensitivity of individual receptors is subsequently considered as part of the impact assessment. Information on cetacean distribution is also constantly updated with information received from MMOs on seismic survey vessels. The approach adopted in the marine ecology specialist assessment will utilize and apply the precautionary principle to account for all species historically known to be present, as well as species for which suitable habitat may have existed within Block3B/4B, instead of relying on ‘snapshot’ insights that would have been obtained from a one-off survey. The precautionary principle requires action to prevent serious and irreversible damage even before harm can be scientifically demonstrated. This approach is especially important due to the seasonal migratory behaviour of many of the species, as well as the fact that some species numbers have been affected greatly historically. The precautionary principle assumes the presence of species and the marine ecological study will assess impacts on this basis. J Where information on climate change effects on populations is available, this has been included in the baseline description. Information on coastal sensitivity (Threat status of various benthic habitat types) is included in the baseline based on information from the 2018 NBA (Harris et al. 2019). It includes the detection of coastal erosion hotspots and was completed in June 2020 (DEFF & CSIR 2020). A further report on the analysis of hotspots was released in early 2021 (DEFF & CSIR 2021). The impact assessment methodology that will be used, by its nature already considers past and current activities and impacts. The potential cumulative impact is assessed for each impact, thereby taking into consideration the potential impacts of the proposed activity, relative to other marine exploration, production, and mining activities off the West Coast. For example, in considering the impact on the benthic environment cognisance will be taken of the benthic ecosystem threat status, which is based on past and current impacts and activities. Similarly, the assessment of the impact on cetaceans considers the sensitivity of the receptor and associated local or IUCN conservation rating, which is determined based on criteria such as rate of decline, population size, area of

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

complete modelling of worst-case scenarios should a blow-out occur. Accurate modelling of the fate of oil or gas condensate from a well blowout or leak must consider the depth of the emission, its force and maximum quantities emitted given realistic timeframes for gaining control of the well, the depth of the well, and the density of released hydrocarbons. The oil spill modelling must also incorporate results of laboratory analyses of the target hydrocarbons. H 4. The ESIA should address broader environmental and socio-economic considerations outside the control of the proponent 4.1. Functioning ecosystems are the lifeblood of individuals, communities, businesses and ultimately the entire planet. The benefactors are profoundly dependent on the services that these ecosystems supply. And often as is the case now the world's ecosystem, and particularly the offshore regions where there is an abundance of biodiversity, are under increasing strain in the name of development. 4.2. The costs of ecosystem degradation are often not fully comprehended until the damage has already been done. When considering new projects, accurate, upfront assessment of both impacts on, and dependence on, ecosystem services is essential. Here, existing environmental and social impact assessments meant to judge the impacts on the natural environment and local communities, often fall short. 4.3. The ESIA must specifically account for the project's entire lifecycle impacts on the ecosystem service benefits, as confirmed in recent judgements pronouncing that exploration and production phases are intrinsically intertwined and are discrete stages in a single process. The ESIA must not overlook future generations who will be vulnerable to ecosystem change. A failure to consider some of the harmful social and economic consequences of a project's environmental effects beyond the temporal scope of exploration can lead to a false sense of security about the project's overall impact, and can make it difficult to develop effective mitigation strategies for a project's long-term impacts. 4.4. Therefore, it is crucial that impact assessments, like the present one, thoroughly evaluate the potential consequences of a diminished or lost ecosystem services provided to local coastal communities and fisherfolk peoples who rely on marine resources. I 5. The ESIA must accurately describe up-to-date environmental baseline conditions 5.1. Appropriate and up-to-date scientific information should be available to inform a comprehensive assessment of impacts, before a decision can be made whether to authorise a harmful activity. A comprehensive and accurate assessment of the potential impacts requires a robust understanding of the current state and potential stressors Without a thorough understanding of the current state and potential sensitivities of marine ecosystems, it is not possible to evaluate the significance of future impacts accurately and to accurately assess the cumulative environmental effects. 5.2. Section 2(4)(a)(vii) of NEMA provides that sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors, including "that a risk-averse and cautious approach is applied, which takes into account the limits of current knowledge about the consequences of decisions and actions". In *WWF South Africa v Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and others*, the Court found that "[p]otential errors are 'weighted in favour of environmental protection', the object being 'to safeguard ecological space or environmental room for maneuver.<sup>27</sup> 5.3. The precautionary

geographic distribution, and degree of population and distribution fragmentation. The implications of global climate change will be considered at a high level and how the exploration project may be affected by such change or exacerbate such change. K Please refer to the responses given to #B above. The scope of the assessment of any economic benefits will be limited to the exploration activities only and will not consider any potential future economic impacts, positive or negative, during production. However, the Economic Impact Assessment will include a detailed assessment of the sectors operating within the receiving environment. The economic impact assessment will consist of three assessment phases and culminates in a perspective on the impact (and extent thereof) of the proposed project within the receiving economy: 1. The impact assessment will first undertake a synthesis of the potential impacts identified from the profiling analyses of the receiving economy. The purpose of the synthesis is to identify areas of impact or key impact themes, that is relevant to the proposed project and that can be included into the economic impact assessment. Once the synthesis of potential economic impacts has been completed and the key impact themes have been identified, impacts associated with each theme is identified and described. 2. By making use of the key impact themes (and associated impacts per theme), quantitative economic impact of the proposed project will be modelled to determine the quantified net gains or loss imposed by the proposed project on the receiving economy. The quantitative economic impact assessment is based on a bespoke input-output model developed for the economic impact assessment. The model quantifies the economic impact of each impact theme (and relevant impacts) based on several metrics (additional business sales, additional GDP, additional employment, additional fiscal benefits, SMME opportunities and household income growth) and determines the total net economic impact of the proposed project and the gains and/or losses it poses to the receiving economy. 3. The key impact themes and relevant impacts per theme will then be assessed within the qualitative economic impact assessment framework. The qualitative analysis will make use of the impact significance rating methodology as defined by the Scoping Report Section 9.1. It should further be noted that the engagement strategy did not only include for engagement with the traditional leaders that identify as Khoisan or indigenous, but aimed to also include a broad range of stakeholders, including members of the small-scale fishing, aquaculture, tourism, sectors to name a few. It should further be noted that Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report details that there will be close interface between EIMS and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) teams to ensure that project messaging is consistent. Engagement and meetings with the communities will include, contact details of key community representatives; best methods for future consultation; best methods for the dissemination of information/report and better ways of raising issues of concern, specifically regarding issues that relate to the research on cultural heritage at the coast. L Please refer to section 10.3 for details of the terms of reference for the Cultural Heritage Assessment (CHA). It should be noted that the CHA draws from ongoing research undertaken by the Nelson Mandela University (NMU). The study is not limited to 35 days and will be assessing along the west coast. Furthermore, the CHA, with reference to Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

approach is applicable to limits on available information during both exploration and production phases, as confirmed by the court in *Sustaining the Wild Coast NPC and others v Minister of Mineral Resources and others*.<sup>28</sup> 5.4. The proposed activity, along with other marine exploration, production, and mining activities off the West Coast, can significantly increase the intensity of environmental stressors on the broader regional ecosystem. This could alter the current risk status to marine biodiversity and climatic conditions, given the uncertainty and poor knowledge of the extent of species-level and ecosystem-level impacts. 5.5. The ESIA should not rely on outdated information and data from previous environmental impact assessments for other marine exploration, production, and mining activities off the West Coast. If the ESIA does not incorporate a comprehensive and up-to-date understanding of the regional environmental trends within the offshore areas demarcating the Orange Basin, there is a risk that it will miss critical interactions and fail to implement effective mitigation strategies. 5.6. The Draft Scoping Report appears to not address the lack of availability of a regional baseline for multiple components of the marine and coastal ecosystems potentially impacted. Accurate and up-to-date baselines ensure the efficiency of any subsequent project-specific environmental assessment conducted within the same region. 5.6.1. The Scoping Report indicates no adequate baseline for cetacean populations will be included in the ESIA. For example, it is stated: “The individual and population level consequences of other exploration activities or multiple smaller and more localised stressors are difficult to assess. Information on the population trends of resident species of baleen and toothed whales is unfortunately lacking, and the potential effects of seismic noise on such populations remains unknown” and “Information on the population trends of resident species of baleen and toothed whales is unfortunately lacking, and the potential effects of seismic noise on such populations remains unknown. While it is foreseeable that further exploration (seismic and well-drilling) and future production activities could arise if the current application is granted, there is not currently sufficient information available to make reasonable assertions as to nature of such future activities. This is primarily due to the current lack of relevant geological and resource potential information, which the proposed exploration process aims to address” J 5.6.2. Climate change is a measurable reality, and South Africa and its coastal waters are particularly vulnerable to its impacts. This means that the baseline state for marine and coastal ecological systems in South Africa is changing. Animal migrations and feeding habits shift with changing environmental drivers. As an example, since 2011, super-groups of humpback whales ranging from 20 to 200 individuals have been observed in the coastal region of the Southern Benguela current between St Helena Bay and Cape Point. A feeding strategy of densely packed individuals is unprecedented in this region, and researchers have concluded that shifting oceanographic regimes are resulting in large phytoplankton blooms that precede super-group feeding strategy events. 5.6.3. Given how quickly cetacean distribution and feeding and breeding patterns are changing due to shifting ocean temperatures, currents, and resource availability, this substantial knowledge gap must be remedied by new surveys that cover all seasons over two

will not be limited to the Khoisan, but will incorporate all of the cultural heritage and intangible aspects prevalent to the study area. M It should be noted that the interests of the whole community (from and intra- and inter-generational perspective, as well as having regard to potential impacts on living organisms in South Africa’s coastal waters) will indeed be assessed in the assessing of the marine ecology, the impact on the fishing industry, the detailed social and cultural heritage assessments, the detailed acoustic, oil spill and drill cutting modelling, the detailed economic assessment and the public consultation undertaken. With regards to the requirements of Section 63 of the NEM:ICMA, the Competent Authority will have to decide whether it will have sufficient information at their disposal in order to reach an informed decision regarding the proposed activity. N The purpose of this process is to invite I&APs to comment on the draft scoping report so as to inform the environmental impact assessment study. The exploration right (which was granted 2019) is not a document which must be disclosed for purposes of this environmental authorisation granting process. If notwithstanding the explanation above an I&AP still seeks a copy of the exploration right then such I&AP has the election to exercise its rights under PAIA by applying to the Petroleum Agency or DMRE for a copy alternatively the exploration right can be inspected at the public registry office, namely the Mineral and Petroleum Titles Registration Office. O It is understood that the JV Partners hold the following interests: Africa Oil SA Corp - 26.25 %; Ricocure – 53.75 %; and Azinam -20 %. P Please find attached a copy of the Environmental Authorisation and final Scoping Report. Q During the initial technical prospect evaluation, the northern area of the block was considered to have far higher prospectivity and therefore the JV a selected that area for a seismic reprocessing project of the 3D data that was acquired in 2013 by BHP/Shell. R It is understood that no reconnaissance activities were undertaken as part of the Exploration Right. S The purpose of this process is to invite I&APs to comment on the draft scoping report so as to inform the environmental impact assessment study. The exploration right renewal application it is not a document which is required to be disclosed for purposes of environmental authorisation granting process. If notwithstanding the explanation above an I&AP still seeks a copy of the renewal application, then such I&AP has the election to exercise its rights under PAIA by applying to the Petroleum Agency or DMRE for a copy. T Please refer to Appendix 5 of the Scoping Report.

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

years at minimum. 5.6.4. There is inadequate baseline data on beaked whales in the study area, as the Scoping Report admits: There are almost no data available on the abundance, distribution or seasonality of the smaller odontocetes (including the beaked whales and dolphins) known to occur in oceanic waters (>200 m) off the shelf of the southern African West Coast. Beaked whales are all considered to be true deep-water species usually being seen in waters in excess of 1 000 – 2 000 m deep (see various species accounts in Best 2007). Presence in the project area may fluctuate seasonally, but insufficient data exist to define this clearly. Beaked whales seem to be particularly susceptible to man-made sounds and several strandings and deaths at sea, often en masse, have been recorded in association with naval mid-frequency sonar (Cox et al. 2006; MacLeod & D'Amico 2006) and a seismic survey for hydrocarbons also running a multi-beam echo-sounder and sub bottom profiler (Cox et al. 2006). 5.6.5. Beaked whales and dolphins are commonly observed in Block 3B/4B by marine mammal observers (MMOs) during seismic surveys. Beaked whales dive to great depths to forage and spend long periods of time deep underwater. The observations from MMOs at the surface, though numerous, are an underestimation of their abundance in the Block. 5.6.6. The operating frequencies of the proposed single beam and multi-beam sonar falls into the high frequency kHz range, overlapping with cetacean's hearing sensitivity frequency range, particularly for cetaceans of High Frequency and Very High Frequency hearing groups, which includes the beaked whales and dolphins known to be in the Block. Such frequencies would be audible for long distances (tens of km) before attenuating to below threshold levels. 5.6.7. Given the lack of baseline information on cetacean distribution and seasonality in the Block, particularly for the most acoustically sensitive cetacean groups, a precautionary approach should be taken such that where the impacts of exploration cannot be accurately predicted, the activity should not be authorised. K 6. The ESIA must comprehensively assess economic impacts 6.1. The TOR and scope of the Economic Impact Assessment must consider short-term to long-term implications of economic impacts for the complete life cycle of the project including production, paying particular attention to irreversible, permanent and irreplaceable losses of natural and heritage resources. 6.2. In addition, the assessment ought to consider the full spectrum of contexts in which economic impacts on fishing both commercial and small-scale, food security and livelihood development may be realised ie the local, regional and national context. The scope of the economic impact assessment should adopt a range of scenarios to test the potential economic impacts of various development paths within the regional western coastal area within South Africa EEZ. The basis of the assessment of scenarios must include: 6.3. The cost benefit of addressing the threat of climate change and the necessity to move to net zero economy. Net Zero commitments creates barriers to oil and gas development and taxes on emissions will dis-incentivize investment in oil and gas developments. 6.4. An evaluation of the net socio-economic benefits of the no go option – the status quo provides livelihoods for many coastal dwellers and provides both cultural value and contributes to their well-being. Not going ahead with the project will continue those benefits – going ahead risks



Mr Allan Basajjasubi

undermining and destroying these communities. 6.5. An evaluation of the cost benefits of a business as usual taking into consideration the fluctuation of the global energy prices of oil and gas and the availability of imports 6.6. An evaluation of demand within the context of a carbon border adjustment tax regime and transitions to renewable energy systems. 6.7. An identification and incorporation of priority ecosystem services for inclusion within the terms of reference. By adopting this approach, the economic assessment can pinpoint the pertinent ecosystem services that necessitate consideration. Moreover, this aids in identifying the relevant stakeholders that should be actively engaged throughout the assessment. The process should consider the following: 6.7.1. In identifying and incorporating priority ecosystems services for inclusion, an inclusive stakeholder engagement strategy must extend beyond engaging solely with indigenous communities, though their cultural and indigenous intangible heritage are deeply connected to the concerned area. The engagement strategy should extend to encompass fishers who may not explicitly identify as Khoisan or indigenous. These fishers possess tangible and intangible cultural heritage that is intricately interwoven with their fishing practices, harvesting activities, and diverse interactions with the ocean. 6.8. By incorporating a holistic approach to assessing the socio-economic scenarios that impact tangible and intangible cultural heritage that is linked to fishing harvesting and use of the ocean in diverse ways, the socio-economic dimensions of the project's environmental impacts can be effectively captured. This holistic approach ensures that unforeseen costs and benefits linked to the project are adequately considered. In this manner, the assessment should endeavour to identify stakeholders who might otherwise remain overlooked, guaranteeing a well-rounded perspective on the potential ramifications of the project. 6.9. In conclusion, the Economic Impact assessment should encompass the entire project lifecycle, from short to long term, focusing on irreversible losses of natural and heritage resources. This evaluation must span various economic contexts, considering factors like global energy price fluctuations, carbon border adjustment tax regimes, and transitions to renewable energy systems. Priority ecosystem services should be identified and incorporated into the assessment, involving stakeholders beyond indigenous communities, extending to fishers with cultural ties to the area. A comprehensive approach to assessing socio-economic scenarios linked to fishing and ocean use will ensure the project's environmental impacts are adequately addressed. This inclusive strategy aims to capture unforeseen costs and benefits while recognizing stakeholders that may otherwise be overlooked, providing a well-rounded understanding of the project's potential consequences. L 7. The ESIA must comprehensively assess cultural heritage impacts 7.1. The plan of study for the Cultural Heritage Assessment (CHA) appears to follow the same methodology as a number of other recent similar studies in EIA processes which NJ and The Green Connection have participated. It dedicates only 35-days of field work to cover the coastline from the Namibian border from Alexander Bay to the Gqeberha region. We believe that this is inadequate to properly consult with indigenous and local communities, and to understand and assess their cultural heritage. 7.2. Further, the CHA should not concentrate



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Allan Basajjasubi

only on assessing impacts on Khoisan cultural heritage and intangible aspects, but should include an assessment of cultural heritage of indigenous fisher communities, distinct from indigenous groups. There are many fishers who do not specifically identify as Khoisan or indigenous, but possess significant tangible and intangible cultural heritage intertwined with their fishing, harvesting, and ocean-related activities, showcasing diverse cultural connections. A comprehensive CHA requires engagement with indigenous structures and groups, as well as traditional, small-scale fishers from different locales. M 8. The ESIA must take into account relevant integrated coastal management considerations 8.1. According to section 63(1) of the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, 24 of 2008, various factors must be taken into account in deciding on an application for environmental authorisations for “coastal activities”. The ESIA holds the responsibility of integrating a forward-looking perspective into its assessment. This requires a comprehensive evaluation encompassing the impact’s scale, duration and range concerning the interests of the whole community, as defined in the Act. N REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION 9. The Draft Scoping Report acknowledges that the Joint Venture Partners are the holders of an Exploration Right for Block 3B/4B. 9.1. Please provide a copy of the Exploration Right. O 9.2. What is the respective interest holding percentage of the JV partners? P 9.3. Were the JV Partners granted an environmental authorisation at the time that the right was awarded? If so, please provide access to copies of the environmental authorisation, as well as the EIA process that preceded the granting of the authorisation. 9.4. Please provide a copy of the approved EMPR associated with the Exploration Right, and any audit report for the EMPR. Q 10. Please explain what is meant by the following sentence, particularly in respect of the underlined portion: “As part of the process of applying for the

Monica Stassen

Date 2023/06/22 Method Email

Comment

Good day Please note I wish to register as an interested and affected party for the above-mentioned project. Kind regards Monica

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that you have been added to the project’s I&AP database.

Date 2023/08/31 Method Email

Comment

I received the email below, but my understanding was that the deadline for comment on the scoping report had passed. Will it be re-opened to consider any comments from the public meetings? Kind regards

Response

Thank you for your email. The public meetings to be held in Cape Town and Hout Bay were rescheduled because of the recent civil unrest in the area. The scoping report has already been submitted, and the review period subsequently closed. However, should you have comments,

Monica Stassen

these will be welcome during the EIA review period.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

A letter was submitted via email with the following content: Re: Notification Regarding Opportunity to Participate in The Environmental Authorisation Application Process for The Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration. As an Interested & Affected Party, The Southern African Foundation for the Conservation of Coastal Birds (SANCCOB) hereby, submits comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report for proposed exploratory drilling in Block 3B and 4B on the West Coast of South Africa. SANCCOB has already participated in several ESIA/ EIA processes for exploratory drilling in South Africa. The Southern African Foundation for the Conservation of Coastal Birds (SANCCOB) is a non-profit marine conservation organisation, with two centres situated in Cape Town (Western Cape) and Gqeberha (Eastern Cape). SANCCOB’s primary objective is to reverse the decline of seabird populations in southern Africa, the flagship species being the endangered African penguin, which is endemic to the African continent. This is achieved through the rescue, rehabilitation and release of ill, injured, and oiled seabirds or abandoned chicks that need specialised hand-rearing. SANCCOB has a long history of oiled wildlife response along the South African coastline and has responded to every oil spill that has affected seabirds since 1968. SANCCOB regularly engages with governmental stakeholders and industry and has made clear recommendations to minimise or mitigate risks to marine wildlife. Furthermore, SANCCOB is the named responder for seabirds affected by oil pollution in South Africa’s National Oil Spill Contingency Plan (NOSCP). SANCCOB wants to note with concern a substantial gap in the Draft EIA Report; there is no reference to or suggested recommendation for an oiled wildlife contingency plan or any wildlife response strategy. This is concerning as this point was raised in the public participation meetings for the scoping report held in October 2023. A wildlife contingency plan is a critical component of any oil pollution response as it provides a detailed overview of the species at risk, the most appropriate response strategies, allocates roles and responsibilities, and provides a detailed overview of tier 1, 2 and 3 capabilities (equipment and personnel). In addition, none of the recommendations focus on building/ having access to a stockpile of oiled wildlife response equipment nearby. Whilst the probability of an oil spill is considered low, it is well documented in the draft EIA that if one happens, the resulting environmental impact would be significant. The oil spill modelling reinforces this concern. An oil spill under the right circumstances could impact sensitive areas and potentially even reach seabird colonies home to hundreds of at risk species. This is not in line with international best practices for wildlife preparedness (IPIECA 2017)1. 1. Risk of a blow-out/oil spill Considerations must also be given not only to the increased number of vessels operating around the drilling

Response

SANCOB has been registered as a key I&AP in the process. Section 9.3.1 of the EIAR includes the identification and assessment of the impact on seabirds during normal operating conditions as well as in the unlikely event of a well blow out. The following mitigation measure has been included as a recommendation of the EIAR and a requirement in the EMPr: “The OSCP and BOCP must include an oiled wildlife contingency plan or any wildlife response strategy developed in consultation with the specialist wildlife response organisations (e.g. SANCCOB). Such plan must consider and align with international best practice, including the IPIECA Wildlife Response Preparedness Guidelines.”. The shipping vessel traffic within the Block 3B/4B is described in Section 8.9 of the EIAR. Section 9.3.1.3.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the impact associated with the accidental release of oil due to vessel collisions. There will be a vessel exclusion area of 500m around the drilling vessel during drilling activities. The EIAR and the EMPr include the following mitigation measure: “Develop a well-specific response strategy and plans (OSCP and Blow-out Contingency Plan – BOCP), aligned with the National OSCP, for each well location that identifies the resources and response required to minimise the risk and impact of oiling (shoreline and offshore). This response strategy and associated plans must take cognisance to the local oceanographic and meteorological seasonal conditions, local environmental receptors and local spill response resources”. Regarding the comment on the scheduling of the drilling operations, whilst it is expected that safe drilling operations can be conducted year-round, the operator would need to consider the optimum period based on all relevant considerations (including operational, economic, environmental, or safety considerations). There are no specific guidelines or standards for safe weather conditions. Safe operations are vessel and activity specific. Vessel operator and drilling contractor will take decision whether safe to proceed based on their standard risk assessment procedures specific to the vessel and activities being undertaken. The EIAR and the EMPr include the following mitigation measure: “Develop a well-specific response strategy and plans (OSCP and Blow-out Contingency Plan – BOCP), aligned with the National OSCP, for each well location that identifies the resources and response required to minimise the risk and impact of oiling (shoreline and offshore). This response strategy and associated plans must take cognisance to the local oceanographic and meteorological seasonal conditions, local environmental receptors and local spill response resources”. The development of a wildlife response plan in collaboration with specialist wildlife response organisations will be added to the mitigation measures and recommendations. Regarding drilling windows, wells can be safely drilled year-round in the conditions anticipated on the licence area, however, drilling rig schedules do consider weather conditions to the extent necessary. The disturbance to marine

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Monica Stassen

site but also to the high vessel traffic in the area which increases the potential for vessel collision. The drilling area is located within the main traffic routes that pass around southern Africa, which experience high vessel traffic. The weather conditions off the coast of South Africa can be dangerous, thereby increasing the risk of an oil spill incident. Oil spill response companies will be ineffective if the sea and/or weather conditions are too rough. On page 409 of the Environmental Impact Assessment report, under the section that addresses how large or small spills should be handled, one of the project mitigation measures includes "As far as possible, avoid scheduling drilling operations during the periods when weather and metocean conditions make safe drilling operations less than optimal." Are there any guidelines for what safe weather/ metocean conditions are? Or is that at the discretion of the operator? If it is at the discretion of the operator what safeguards are there to ensure they are not taking unnecessary risks? There should be a well-specific response strategy and plans (Emergency Response Plan (ERP) and an Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) that is available at all times during the drilling operation), aligned with the NOSCP, for each well location that identifies the resources and response required to minimise the risk and impact of oiling (shoreline and offshore). The response strategy and associated plans must take cognisance of the local oceanographic and meteorological seasonal conditions, local environmental receptors and local spill response resources.

2. Sensitive marine wildlife likely to be impacted. Over 35 seabird species occur in the vicinity of the drilling area, nine of which are listed as endangered or threatened on the IUCN Red List for Threatened and Endangered Species. An oil spill affecting pelagic seabirds could have catastrophic consequences as these birds are not easy to capture, extremely susceptible to stress and secondary complications linked to rehabilitation. Therefore, their mortality in rehabilitation centres is often very high. On page 376 of the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report, it cites the following "Being highly toxic, oil released during a blow-out would negatively affect any marine fauna it encounters. The taxa most vulnerable to hydrocarbon spills are coastal and pelagic seabirds. Some of the species potentially occurring in the AOI, are considered regionally 'Endangered' (e.g. African Penguin, Cape Gannet, Cape Cormorant, Bank Cormorant, Roseate Tern, Atlantic and Indian Yellow-nosed Albatross, Northern Royal Albatross, Sooty Albatross, Grey-headed Albatross) or 'Vulnerable' (e.g. White Pelican, Caspian Tern, Damara Tern, Wandering Albatross, Southern Royal Albatross, Leach's Storm Petrel, White-chinned Petrel, Spectacled Petrel)." Numerous species of fish, turtles and cetaceans occurring in the project area are also considered regionally 'Critically Endangered', 'Endangered' or Vulnerable and the overall sensitivity of offshore receptors to a large oil spill is HIGH." According to Page 65 of Appendix 4.6. of the Marine Ecology Assessment, the closest breeding islands to Block 3B/4B are Bird Island in Lambert's Bay, the Saldanha Bay islands, Dassen Island, Robben Island and Seal Island approximately 180 km, 130 km, 145 km, 190 km and 225 km to the east and southeast of the southern section of Block 3B/4B, respectively. Whilst the Block itself lies outside the African Penguin foraging range it does overlap to some extent the Cape Gannet foraging and distribution range as well as

wildlife is identified and assessed in Section 9.3.1 of the EIAR. The mitigation measures referred to (page 204 and 205 of Marine Specialist Assessment) have been included in the EIAR and EMPr. The acoustic modelling study provided Pts, TTS and behavioural impact zones for the main faunal groups likely to be impacted. It must be noted that the noise associated with exploration drilling will persist for only 3-4 months so the complete avoidance of the area into the future by affected marine fauna is highly unlikely. Sittings information was drawn from Best 2007 and based on MMO observations. Cumulative impacts form part of each assessment matrix and contributes towards determining the overall significance of a particular impact. Cumulative impacts were also considered in the specialist reports and the EIAR. Mitigation measures have been included in the EIAR and EMPr relating to light emissions. Where feasible, operational lights will be shielded (e.g. light cowl) in such a way as to minimise their spill out to sea. The comment on collisions being rare was based on a search of the literature to this effect and to reports from the ECO of one of the larger hydrocarbon companies operational off RSA. The comment regarding seabird injuries is noted. A recommendation will be added to the EIAR to ensure that designated personnel receive training on the handling of affected seabirds from a suitably qualified facility/ organisation. Section 5.1 of the EMPr defines the specific roles and responsibilities applicable to the implementation of the EMPr. The AOI for drilling is located ~190 km offshore at its nearest point and therefore far removed from coastal species that typically nest on abandoned structures. As the rig/drillship would only be on site for 3-4 months and the offshore location would suggest a likely lack of typical nesting material, this aspect was not considered a likely risk

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Monica Stassen

several pelagic bird species (See Figure 63 in Appendix 4.6. Marine Ecology Risk Assessment). Given the high risks to several sensitive species and habitats it is essential that a Wildlife Contingency Plan is developed as an Annexure to the OSCP. SANCCOB wishes to reiterate that oiled wildlife response is integrated into the site-specific Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP). In the Marine Ecology Assessment (Appendix 4.6) various references to an Oil Spill Contingency Plan are made yet there is no mention of an Oiled Wildlife Contingency Plan. On Page 217 it mentioned, “collect and transport oiled birds to a cleaning station”. There are very specific protocols to follow when capturing oiled seabirds and there is no mention of this in the draft EIA. Additionally, it is not clear if wildlife will be included in the OSCP. A key recommendation from this study should be that the OSCP includes an oiled wildlife contingency plan as an annexure. This plan should be developed by specialist wildlife response organisations with experience in oiled wildlife response. Lastly, there is no mention of what would happen if turtles or marine mammals are oiled. This also needs to be addressed. SANCCOB also strongly advocates that drilling should not be carried out during the winter months as this coincides with the arrival of breeding Southern Right Whales and Humpback whales along our coastline (Pages 80-83 of Appendix 4.6 Marine Ecology Assessment). Humpback whale sightings have been reported by MMOs during a 2012 3D seismic survey in the adjacent Deep Water Orange Basin Area (CapFish 2013a) and encounters within Block 3B/4B are thus likely as stated on Page 81 of Appendix 4.6. Marine Ecology Assessment.

3. Disturbance to marine wildlife The concern remains that the drilling operations and the associated increase in shipping traffic could negatively impact pelagic fish, seabirds and cetaceans surrounding the drill site. The noise produced by ship engines, drilling technology and air transportation has the potential to cause disorientation and stress in marine wildlife resulting in complete avoidance of the region going forward. On Page 83 of Appendix 4.6 – Marine Ecology Assessment it cites two sources namely Cox et al. 2006 and MacLeod & D’Amico 2006 reported that beaked whales seem particularly susceptible to man-made sounds and several strandings and deaths at sea. The study also cited Tyack et al. 2011 on Page 83 which noted that “beaked whales seem particularly vulnerable to man-made noise is not yet fully understood, the existing evidence clearly shows that animals change their dive behaviour in response to acoustic disturbance, and all possible precautions should be taken to avoid causing any harm.” The draft EIA goes on to conclude that “Sightings of beaked whales in the project area are expected to be very low” on Page 84 of Appendix 4.6. – Marine Ecology Assessment. SANCCOB is seeking clarity on how this conclusion was reached. Is it based on historical observation data? Studies cited on page 160 of Appendix 4.6. – Marine Ecology Assessment notes growing evidence of the effects of anthropogenic noise across the marine ecosystem and the potential consequences of these sounds affecting marine animals at multiple levels. These studies reiterate the importance of considering the cumulative impacts of noise on the ecosystem. It is not clear if the cumulative impact of the additional noise in an already noisy marine environment was considered in this study. In addition, sections of Page 193 of Appendix 4.6. – Marine Ecology Assessment note

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Monica Stassen

several species that could be affected by increased noise levels and how they may be used to a noisy marine environment. SANCCOB is seeking clarity on how the above conclusion was reached. Are there any studies available to support the claim above? Should environmental authorisation be awarded then SANCCOB strongly recommended that the mitigation measures proposed on Pages 204 – 205 be implemented along with a monitoring programme. SANCCOB welcomes the inclusion of artificial lighting in the draft EIA and the overview of mitigation measures. On page 66 of Appendix 5 – Environmental Management Plan, it specifically notes that artificial lighting “may disturb and disorientate pelagic seabirds or attract cephalopods and fish. The draft EIA ultimately concludes that animals in the area should be accustomed to high vessel traffic and associated lighting... and that reports of collisions or death of seabirds on vessels are rare. How was this determined? Is this based on observations? Disoriented birds may not necessarily end up on the rig they can fall into the water and be washed away. In the absence of definitive information, a more precautionary approach should be taken. The draft EIA does give guidelines on what to do if a seabird is injured on the rig or vessel. Furthermore, on Page 66 of Appendix 5 – Environmental Management Plan it notes that “disorientated, but otherwise unharmed, seabirds in dark containers (e.g. cardboard boxes) for subsequent release during daylight hours. There are specific protocols that needs to be followed when catching and boxing seabirds. Specific attention needs to be given to the size of the box, the number of ventilation holes and the location where the box will be stored. Any area that is poorly ventilated or not temperature controlled can result in the bird becoming weak or sick. A recommendation in the draft EIA should be that key personnel receive training on handling affected seabirds from a reputable rehabilitation centre. SANCCOB wishes to add that seabirds are also attracted to floating structures, and any object left unoccupied for long periods could become occupied by birds. Depending on the time of year, these birds could start nesting, making it impossible to remove the nests until the chicks have fledged. It is therefore concerning that this point was not covered in the draft EIA study.

Ms Adri La Meyer

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

Thank you for your email of 13 June 2023. Kindly register the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning as a commenting authority for this application. You may add me as the contact person for the Department. Please could you inform me when the DSR is released for comments?

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below. We will keep you informed of the DSR comment period.

Date 2024/02/09 Method Email

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Adri La Meyer

Comment	Response
The Department hereby requests a one-day time extension to submit its comments on the Draft EIA Report please. We hope that you would be able to accommodate our request to submit comments on 09 February 2024 please. We apologise for the inconvenience caused by this request.	We are happy to accommodate this request. Please provide us with your comments by today.

Elise Tempelhoff

Date	2023/07/19	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Dear EIMS, Please send a map of the targeted area. Thank you.	Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. Please see the attached files for your interest. I've included a locality map, as well as a KML file.		

Mr Neville Van Rooy

Date	2024/01/30	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Will there be any Online meeting?	<p>Dear Neville, Please see the link below. The meeting will be held tomorrow (1 February 2024 – 15:00) afternoon on MS Teams. Please follow the link below to register: <a href="https://teams.microsoft.com/registration/sU6H5z0n7kudxA2EINu4JA,iAKBatbrSU2qAUveW_L7Ag_AjAREdV7C0ONCQrPtNeMIA,sKIKK8MhaUmnFYDxz5rywQ,2NiWn-AMjEO6KPD2ZwgbHA,upr3TbtgGUyATicMzpmktA?mode=read&amp;tenantId=e7874eb1-273d-4bee-9dc4-0d8494dbb824">https://teams.microsoft.com/registration/sU6H5z0n7kudxA2EINu4JA,iAKBatbrSU2qAUveW_L7Ag_AjAREdV7C0ONCQrPtNeMIA,sKIKK8MhaUmnFYDxz5rywQ,2NiWn-AMjEO6KPD2ZwgbHA,upr3TbtgGUyATicMzpmktA?mode=read&amp;tenantId=e7874eb1-273d-4bee-9dc4-0d8494dbb824</a> We would also like to thank you for joining us for most of our public meetings along the west coast. Your presence helped raise awareness in the various communities and allowed them the opportunity to engage with the project material further.</p>		

Cheryl Foggan

Date	2024/02/08	Method	Other
Comment	Response		
1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a	1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to		



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cheryl Foggan

whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the

relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cheryl Foggan

conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated

Cheryl Foggan

regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cheryl Foggan

substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

As an employee of the Strandloper Ocean Boutique Hotel (Pty) Ltd, I fully support the attached letter of Mr Peter Pickford. Please also register Strandloper Ocean Boutique Hotel (Pty) Ltd as an Interested and Affected Party. \*\*See P Pickford Letter and comment\*\*

Response

Thank you for your email. This email serves to acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford’s letter. Your details have been recorded in our I&AP database for this project.

Janine Donn

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

I say no to this project, because many things will change. Me and my family won’t be able to enjoy the beach anymore. Our community are illiterate so we won’t be able to enter specialised job post. We won’t be able to feed from the river and its our primary food chain, further will it disrupt our birdlife and livelihood. Will our community benefit from this project in the form of semi-skilled or skills to be in better job post.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Lana Coetzee

Date 2023/10/03 Method Email

Comment

Attached please find our registration form as I&AP for the project: AOSAC Block 3B/4B Exploration EIA

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that the provided information has been captured and included in our I&AP Database.

Mrs Caroline van Wouw

Date 2024/01/26 Method Email

Comment

Response

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mrs Caroline van Wouw

Please advise what the final date for public submissions for this project will be.

Apologies for the late reply. We have been out along the West Coast conducting public meetings for the project. Commenting period for this project ends 8 February.

Jo-ann Boois

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Die gasse van olie kan n groot invloed he op ons natuurlike habitte binne die see. Seediere en seeplante kan vernietig word. Wilde seediere by baaie kan na sekere areas beweeg waar dit 'n groot gevaar in hou vir mense wat swem of selfs visvang. Die gedreun van masjienerie kan die groei van vispesies belemmer.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Cecile Almazan

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cecile Almazan

the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their

the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the



## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cecile Almazan

desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cecile Almazan

mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Date 2024/02/09 Method Email

Comment

As a resident of Paternoster, I fully support the attached letter of Mr Peter Pickford. Please also register me as an Interested and Affected Party. \*\*See P Pickford Letter and comment\*\*\*

Response

Thank you for your email. This email serves to acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford's letter. Your details have been recorded in our I&AP database for this project.

Date 2024/02/09 Method Email

Comment

Response

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cecile Almazan

As a resident of Paternoster, I fully support the attached letter of Mr Peter Pickford. Please also register me as an Interested and Affected Party. \*\*See P Pickford Letter and comment\*\*\*

Thank you for your email. This email serves to acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford’s letter. Your details have been recorded in our I&AP database for this project.

Anthony Vaughn

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

## Comment

A 1. Preparation of affected parties for public participation a. It is my experience that the community of Lambert’s Bay weren’t adequately informed and or prepared to give input on the matter. We reside in a community that have been traditional fisher folk for many generations and our exposure to the processes and terminology around the topics discussed are very limited. Our main concern is that the activity in the ocean will disturb the eco-system and negatively impact our way of living. Uncertainty about our income from our traditional fishing activities is one of our main concerns. My request to the organizations that want to come and do explorations is that you start educating the affected communities about the processes involved, so that we can give informed and relevant input at these sessions. We want our ocean to be undisturbed. Investors, government and mining companies want to look for oil and gas to mine it. So come to us and explain the processes in layman’s terms. Give us the pros and cons. Also include our communities with benefit sharing initiatives. Have workshops and try to accommodate as many members as possible of our communities please. B Should natural disasters, vandalism, acts of war occur to your equipment malfunction, oil or gas leaks happen, how would the fishing communities be compensated in such circumstances? Do you include this in your study? C b. The time scheduled for the interaction is another challenge. I understand that we all have time constraints and that we will never be able to get all affected parties together. However, fishermen need to give their input. The time you schedule the meeting was for 10h30 the morning. Fishermen most likely be at sea during this time.

## Response

A It should be noted that the public participation has been done in compliance with the requirements set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014, as amended. This included the following: • placement of various adverts in local, regional and national newspapers; • placement of approximately 150 site notices along the coast and interior; • identification and communication with the relevant organs of state, community based organisations (amongst them the Kobush Ontwikkelingsvereniging), non-governmental organisations, etc. Over and above the requirements of the EIA Regulations, 2014, the following was also undertaken: • A series of radio adverts were run on local and regional radio stations; • Undertaking of approximately 1200 surveys in key local communities regarding the project and the perceptions of the project from a community point of view. This was undertaken by an independent company, Abalobi Express, who employed a host of community consultants and field workers from the local communities. • Pamphlet Distribution in the following towns with the towns in your immediate surrounds in bold: o Redhill / Simonstown, o Fishhoek, o Vrygrond, o Lavender Hill, o Retreat, o Grassy Park, o Strandfontein, o Mitchell’s Plain, o Hanover Park, o Phillippi, o Manenberg, o Langa, o Gugulethu, o Macassar, o Khayelitsha, o Kraaifontein, o Cape Town Central, o Bloubergstrand, o Melkbosstrand, o Yzerfontein, o Atlantis, o Mamre, o Darling, o Hopefield, o Stompneusbaai & The cove, o Laingville, o Laaiplek & Noordhoek, o Langebaan, o White City, o Diazville & Louwville, o Paternoster, o Elandsbaai, o Leipoldtville, o Redelinghuys, o Lambertsbaai, o Graafwater, o Doringbaai, o Pappendorp, o Ebenhaezer, o Hondeklipbaai, o Lepelfontein, o Garies, o Kheis, o Klipfontein, o Kharkams, o Kamieskroon, o Soebatsfontein, o Spoegrivier, o Concordia, o Carolusberg, o Bersig, o Nababeep, o Okiep, o Bulletrap, o Buffelsrivier, o Komagas, o Koingnaas, o Kleinsee, o Tweerivier, o Steinkopf, o Eksteenfontein, o Lekkersing, o Alexanderbaai, o Sendelingdrift and o Kuboes. We take note of your suggestion for education of the communities and will consider this further in the EIA Phase. B It is our understanding that as part of the Exploration Right process, the Applicants are required to have adequate insurances in place to ensure that in the event of an emergency the necessary funds and highly trained teams are available for any scale of response. C Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will consider this for the next round of meetings in the various locations.

Yashke Walters

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

### Yashke Walters

Date 2024/01/18 Method Email

#### Comment

Please send on Google Earth KML files or QGIS shapefiles of the development footprint.

#### Response

I&AP provided with information required in the form of a KML file.

### Mr Ismat Adams

Date 2023/06/19 Method Email

#### Comment

Good day Please register me as I&AP. Name: Ismat Adams Organisation: CapeNature Capacity: Land-Use Scientist – Landscape West Email: \*\*\*\*@capenature.co.za Contact no.: \*\*\*\*\*  
Please send on Google Earth KML files or QGIS shapefiles of the development footprint. Kind regards,

#### Response

Dear Ismat, Please find the attached KML file as requested.

Date 2023/06/19 Method Email

#### Comment

Good day Please register me as I&AP. Name: Ismat Adams Organisation: CapeNature Capacity: Land-Use Scientist – Landscape West Email: \*\*\*\*@capenature.co.za Contact no.: \*\*\*\*\*  
Please send on Google Earth KML files or QGIS shapefiles of the development footprint. Kind regards,

#### Response

Dear Ismat, Thank you for your email. The provided details will be included in our I&AP database as requested.

Date 2023/07/25 Method Email

#### Comment

Good day Please send on a Google Earth KML file or QGIS shapefiles of the exploration area of interest. Please also send on the Competent Authority's reference number for this application. Kind regards,

#### Response

Dear Ismat, Thank you for your email. Please see the attached file as requested. The competent authority reference no. for this project is: 12/3/339

### Ms Kate Teesdale

Date 2023/08/18 Method Email

#### Comment

I hereby register as an Interested and Affected Party with regards to the EIA being done on the 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right St. Helena-Hondeklip Bays areas.

#### Response

Thank you for your email. We can confirm that you been registered as an I&AP for this project.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Kate Teesdale

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

## Comment

A My comments and questions on the EIA: 1) Knowing full well the painfully destructive practice of some of the survey methods incorporated by big oil companies e.g. the sonic harm inflicted on ocean life by seismic surveying, how is it even possible that you can monitor practices such as these and still ethically call yourself an ‘Environmental Impact Management Service’? Surely this is a misleading name for your service, which should perhaps consider a more accurate name, such as ‘Look Away From The Damage Big Oil Companies Continue To Inflict On The Environment While We Pocket The Big Cash And Continue To Enable These Big Companies To Sell The Public The Idea That This Is All In Their Best Interest Management Agency’. I would like to comment that an entire mindshift is required when it comes to how we define and term ‘environment’, and until such time as we can give the environment the same rights and voice as any human we should withhold any invasive or destruction processes where there is even a discussion, such as this one, as to the possible harm that might be caused through prospecting, mining and drilling of the ocean. B 2) knowing full well that the Paris Agreement specifies all nations are to work towards Net Zero by 2050, the fact that agencies such as yourself are even willing to work on cases such as these where big oil companies will stand to gain untold billions even while humanity struggles to turn our energy demands to alternative sources is highly suspect. C 3) If we as humans, who have seen what big oil and gas disasters at sea can do, continue to allow big oil prospecting, drilling, mining and processing where there is \_any\_ risk to the environment at all - not ‘low risk’, not ‘unlikely’, but any chance of not being one hundred percent safe - then we are acting irresponsibly and the public must see to it that these processes are stopped immediately, if agencies such as yourself are for whatever reason unable to act with conscience and declare these processes unsafe and potentially harmful and therefore unlawful. Since we are being asked to comment, I would like to comment that on this basis alone, that there is even any risk of harm where we should, as intelligent beings on a living planet, sharing resources with other beings, be at all times acting on a ‘First Do No Harm’ basis, \_especially\_ in cases where we are directly invasively affecting the environment, such as drilling and mining the oceans for oil and gas, this entire process should be halted and closed permanently as unlawful and potentially environmentally harmful.

## Response

A Comment noted. This comment will be provided to the PASA and the Competent Authority, the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE), as part of the final Scoping Report submission for their further consideration. A detailed Acoustics Impact Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. The cumulative impacts associated with noise have been described in Section 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report. The results of the acoustics model will be used by the fishing and marine ecology specialists to inform impacts on the associated aspects. Impacts have been identified for further investigation in the EIA Phase and are detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists’ assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. EIMS’ position is to responsibly fulfil our role as independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners (EAP) and in that way provide an unbiased assessment of the proposal by the Applicant. Should the results of the EIA process yield impacts that are unacceptably high and cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, then this will be detailed at the conclusion of our EIA Report and submitted to the Competent Authority for their consideration and decision making. B The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. EIMS’ position is to responsibly fulfil our role as independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners (EAP) and in that way provide an unbiased assessment of the proposal by the Applicant. Should the results of the EIA process yield impacts that are unacceptably high and cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, then this will be detailed at the conclusion of our EIA Report and submitted to the Competent Authority for their consideration and decision making. C Please refer to the response provided in #B above. The potential for oils spills are acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. In assessing the impacts associated with an oil spill, past oil spill events and other similar case studies will be considered to inform the magnitude and residual impacts associated with a potential future event. As part of the Exploration Right process, the Applicants are required to

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Kate Teesdale

have adequate insurances in place to ensure that in the event of an emergency the necessary funds and highly trained teams are available for any scale of response.

Magrieta Jacobs

Date 2023/08/30 Method Email

Comment

Ek is bekommerd want ons osean sal vernietig word en ook beskadig word. Vissemanne en vroue se regte sal wegevat word want hul vang vis. Hul verdien geld uit die vislewe. Hul sal nie meer kan visvang nie. Visse sal doodgaan as daar gemyn word in die see. Die geraas wat masjienerie sal veroorsaak in die see sal 'n negatiewe invloed het op die oseaan. Die spesies sal doodgaan in die see, hul sal uit hulle broeiplekke vlug.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Joshua Hayes

Date 2023/07/07 Method Email

Comment

Good day, Kindly add me to the list for all communication regarding 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA. I live on the coast adjacent to this project and consider myself a potential interested and affected party. Contact number: +27 (0) 82 \*\*\*\*\* Email: j\*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com EIMS Reference Number: 1570

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been included in our I&AP database.

Claire Campbell

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

I would like to register as an I&AP for this project Please also include the Project reference number EIMS 1570 3B4B

Response

Thank you for your email. We can confirm that you have been registered as an I&AP for this project.

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A - How do you plan to mitigate your negative affect on the Snoek as the migration route of Snoek will be directly affected, negatively by this project. - The Snoek is imperative to a part of the life cycle it is part of in the ocean, their numbers will decline drastically could cause species

Response

A The fishing sector was identified as a key sector and was proposed as the focus of a dedicated study, a Fisheries Impact Assessment, for completion during the EIA Phase. The results of the impact on the applicable fishing sectors, including snoek, will be detailed in the EIA Report. The



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Claire Campbell

collapse. B -What of the devastating affects the poorest of the poor will have to deal with, their livelihoods depend on the ocean. Their basic need - food, will be affected. C -What of climate change, we know better than this, why are we still investing on old outdated arcaic ways, when we have cleaner, greener options. We are supposed to reduce our carbon footprint, not so? This is just driving fossil fuels. Come on, don't you care what becomes of those after you. Or just some mere respect for our mother earth? D - What of my right to a clean, safe and sustainable environment?

significance of the identified impacts will be determined during the EIA Phase and where possible, the mitigation measures will be identified in an attempt to reduce the significance. B The scope of the assessment of any economic benefits will be limited to the exploration activities proposed as part of this application only and will not consider any potential future exploration or production economic impacts, positive or negative. A detailed Economic Impact Assessment has been proposed for the EIA Phase that will include a detailed assessment of all of the sectors operating within the receiving environment. Furthermore, the fishing sector was identified as a key sector and was proposed as the focus of a dedicated study, a Fisheries Impact Assessment, for completion during the EIA Phase. C A detailed Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment has been proposed as per Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. D The right to a healthy environment is recognised in the guiding principles of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 1.7 of 1998 – NEMA), as amended (please refer to Section 4.3 of the Scoping Report. As stated in Section 4.1 of Scoping Report, The Bill of Rights in chapter 2 section 24 of the Constitution of South Africa Act (Act No. 108 of 1996) makes provisions for environmental issues and declares that: “Everyone has the right - a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that: i. prevent pollution and ecological degradation; ii. promote conservation; and iii. secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development” The Scoping and EIA process as well as associated impact mitigation actions are conducted to fulfil the requirement of the Bill of Rights.

Patricia Dam

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Dit belemmer die voortbestaan van ons vissermanne. Dit kan die trek van voels en see diere na 'n ander habitat veroorsaak. Dit kan mense siek maak en die dood van baie diere veroorsaak. Dit kan die natuur benadeel soos: klimaatsverandering. Plante kan uitgeroei word en ons natuurskoon sal beskadig word. Ons kinders kan dan nie lons nagedagtes aan skou nie.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Alvin Roon

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Alvin Roon

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

Ek is nie oortuig wat die mees doeltreffende of beste kommentaar is nie en het daarom ook besluit om nie 'n campaign deur Aksie Paternoster Action van stapel te stuur nie. Soos wat ek dit verstaan is die prospekter werk byna afgehandel met sover ons weet weglaatbaar min skade? Olie besoedeling moet verhoed word, maar dit wil nie sê dat geen olie meer gebruik of ontgin moet word nie. As prospekter werk positiewe resultate wys en ontginning die volgende stap is, is not in our backyard nie na my mening van toepassing nie. Van geen punt op land gaan die boortorings op 200km en meer sigbaar wees nie. Bedreiging van die seelewe lyk dus die enigste moontlike gevaar. Omdat mikro plastiek toenemend saamsmelt met olie, en die opruim van besoedeling nog moeiliker maak, word die verantwoordelikheid en gepaardgaande koste daarvan nog groter. Ek is nie 'n regskenner nie, maar sou dink dat om prospekterders en ontginnings instansies te dwing om aan alle veiligheidsmaatreëls te voldoen, dit toegelaat kan word slegs op voorwaardes: • Dat 'n bank waarborg uitgereik en in stand gehou word ten gunste van die kus bewoners (munisipaliteite, toerisme- en visbedryf). Die detail van so'n waarborg moet deeglik opgestel word om kugemeenskappe en die biosfeer te beskerm. • 'n Onpartydige moniteerder in diens van Omgewingsake (maar betaal deur die ontginnings maatskappy) moet maandeliks rapporteer aan die ontwikkelaar en kusbewoners tot beëindiging van die ontginning. • So'n ontginnings reg mag slegs verkoop word met hierdie waarborg wat in plek gehou word. • Hierdie waarborg kan slegs onthef word na totale herstel van die omgewing wat die seabodem insluit by beëindiging van die projek. • Ontginning mag slegs plaasvind as die gas/ olie in Suid Afrika tot voordeel van Suid Afrika (nie individue) verwerk word. So'n waarborg moet geld beskikbaar he van dag een.

Response

Dear I&AP, Apologies for the delay in response to your comments. This email serves to acknowledge your comments. Your details have been recorded in our database. Please note that the addition of your details to the database will be notable in the updated and revised EIA Report to be made available on 8 April 2024. Since the report will be placed for review once more, further comment or an expansion on comments already provided are welcome.

Ms Linda Pawson

Date 2024/01/25 Method Email

Comment

Thank you for the information session held at our townhall in St Helena Bay this morning. See attached feedback form. Comment Sheet: Apart from the environmental issues, my biggest concern is the livelihood of the fisherman in our town. It's not a secret that our government are only interested in lining their own pockets. If the Canadian company can guarantee that South Africans will benefit from the project then that will be good. But until that happens I will be opposing this project of [sic] the shore of the town I've chosen to live in as I have a moral responsibility towards the fishermen's community.

Response

Thank you so much for your feedback. I have included your comments as part of our database to be submitted with the final report. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you need more information.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Rachelle Seymore

Date 2024/01/27 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Attached please find my comments with regards to the public participation at SHB on 25 January 2024. Kindly acknowledge receipt hereof. \*\*See attached Comment Sheet\*\* Content of comment sheet: I am totally against the project. Oil spillage will be inevitable and will have catastrophic effects. It could be at the rig, or due to a blow out, or when there is a transfer from rig to ship or even at the harbour where all will be off loaded for refining. This will affect the whole coast with 1000's of km, due to winds or/and tides. the beaches will be at risk as well as the fauna & flora, fish, whales & other species such as turtles will be affected. I believe seismic testing will be done. The blasts will affect everyone & especially the sea life.

Response

Apologies for the late reply. I have not been in the office for the last two weeks. This is to acknowledge receipt of your comments. Your details have already been included in our I&AP database.

Mrs Beverly Pickford

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. It is an impossible task to comment page by page on the entire Environmental Authorisation Application as it is a document of hundreds of pages, however, here are a summation of my comments. 2. NEMA REQUIREMENTS: 3. It is the Constitutional Right of all South Africans to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment, and to decide whether oil and gas exploration will threaten this right. All South Africans have not been addressed, and specifically excluded are those that do not own a computer or cell phone, without which it is not possible to appeal or comment. 4. The portion of the population that will potentially be most affected by oil & gas exploration, are the fishers that live along the coast and those that survive from tourism along a pristine coastline, with healthy whale migrations, and a large percentage of this community know nothing about the Africa Oil proposal. Even if they do own a cell phone, to read a document of hundreds of pages on a cell phone screen is an impossible task. The EIA process is flawed at the outset if the most affected sector of the community has not been thoroughly addressed. 5. Further to this, on the given day of the St Helena Bay I&AP's Public Meeting 8-1pm, 25 January 2024, with the EIP, EIMS, there were no fishers present. On the same day, at the same time, 200 fishers attended Co-operative's DFFE meeting at The Cove, a fishing village adjacent to St Helena Bay, where they had been led to believe they would be addressed by Minister Creecy with regard to everyday fishing issues. Minister Creecy was not present and the government officials hosting this meeting advised that oil & gas exploration was not on the agenda. 6. CUMULATIVE EFFECT TRANSPARENCY: 7. The above Africa Oil 3B/4B Drilling Application follows right on the heels of Geodata Searcher's Seismic Application, granted permission to proceed by the Government in December 2023. I find it misleading in the

Response

1. Comment noted. 2. 3. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 4. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mrs Beverly Pickford

extreme that each application on the West Coast and its EIA is viewed as a separate entity when the cumulative effect of many enterprises, and ultimately oil rigs, could be of much greater impact to the fisheries and marine life. 8. It must be acknowledged that the granting of the Geodata Seismic Permit, which was passed in a 6-month period, when most EIAs take two years to be approved, is disturbing, particularly followed directly by the Africa Oil Drilling application. It seems the government is racing headlong into an arena where the impacts are, at best, not sufficiently scientifically researched. 9. Geodata's Application is in a block approximately 200 kilometres from the coast, and the Africa Oil Application is approximately 100 kilometres from the coast, causes concerns as to where the line will be drawn in proximity to the coast? As oil & gas exploration closes in on the coast and coastal marine protected areas, more and more species of marine life and coastal life, including endangered seabird species will be negatively impacted. 10. Geodata began seismic blasting off the Transkei Coast in and was stopped by the Court. They proceeded to the West Coast without a proper EIA and were once again stopped by the Court. There was good reason for these court rulings, and to now rush through hastily compiled desktop surveys of the potential impacts of oil & gas exploration on the planet, the community and the environment, is irresponsible. 11. FLAWS IN THE EIMS EIA 12. The area under proposal lies 100 kilometres from the coast, and extensive research shows that all marine life lying within 10 kilometres of the drilling (and seismic) activity will either be killed, or breeding and behavioral patterns will be drastically altered. Yet, all impact on the marine life is indicated by the EIA as low negative, with the exception of an actual oil spill, which is indicated as medium negative. This leans very much to an intentional misleading of facts. Damage to the marine environment by oil entering the ocean is well documented in the media and by scientists and even after millions of dollars in clean-up efforts the environments never fully recover. 13. A desk top evaluation of potential impact of drilling or seismic activity on our ocean, our coast and marine life, on which entire communities depend for their livelihood and survival, is not sufficient to convince the community of the legitimacy of the EIA. 14. The community that lives along the coast, is culturally attached to their ocean and marine environment and are not prepared to threaten this, when so much is at stake and so much about the potential negative impact on the environment is unresolved. Their desire, is to continue their tradition of fishing and life in a pristine environment and are not willing to risk this. The EIA does not reflect this standpoint. 15. MARINE LIFE & FISHERIES 16. It must be acknowledged that there are some things that as the protectors of our natural resources and our marine protected areas we should not tamper with. The introduction to the Marine Ecosystem and Fisheries section of the EIA on page 28 states: 'Licence Block 3B/4B is situated within the southern Benguela Large Marine Ecosystem, which is considered one of the largest and most productive of the world's coastal upwelling systems.' 17. For this reason, it is one of the richest fisheries off the coast of Africa. Should we be risking upsetting this fine balance of nature? The EIA acknowledges that in all areas of oil & gas exploration and extraction there will be a negative impact. EIMS sets about to grade this, for the most part as 'low negative', but if

details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (i) one local newspaper; or (ii) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 5. As it pertains to representatives of the fishing industry, the low attendance of fishermen was noted during the Open Day Session. A public meeting was held at the Steenberg's Cove Community Hall on 3 August 2023 during the scoping phase of this project as this is the preferred venue for engagements. As for the Open Day Sessions, due to the venue already being booked for the same day, Sandy Point Hall was chosen as an alternative. EIMS was not aware of the nature of the Steenberg's Cove Community Hall's use that day as the administration of the hall was not at liberty to share this information. Regarding the proceedings of the meeting at Steenberg's Cove Community Hall, the observations produced in this comment are noted. 6. 7. EIMS acknowledges the two different projects off the West Coast. The observations and opinions presented are noted. 8. Comment noted. It is however necessary to state that the Block 3B/4B Exploration project is a separate application from the Searcher Seismic application involving different applicants and different processes which are not interlinked. 9. Comment regarding the different distances of the two different projects associated with offshore exploration off the West Coast is noted. In terms of this project, potential impacts on marine biodiversity and ecology have been considered in relation to the location of the proposed activities. 10. Comment noted. 11. 12. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mrs Beverly Pickford

we have an oil spill it will not be 'medium negative' it will be the death of the West Coast's marine life and fishery. And if the oil spill smoothers the coast, the coastal life too. No one can rule out this possibility, it has happened and will happen again. 18. This fishery is the lifeblood of the West Coast communities. The EIA states that the fishing sector is worth R8 Billion a year. The commercial fishing sector employs over 28 000 people and thousands more in the small-scale, subsistence and recreational fishing sector. This is a community of fishermen. It is reckless to jeopardize this cultural stronghold where food on the table is paramount. 19. The EIA states: 'The largest and most valuable fisheries are the deep-sea trawl industry and the pelagic-directed purse-seine fishery targeting pilchard, anchovy and red-eye round herring. The spawning areas for anchovy, sardine, hake and snoek lie off the West Coast and Cape Columbine. The EIA diagrams show some overlap between the area proposed for drilling and spawning areas, and in most diagrams they lie directly alongside each other. The most fundamental research on the recorded movement of spawning grounds will show that this is in response to movement of current, water temperature and water turbidity, so spawning areas do change. For proposed seismic exploration, drilling and oil & gas extraction right next to, or in spawning areas, we cannot rely on a desktop evaluation to assess a highly unpredictable and changeable situation. The coastal community and it's associated oceanic industries will be exposed to extreme risk if oil & gas exploration in the heart of spawning areas proves detrimental. A desktop evaluation is chronically insufficient in evaluating this danger. 20. Tuna fish, the target of pelagic long-line fishers, are highly migratory and found on the high seas; there is no map as to where they will be found. Tuna, like all marine species, including plankton and invertebrates, are part of a very delicately balanced food-chain, we cannot afford to tamper with this at any level. Bio-diversity is the key to a pristine eco-system. With one of the world's most productive coastal upwelling systems in our hands, can we afford to upset the balance? 21. The West Coast islands and peninsulas are also the stronghold and breeding areas for dolphins, seals and numerous seabird species, some of which are endangered, and all of these are known to feed far offshore. They are entirely dependent on the movement of the krill, anchovies and sardines. 22. WHALE MIGRATION ROUTE 23. The EIA is deficient in acknowledging the scale of one of most significant humpback whale migrations on earth. Between April and September each year thousands of whales migrate northwards along the West Coast to their calving grounds off Angola and Gabon. Then between September and December the whales migrate southwards again towards their feeding grounds off Antarctica. 24. Research indicates that these whales are stalling off Cape Columbine and the West Coast and feeding on the rich upwellings of krill. Whales, which are very sensitive to any underwater noise, which travels for hundreds of kilometres under water will be deeply affected by any seismic or drilling activity. The application dilutes this consideration almost to the point of ignoring it. 25. Added to this is the year-round presence of Critically Endangered Sperm Whales, which are deep ocean whales, preferring depths of around 1000 metres, and the seasonal presence of the Southern Right Whales between July and September, which are

mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on marine biodiversity is assessed through the project's EIA. 13. The EIA employs several datasets which have been collected through various methodologies. These data will be further verified through pre-drilling surveys to be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. 14. As part of this EIA, a cultural heritage assessment was conducted to gain an appreciation of the intangible value communities attach to ocean resources and the marine environment. This has been contemplated together with representatives of Nelson Mandela University and involved fieldwork exercises. The relevant report is presented as Appendix 4.5. 15. 16. Comment noted as it pertains to subsequent comment. 17. As it pertains to the project's potential impacts, the EIA provides a list thereof together with potential mitigations to minimise the severity of these impacts. See above comment regarding the relationship between the rating of impacts, and mitigations proposed. 18. In relation to the EIA, the concerns raised here have been considered paramount. It is for this reason that relevant studies have been conducted which have produced data as rightly pointed out. 19. Section 8.3 of the EIAR presents the receiving biological environment applicable to the application area. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the likely impacts associated with the activities (which does not include a regional 2D or 3D seismic survey). The assessment has been undertaken by a qualified and experienced scientist. 20. Please refer to the response provided in the preceding comment. 21. Please refer to the response provided in the preceding comment. 23. Section 8.3.2.7 of the EIAR presents the baseline information relating to Mysticete whales (including humpback whales). This section specifically notes the presence of these whales in the block. The report states: Humpback whales are thus likely to be the most frequently encountered baleen whale in the project area (Figure 69), ranging from the coast out beyond the shelf, with year round presence but numbers peaking during the northward migration in June – February and a smaller peak with the southern breeding migration around September – October but with regular encounters until February associated with subsequent feeding in the Benguela ecosystem.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mrs Beverly Pickford

frequently seen with calves in the St Helena Bay area. 26. Throughout the EIA there is insufficient conclusive evidence that there can be mitigation measures to avoid a dire effect on the whale migrations. An on-board observer can only observe whales in the immediate vicinity in perfect weather conditions and daylight, whales can hear noise and detect vibration for hundreds of kilometres under water at all hours of the day. 27. Researchers believe that some 'low frequency whale sounds can travel more than 10,000 miles in some levels of the ocean'. If one puts this information in context of seismic and drilling activity, we are embarking into an area where we know there will be disturbance, disorientation and even death, but this EIA has not even touched the surface of the potential damage that could be done. 28. DESIRABILITY 29. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 30. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. 31. The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long-term consequences not only for South Africa but all of the planet. 32. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 33. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit, with a sincere disregard to the cost to the planet and all humanity. 34. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our Constitution. 35. It is well known that in the home countries of the applicants Geodata and Africa Oil, being Australia and Canada, there is much opposition to oil and gas exploration in pristine seas and particularly fisheries, let us be cautious in the weighing of what we are threatening and have to lose as a country, before proceeding. 36. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

Humpback whale sightings have been reported by MMOs during a 2012 3D seismic survey in the adjacent Deep Water Orange Basin Area (CapFish 2013a) and encounters within Block 3B/4B are thus likely. 24. Section 9.3.1 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts to the marine environment including impacts to the whales. Management and mitigation measures are identified for inclusion into the EMPr. 25. Section 8.3.2.8 of the EIAR presents the baseline information relating to Sperm whales. The report states that: "Sperm whales were the most commonly reported species sighted by MMOs and detected with PAM during 2D and 3D seismic surveys undertaken in the adjacent Deep Water Orange Basin Area (CapFish 2013a, 2013b)". 26. Section 9.3.1 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts to the marine environment including impacts to the whales. Management and mitigation measures are identified for inclusion into the EMPr. The suggested management and mitigation measures align with international best practice requirements. 27. Please see comment above. The potential impact on the marine environment related to noise emissions is identified and assessed in Section 9.3.1.2.6 of the EIAR. Please note that this application does not include regional 2D or 3D seismic surveys. 29. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 30. Comment noted. 31. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 32. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mrs Beverly Pickford

EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 33. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 34. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA. 35. Comment noted. 36. Comment noted. Thank you for your submission.

Mr Ian Mills

Date 2024/02/11 Method Email

Comment

My wife Deirdre and I own a property at Paternoster - Number 4 Dick Clark Street. Our comment is as follows. The recent survey shows that the proposal to drill for oil off the coast is almost certain to result in negative impacts to the ecology, fisheries and environment of the region, but this could be reduced to negligible levels as long as the report's recommended mitigation measures are implemented. Our concern is that there does not appear to be any guarantees that such mitigation measures will be adequately implemented and sustained over time. We lack confidence that the Applicants (African Oil, Ricocure Pty and Azinam Limited) will wholeheartedly limit the impact on the marine ecosystem, nor do we believe that the South African authorities have either the will, means or incentive to enforce them. For that reason we believe that the project should be authorised to go ahead unless a transparent mechanism is set up to inspect and hold the Applicants to account for any environmental damage. Furthermore, we believe that the inspecting body should be independent and report directly to central government.

Response

Thank you for your comment in terms of this project. I would like to apologise for my late reply as I was away for some time. Your concern is valid and understandable. Thank you for reaching out to us about this. In terms of how different mitigation measures are implemented for different projects such as this one, an Environmental Authorisation which the applicant is applying for would be granted under the premise that the recommendations stipulated in the Environmental Management Program (EMPr). After undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment, an EMPr is drafted which includes within it the mitigations proposed which would render the impacts as per post-mitigation ratings. The EMPr would then inform a list of conditions which will need to be complied with throughout the proposed activity. The EMPr also notes who the responsible party would be. Further, a monitoring party, such as an Environmental Control Officer (ECO), is also specified. Different indicators are associated with each condition, and these allow for subsequent and effective auditing of the activity to see if the activities comply with conditions. Different audit reports, internal and external (by an independent auditor) are then sent to the relevant government department as required by law. I hope this brief summary is able to provide more information on the process in terms of allowing for the mitigations proposed to be effectively implemented. Should you need any more information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Mr Masizakhe Gunya

Date 2023/08/06 Method Email

Comment

A 1. It has been a main factor to the fishing industry a decline or decrease on the number of fish caught at Sea for the past few years due to various reasons, so how does this exploration is going to contribute or affect the daily fishing activities ? B 2. How are you going to prevent water pollution/ oil spillage and what measures do you have in place? C 3. Is there a need for the use of harbour infrastructure and facilities as part of logistically arrangement during

Response

A A detailed Fisheries Impact Assessment has been proposed to assess the impacts on the various fishing sectors in operation along the west coast. The results of this assessment will be presented in the EIA Report. B The potential for a well-blowout is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Masizakhe Gunya

exploration? D 4. Was there any consultation with the community on this matter? If yes, what is their recommendations? E 5. What will be a benefit/opportunities created for community of Lambert's Bay on this project? F 6. What are the advantages and disadvantages of gas and oil for Lambert's Bay community? G 7. Which stakeholders are involved/consulted in this exploration project and their roles and responsibilities? H 8. How long does an exploration process takes? I 9. If the oil and gas is found which method of communication will be used to inform all stakeholders involved and what will be the way forward?

spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. C It is anticipated that the support vessels will be operating out of Saldanha or Cape Town. D Please refer to the Public Participation Report included in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report. E It is anticipated that the benefits or opportunities for Lamberts Bay will be limited, owing to the nature and location of the exploration activities offshore. The Economic Impact Assessment proposed for the EIA Phase will be able to provide greater detail and will be made available as part of the EIA Report. F It is anticipated that the benefits or opportunities for Lamberts Bay will be limited, owing to the nature and location of the exploration activities offshore. The Economic Impact Assessment proposed for the EIA Phase will be able to provide greater detail and will be made available as part of the EIA Report. G Please refer to the Public Participation Report included in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report. H With reference to section 3.2.2 of the Scoping Report it should be noted that the anticipated duration associated with the drilling operations is approximately 3-4 months, and as such, it is anticipated to be of short duration. I Should a discovery be made, it will be up to the applicant to announce the discovery. Should a production right application be submitted, a separate EIA will need to be undertaken and this will again involve public participation with the local communities (outside of the current process for exploration only).

Mr Lindani Mtshali

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

I hope this email finds you well. Please can you add me (Lindani Mtshali) to your I&AP list. I'm from The WILDTRUST that is a Conservation NGO. I would like to also take part as an interested and affected party.

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Ms Jeanette Marais

Date 2024/02/09 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jeanette Marais

whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the

relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jeanette Marais

conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jeanette Marais

regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jeanette Marais

substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Anthony Siebert

Date 2024/02/07 Method Email

Comment

This is to inform all concerned with this activity, that i objective to the activities planned (both impacting land and ocean). I do not have to re-iterate what the environmentalists have already said and objected to in this regard (pertaining to this specific activity and others). We are short minded with financial bottom line objectives ~ all about money and returns with ZERO care to the environment. In the past , just consider the damages done , on land and in the ocean. The past will be repeated because we cannot give 100% guarantee that no damage will be done & secondly , if it does, that the companies dont have the financial capability (insurance) and know-how to remedy the environmental damage. I whole heartedly object NB : solar and wind are renewable energies ahead of us . Lets focus all our effort on this for generations to come (your and my kids , kids etc).

Response

Thank you for your email. This is to confirm that we have received your objection to the project. Please feel free to peruse the project’s associated reports and literature made available to the public for review. Incorporated is a more comprehensive assessment of the different impacts which might be interesting to read through. Thank you once more, your details have been included in our database for further communication about the project.

Caroline Boois

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Hoekom is ek bekommerd oor die oseaan deur Africa Oil? Dit sal ons oseaan vernietig en ons mense sal nie meer kan swem of ons diere daarin lewe nie. Ons sal nie meer 'n inkomste kan maak uit die see nie. Ja ons mense sal nie meer kan uit gaan vir vis of see toe nie.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Ernest Titus

Date 2024/02/07 Method Other

Comment

Written comment submitted via the Lambers Bay Pen en Papier organisation or affiliation.

Response

Comments were acknowledged and organisation informed. Dankie vir u e-pos. Ons kan bevestig



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ernest Titus

Content of comment was transcribed as follows: Hoe sal hierdie pojek my kulturele en spirituele gewoontes beïnvloed indien dit voortgaan. My gewoonte reg sal negatief beïnvloed word, asook die van my \*Mede kito I\* broers en susters 'n oeroue tradisie sal verdwyn wat uitgeoefen word dekades lank deur ons voorouers, en tot en met vandag bestaan. Was die konsultasies in 'n verstaanbare taal aangebied en was dit verstaanbaar Hierdie projek was in 'n verstaanbare taal verduidelik maar was vir baie onverstaanbaar. Kommentaar oor voornemende projek 1) 'n hoof bekommernis omtrent hierdie projek Ons grootste bekommernis rondom hierdie projek is da tons teenkating nie in \*ac\* geneem sal word deur die staat nie, en hulle sal voortgaan om hierdie projek te ondersteun ten koste van hulself, ant gedurende konsultasies was dit van die kardinale vrae wat nie die gewenste uitrokkings getoon het nie. 2) Hoe hierdie projek my lewens omstandighede en die van my gemeenskap sal beïnvloed Hierdie projek kan 'n hewige impak op beide my en die gemeenskap he, dit kan 'n massiewe instroming van mense wees, wat werk soek, en dan 'n negatiewe impak in ons gemeenskap te \*\*\* kan bring. My lewensbestaan kan ingedra\*\*\* kom, deurdat my bestaan as visser bedreig sal word. Ons stapel voedsel al vis sal onbekostigbaar word, deurdat dit ingevoer sal moet word. Omdat die verskillende toetse om te kyk vir olie 'n negatiewe invloed op ons vis spesies te weeg kan bring wat groot sosiale probleme kan veroorsaak in ons gemeenskap. 3) Hoe sal hierdie projek my toegang en gebruik van die oseaan beïnvloed, asook die diere spesies Ek glo dat hierdie projek my toegang asook die gebruik van die see se spesies sal beïnvloed, deurdat seestrome, gifstrome en ontploffings, die spesies kan laat verdwyn wat broodnodig is om lewens bestaan asook die van ander vissers te verseker. Die voel lewe sal ook hierdeur negatief beïnvloed word, en dan die toerisme bedryf 'n geweldige \*knou sal toedien. 4) Sal daar enige voordele vir ons as gemeenskap wees Met die verskillende werkwinkels wat aangebied was deur TEEPSEA ens, was dit van die kern vrae wat gestel was. En met die onduidelike antwoorde was dit duidelik dat die voordele minimal of geen sal wees, omdat daar gebruik gemaak sal word van kundigheid en opleiding taboe sal wees. M.A.W. die gemeenskap sal geen voordeel daaruit trek nie. 5) Was die positiewe en negatiewe impakte gebesprek van die projek DMV konsultasies Met publieke deelnames asook DMV konsultasies, was slegs die positiewe kant van die projek voorgehou. Die publiek was nooit ingelig van die moontlike \*neine effekte wat dit te weeg kan bring nie. Dit op sigself spreek van ongevoeligheid.

dat u besonderhere is op ons database opgeneem. U kommentaar sal in ons finale verslag aangeteken word.

Mr Tim Brown

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

As a director of Laureate Private Resorts, I fully support the attached letter of Mr Peter Pickford. Please also register Laureate Private Resorts as an Interested and Affected Party.

Response

Dear Sir, Thank you for your email. We acknowledge your support of Mr Pickford's letter. Your details have been included in our I&AP database.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Tim Brown

\*\*See P Pickford Letter and comment\*\*\*

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

## Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of

## Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Tim Brown

thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to

specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Tim Brown

investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts

Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Tim Brown

are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Roger Seldon

Date2024/02/08MethodEmail

Comment

Please CANCEL any approvals for this potentially catastrophic undertaking. The investigative process was Totally flawed and inadequate. Also, hiding behind euphemistic terms like ‘medium negative’ suggests a fear of revealing what the actual potential harms might be, and possibly even wilful negligence in not addressing the specifics. Has there even been on-site real-world study done to support this proposal, or has it been just desktop copies & pastes and ivory corridor winks and nudges that have lead to this? This potential long term disaster compounded by it being in pursuit of damaging fossil fuels needs to be nipped in the bud.

Response

Thank you for your e-mail. Apologies for the late reply since I have been away the last two weeks. We would like to acknowledge your objection. The study associated with this project is rather intense – amounting to almost 900 pages in literature. As part of the larger report, several specialist studies have been conducted making use of different methodologies. If you are interested, this material can be accessed on the EIMS website – <https://www.eims.co.za>. We have held public meetings to provide a high-level summary of the different impacts pre- and post-mitigation. The report itself may expand on some of the information you may have interacted with through these public meetings and Open Day sessions.

Hendrina Burger

Date2023/08/19MethodEmail

Comment

Hoekom is ek bekkomerd oor die mynbou in die oseaan deur die Africa Oil. 1. Dit gaan ons spesies bedreig in die oseaan. 2. Die visservroue en vissermanne gaan benadeel word want die

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Hendrina Burger

spesies gaan dood. 3. Ons voels spesies word bedreig 4. Daar gaan geen toegang tot die strande wees nie. 5. Toerisme word benadeel.

Ms Etienne Coetzee

Date 2023/07/06 Method Email

Comment

To whom it may concern Please register me as an I&AP to this proposed exploration, mentioned in the title above. Etienne Coetzee c\*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com 0\*\*\*\*\* I live in Britannia Reef, St Helena Bay and will be impacted by the proposed exploration. Kind regards

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been included in our I&AP database.

Mr Brenton Williams

Date 2023/06/26 Method Email

Comment

Hi I am Brenton Williams, the Speaker of Kouga Council and my interest is public participation, which locally falls under my legislative responsibility.

Response

Dear Brenton, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been added to our I&AP database.

Ms Jenny Fulford

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

The officer attending the matter of EXPLORATION /( EXPLOITATION) of St Helena Bay. NO NO NO ! As a long standing resident and concerned humanitarian we cannot see this government getting away with this 1. It has been rushed through all channels without proper consul stations. 2. The West Coast, like the Wild Coast is one of the few places on the SA coastline that is still natural and not overpopulated. 3. THE FISHING!!.... and people’s livelihoods are at risk and in danger of being lost forever. 4. The risk of pollution and our fish population ( severely diminished since the ANC came to power ) is real. 5. No matter the statistics being bandied around here and there, we are threatened once again by greed and greedy politicians who will do whatever it takes to get rich 😞 Our minister of energy is the prime example. Seismic blasting is untested in the long term and we don’t have a lifetime to listen to politicians and like minded business people make a short term decision about our food from the sea and the livelihood families that have for generations fished it. So NO it’s wrong. You have no right to

Response

As the comment is an objection and did not need specific responses towards points made, the I&AP was thanked for their comment, and told that their comment will be included in the final EIA Report: - Apologies for the delay in response. We have been drafting responses for all I&APs who have sent us comments in the recent weeks. This message serves to inform you that your comment and details have been recorded. Your comment will be included in the Final EIA Report to be submitted.



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jenny Fulford

pursue this multibillion venture to destroy our coastline and resources. And NO to Gwedi Mantashe and Barbara Creecy for attempting to hide this monumental issue behind our backs and in haste. My home will be permanently afflicted with a rig on the horizon. NO in my personal capacity as a land owner here.

Ezile Jiba

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

1 Asivumelani nesicelo esithe safakwa yiJV Company and DMRE sokuba kombiwe I oil negas kuBLOCK 3B/4B. Ngoba ayizuphelela kweziBLOCK zicelwayo, kwaye iyakuba neziphumo okanye imiphumela emibi ezintlanzini kunye nezinye izilwanyana zasemanzini, nasebantwini, Kwaye azisokuze ziphinde ziphile kakuhle kuba kuyobe kukupela kobomi bazo, lonto iyothi ichaphazele nabantu benveli abasebenzisa ulwandle. 2 Xa ngaba kuzoqhuntshumbiswa elwandle izilwanyana zaselwandle zizakunqongophala, le yimingcipheko ezakuthi ingqwamane nabantu abaphila ngolandle bangakwazi ukuphine bafumane izilwanyana zaselwandle ukuze bakwazi ukuziphilisa, nanjengoko benxhomekeke elwandle ukuze bakwazi ukuziphilisa 3 Lemigcipheko ingakhokelela kwindlala enkulu kwilali eziselunxwemeni kunye nabantu abaphila ngolwandle, lonto ichaza ukuba umlobi akasayi kuphinde ondle usapho lwakhe, umlobi akasayi kuphinde akwazi ukuphucula ubomi okanye impilo yakhe. Esisehlo sokumbiwe kweoli nerhasi, singanokuthi sichaphazele abantu abasebenzisa ulwandle kuquka abakhenkethi, abantu abahlayo elwandle, nabantu abasebenza ngokuhlangula abanye abantu elwandle. Nabantu abasebenza ngokunfila elwandle. 4. Thina siphila, xa kunokuvunyelwa leoli nerhasi asinko ukuphinde siphuhlise ngokunokwethu kuba uRhulumente akawavuli amathuba emisebenzi, into ephambili yintswela ngqesho ingakumbi kulutsha oluphila elunxwemeni, lonto ithetha ukuba siyokulahlekelwa sisonka sithu. Njengabahlali baselunxwemeni siphila ngokuxoza imbaza, izazwembe, amasenene, silobe intlanzi, iikorofish kunye nezinye izilwanyana ngenjongo zokuthengisa sikwajonge nengeniso ezakusapho lwethu, ukuze sikwazi ukwakha amakaya ethu, sithumele nabantwana esikolweni. INDLELA ESIPHILA NGAYO 1. Singabantu bemveli, kunamasiko ekuye kufuneke siyowenzela elwandle, afana nokuhlamba imimoya engalunganga egulisa abantu kuquka amagqirha, icawe zemveli, amaxhwele kunye nabaPHROFETI nabantu abaye bathunyenlwe zizinyanya zabo ukuba baye elwandle. 2. Sikhule ngolwandle, kulapho siye siyochitha ixesha nokuziphilisa emoyeni nasempehefumleni. ISIMO SEZULU Iisimo sezulu sitshintshile, kwaye sibona uguquguquko olumandla. Kulo nyaka kwinyanga kaMatshi 2023, siye sachaphazeleka sichotho sika 3hours apho kwaye kwakhukhuliseka indle ezihamba imoto, amakhaya wabantu, izikolo zokufundela, idolophu IPort St Johns yayonganyelwe zizikhukhula ezathi zamosha ivenkile zishiya intsapho zingenawo amakhaya. Lonto iyabonisa ukuba isimo

Response

We would like to thank you for your submission. We take note of your impacts identified in terms of the biodiversity, climate change and cultural heritage. These impacts have been included in our report and will be assessed further in the EIA Phase.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Ezile Jiba

sezulu sitshintshile ngokubaxekileya, Kwaye kwantiyibilika nentaba esakhe ecalenikwazo nenaselwandle. Lonto ithetha ukaba xa kunokombiwa iOli kunye neRhasi izakuchaphazela isibhakabhaka, ibangele ukubaxeka kwemvla nokutshisa kweLanga, sikholelwa ekubeni inyikima zomhlaba emanzi zizakubaxeka

## Ms Suzette van Niekerk

Date 2023/06/23 Method Questionnaire

### Comment

word u direk deur die projek geaffecteer? As inwoners van Yzerfontein is die behoud van die rustige en natuurlike biodiversiteit in ons streek ononderbehandelbaar Kan u asseblief vir ons 'n hoevlakbeskrywing gee van die aspekte van die omgewing waarop die projek direk of indirek geraak kan word? (insluitend gebruike soos visvang, skeepvaart, mynbou; topografiese kenmerke; infrastruktuur; sensitiewe flora/fauna) Infrastruktuur - Onveilige kruispad R27 (Weskus pad) en R315 (Darling/Yzerfontien) nie geskik vir verdere hoe ..... volumes nie.

### Response

Comments noted

Date 2023/06/26 Method Email

### Comment

Goeie dag Lucien James, Ingesluit vind asseblief die STAKEHOLDER REGISTRATION FORM om CRAG - Concerned Residents Action Group -Yzerfontein te registreer as belanghebbende party. Ons wil graag alle korrespondensie ontvang en deelneem aan die openbare deelname prosesse aangaande hierdie voorgenome eksplorاسie en versoek om as sodanig geregistreer te word.

### Response

Dear I&AP, Dankie vir u e-pos. Ons bevestig dat u besonderhede in ons B&GP-databasis ingesluit is.

Date 2024/01/10 Method Email

### Comment

Can you please confirm if Yzerfontein Residents Association / YRA is registered as an I&EP in this matter? There was a full change in the management of this organisation, the new management is not sure to which email address this notification was sent, if any

### Response

We confirm that the Yzerfontein Residents Association Concerned Residents Action Group are registered as an I&AP on this project with the email address crag.yzer@gmail.com, which was used to send out the notification below.

## Caleb

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

### Comment

A The problem with these projects is that they contribute highly to Climate Change. The

### Response

A A detailed Climate Change Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Caleb

potential environmental impact these projects can have can be everlasting. B Firstly, we are a fishing town with most of the people depended on the ocean and its resources. C Secondly, we won't receive jobs, because this fields are very technical fields and are community doesn't have the necessary skills to do this job. D Even if this project occurs offshore, it will still affect the migration patterns of marine organisms. E This project won't benefit me or are community, because the wealth will be exported and the community is left with degraded environment and protentional health hazards. F Are ancestors that have drowned in these oceans are unhappy with the activities we are allowing. We have seen with the snoek not appearing this season. Are Easter celebration stairs extinction in the face. G The consultation was conducted in Afrikaans are native language. But we unhappy with the project of Africa Corp and Azinam in block 3b4b.

climate change related impacts. B A detailed Fisheries Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the fisheries related impacts. C It is agreed that exploration activities typically require highly skilled employment. However, where feasible, it is anticipated that the use of local labour could be utilised, but it is anticipated that this will be extremely limited, if at all. However, should local labour be required during the exploration activities, then travel will be from suitable ports. D A detailed Marine Ecological Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the marine ecology related impacts. E A detailed Economic Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the economy related impacts. F A detailed Cultural and Intangible Heritage Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the cultural and intangible related impacts. G We note your unhappiness with the proposed project and will include your correspondence in our Public Participation Report for consideration by the Competent Authority.

Ms Wendy Pekeur

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

An email including several attachments from the community of Doringbaai was sent through this I&AP representing Ubuntu Rural Women. A transcription of all the various comments was undertaken. The names of the various contributors were included in the I&AP database. Essentially, the comments quoted below represent a large portion, if not the entirety of Doringbaai. All comments were completed on comment sheets supplied by Natural Justice: Esme Danster 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ons sal nie meer maak op die see soos ons kan nie. Ja. 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ons sal nie meer van die see kan lewe nie 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee daar sal nie werk vir die gemeenskap wees nie. 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja hulle het dit bespreek met die gemeenskap. 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek voel die projek kan nie voortgaan nie Reffealla Fortuin 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ja ek is bekommerd oor die diere in die see water 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié

Response

Dear Wendy, Firstly, we would like to thank you for your efforts in obtaining comments from the community of Doringbaai. The comments received will be recorded in the EIA Report for submission. The concerns of the community have been noted and provided details have been included in our I&AP database. We would also like to thank your organisation for participating in our Open Day and Focus Group Sessions. We continue to urge the community of Doringbaai to reach out to us for more information that will aid in informing the community further about the project.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Die mense sal nie van die see kan lewe nie 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee ons gan niks geniet. Niks. 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek stem nie saam dat die projek voort gaan nie Maria Owies 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die habitat van die seediëre belemmer 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Werkloosheid want see vis, kreef gaan vertrek 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Glad nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Natuurlik 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Dit sal net 'n negatiewe uitwerking he Crizelda Love 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ons kan nie meer die see geniet soos altyd nie 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Die mense sal nie meer van die see kan lewe nie 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja dit sal 'n impak he 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee dit sal nie. Niks. 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Dit is nie bespreek nie. 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Dit sal natuurlik beïnvloed word. 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja, maar vertaan steeds nie. 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek voel die projek moet gou gestop word Beuren Domberg 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Besoedeling 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Negatief 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee ek dink ni so nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Ms Wendy Pekeur

konsultasies? Ja ek het verstaan 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Nadelige uitwerking op omgewing Josephine Lewendal 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ons wat daarvan – dit is hoekom die bekommernis 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Weet nie – beïnvloed NIKS 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspeesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja NATUURLIK 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee – Nee en Nogmaals nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja Ja Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Nee 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja – Hulle het in Afrikaans gepraat 8. Verdere kommentaar Stop it Stop it Right Now Charmaine Cloete 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die habitat van diere is ingevaar 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Slegs daar gaan werk vir ons nie 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspeesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Nee 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja – hul het in Afrikaans ges 8. Verdere kommentaar Nee Nee Nee Franklin Lewendal 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die manne – hoe moet hul kinders en vrou (cut off) 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ek is 'n visserman se vrou hoe nou 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspeesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Natuurlik 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Ja 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Natuurlik – alweer 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja – dit was in Afrikaans 8. Verdere kommentaar Nee Claudette Cloete 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ek kan \*geensins\*? Skulpies

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

(illegible) 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Niks 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Hy sal my ontvrede stel 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee hy sal nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Kontant 'n negatiewe uitwerking he 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Nee 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Nee 8. Verdere kommentaar Nee Nee Stop Elias B 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die habitat van die seelewe gaan beïnvloed ... 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ek sien niks 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja - negatiewe 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee - nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja - was 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Nee 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? In Afrikaans – het verstaan 8. Verdere kommentaar Stop – Stop – nogmaals stop Phezaan Julie 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Nee dat die vissermanne op einde van dag sonde werk sou wees 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Daar sal geen wees vir ons vissermanne 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Nee 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee dit sal geen voordeel het nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja dit sal praktyke beïnvloed 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja dit is in taal wat ek verstaan 8. Verdere kommentaar Geen kommentaar Preston Goliath 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Vissermanne sal nie meer see toe kan gaan nie. Olie en gas moet gestop word. 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ek's 'n visserman. Ek kan kla sien dinge verander 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja visse spool kla uit. Vistye verander. 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee.



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Ms Wendy Pekeur

Dus Reels ons staan nie vir projek nie. 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja. Maar dit kan skuif loop. 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Olie en gas Projek moet stop, stop. Ronaldwin Snyers 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Vissers mane sal werk loos wees 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Viswinkels sal skade lai 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Die projek sal moet gestop word. Nicole Frisley 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ons menses al werkloos wees 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ons sal 'n skade ly as olie en gas projek voortgaan 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Die projek sal moet gestop word. Esme Frisley 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Dat groot invloed sal op ons visserye he 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Dat dit op die (illegible) die vissermanne se inkomste beïnvloed 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Natuurlik 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ek het dit verstaan in my taal 8. Verdere kommentaar Dit is ek wat praat esme en dis my toespraak Manuel Edward Ghall 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Mislikking van die projek en lewens gevaar 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Baie negatief & ons lewens in gevaar stel ens 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Beslis daar is redelike bewyse aanlyn ens 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Heel moontlik as hulle kan baie werke skep ens 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Nie regtig nie 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Beslis 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Nie regtig as gevolg van translasies 8. Verdere kommentaar Projek moet gestop word eers Anchen Frisley 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die visser manne sal nie mee kan see toe gaan nie 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Baie negatief 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja visse spoel uit vistye verander 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee nie regtig nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? nee 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Beslis 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Projek moet gestop word Mariska Cloete 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Dat dit die see diere se habitat kan belemer. Ja. 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Dat dit op die ou end die vissermanne se inkomste kan benadeel 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja. Ja. 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Natuurlik 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Dit is in my taal verduidelik. Ja. 8. Verdere kommentaar Dit het inelkgeval gaan voordeel vir die gemeenskap 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? 8. Verdere kommentaar Augustine Swarts 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Daar sal meer werk vir die vissermanne wees nie want die visse sal uitspoel wat al kla gebeur 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? My man werk op die see en daar sal vir hulle werk is nie meeste van die gemeenskap maak 'n bestaan uit die see uit 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspeesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Die projek (olie) moet gestop word. Donald Domberg 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Nee 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Op einde van dag sal ek sowel as ander werkloos wees 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspeesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Nee, visse voëlspeesies word uitgeroei 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee dit sal nie die gemeenskap beoordeel nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Nee 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Geen kommentaar Lee-Roy Adams 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die seediere sal doodgaan 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Dit sal die end van die vissermanne is 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspeesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? Ja ek het verstaan 8. Verdere kommentaar Geen Dalene Kordom 1. Wat is jou grootste

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Besoedeling 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Negatief 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Afwesig 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Afwesig 8. Verdere kommentaar Nadelige uitwerking op omgewing E. Engelbrecht 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Dit kan die see besoedel 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Dit kan die gemeenskap uitmekaar maak 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja dit kan beïnvloed 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee die gemeenskap nie beïnvloed 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar \*\*\* (illegible)\*\*\* uitwerking Bhahlela Afrika 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ja dat die see lewe tot [nuut] sal gaan 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Werkloosheid en gesondheid van ons gemeenskap 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja, dit sal want dit sal besoedel wees 4. Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap beoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee glad nie gemeenskap kry nie geleenthede nie en hulle moes nie terug in ons gemeenskap nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6. Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja. Natuurlik later kan ons nie (illegible) gaan doen nie 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het dit jou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Nee ons soek nie olie en gas hier nie Maaren Williams 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Die volhoubaarheid van die seelewe. Ja dit was aangespreek. 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Negatief. Geen werkskepping 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Geen voordele vir ons gemeenskap 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja dit sal 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek is teen die olie en gas projek Bradley Former 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ja is aangespreek 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ja 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja, ons sal nie meer kan ontspan op see nie 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee dit sal nie want daar is geen werkskepping 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja tydens openbare konsultasie 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja, want die see is plek waar ons feestyd bymekaar kom 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja dit het 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek seek nie olie en gas in ons see nie Lauren Arendse 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Ja natuurlik het ons dit aangespreek 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Ek sal nie meer kan see toe gaan nie die see is ons lewe 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja, veral vir kinders wat gaan swem 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee, want daar is geen werkskepping geleenthede 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Ja dit sal 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waarom die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek soek nie die projek nie asb Bronwen Marais 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Dat die see lewe nie meer die selfde sal wees nie 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Werkloosheid sal verhoog met 100% syfer 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspecies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Hy sal definitief 'n impak het 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee glad nie 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Wendy Pekeur

praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Definitief 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Ek soek nie vir olie en gas nie hulle moet gaan Felix Don 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Dat ons visspesies kan uitgeroei word 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Dit kan op die ou end ons brood en botter kos 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Natuurlik 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te verstaan waaroor die projek gaan? Ja 8. Verdere kommentaar Geen Emmor Lewedal 1. Wat is jou grootste bekommernisse met betrekking tot die projek? Is hierdie bekommernisse by die openbare konsultasies aangespreek? Dit kan besoedeling lui vir see duure 2. Hoe sal hierdie projek jou lewensbestaan en dié van jou gemeenskap beïnvloed? Dit kano ns brood en botter kos 3. Glo jy dat die projek 'n impak sal hê op jou toegang tot en gebruik van die see? Saldie projekaktiwiteite beïnvloed hoe visse en voëlspesies in die gebied rondbeweeg? Ja dit kan besoedeling lui op ons visse en voëlspesies 4.Sal hierdie projek jou of jou gemeenskap bevoordeel? Indien wel, watter voordele sal jy/julle geniet? Nee 5. Is die negatiewe impakte van die projek met jou bespreek voor of tydens die openbare konsultasies? Ja 6.Sal jou kulturele en geestelike praktyke deur die projek beïnvloed word as dit voortgaan? Natuurlik sal dit beïnvloed word 7. Is die publieke konsultasies gedoen in 'n taal wat jy verstaan? Indien wel, het ditjou gehelp om te

Ms Jihaan Haffajee

Date 2023/08/21 Method WhatsApp

Comment

Comment: Block 3B/4B Scoping Report From: Ms. Jihaan Haffajee Residential Area: Sea Point In a time where the devastating effects of climate change are all around us - with record hottest days on earth reported recently, together with growing numbers of raging wildfires globally - any further eploration for fossil fuels ought to be shelved. Not only do they threaten to raise global temperatures further, through greater CO2 emmissons, but they also impact the oceans through rising sea temperatures. Coastal communities that are entirely dependeny on the ocean for their livelihoods and survival also stand to be affected by these rising sea

Response

Thank you for your comments. A detailed Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment has been proposed as per Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto.



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Jihaan Haffajee

temperatures. Environmentally and socially, this project poses further danger to the planet, as well as vulnerable coastal communities. I wish to therefore express my strongest objection to it.

Mr Peter Pickford

Date 2023/10/03 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Ja Die impak op die seelewe in the algemeen het 'n effek op die langtermyn oorlewing van die gemeenskappe wat aan die kus woon Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Direk aangrensende. Die conservancy beslaan die kus gebied van Jacobsbaai tot Britania Heights en verteenwoordig al die grond eienaars met seefront eiendom. Kan u asseblief vir ons 'n hoëvlakbeskrywing gee van die aspekte van die omgewing waarop die projek direk of indirek geraak kan word? (insluitend gebruike soos visvang, skeepvaart, mynbou; topografiese kenmerke; Infrastruktuur; sensitiewe flora/fauna) Die vislewe sal volgens navorsing negatief beïnvloed word. Beskryf asseblief enige bio-fisiese en/of sosio-ekonomiese impakte wat u glo tydens die studie oorweeg moet word? Impak op vissers gemeenskappe wat ... is van die ... Het jy enige ander spesifieke bekommernisse, kommentaar of besware teen die voorgestelde projek? Indien wel, kan u asseblief vir ons inligting verskaf? Die langtermyn impak op seediere wat vir oorlewin op onderwater kommunikasie staatmaak effek van seismiese eksplorasië op seelewe

Response

Comments captured and confirmation of receipt sent to Lana Coetzee

Date 2024/02/07 Method Email

Comment

RE: Comment on the Environmental Authorisation application for the proposed Africa Oil Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration Please find attached my comments with regard to the above. I would be grateful for your acknowledgement of receipt. \*\*Letter attached and supported by several I&APs. See related comments.\*\*

Response

Thank you for your correspondence with us and attached letter. We have recorded this as part of the comments which will be submitted with the EIA report. Your contact details have been on our database as a registered I&AP.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Peter Pickford

whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the

relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Peter Pickford

conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated

regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Peter Pickford

	substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.
--	--

Mr Edward Jantjies

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

Comment	Response
Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Visbedryf Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Deeltydse visser Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Vissergemeenskap (owerhede) Is u bewus van enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? ?	Comments noted

Mr George Lenard Johnson

Date 2024/02/07 Method Other

Comment	Response
Written comment submitted via the Lambers Bay Pen en Papier organisation or affiliation. Content of comment was transcribed as follows: Vissers gemeenskap Lambertsbaai 1. Die vissers se grooste bekommernis met die projek is dat daar is dat daar in publieke konsultasies geen van die bekommernisse volwaardig bespreek word nie. Hulle praat met die politieke leiers. 2. Die projek gaan 'n negatiewe uit werking he op ons as inheenise mense se gewoontereg en die van ons huidige gemeenskap in Lambertsbaai. Dit sal ons net verder verarm. 3. Met die aktiwiteit wat gaan plaasvind sal dit 'n groot impak het op die gewoontes van die visspesies in die area so te se die hele weskus. Dit gaan die werk op see vir die vissers belemmer want vis word al hoe skaarse in die weskus. 4. Die projek sal geen voordele inhou vir inheemse vissers langs die weskus soos ons al reeds in verlede gesien het wat Total, Anglo American ens al aan ons gemeenskappe lang die kus gedoen het. Geen werk geen voordele gaan finansiële inspuitings. 5. Nee hierdie voordele en nadele van die projek was nog nooit met	Comments were acknowledged and organisation informed. Dankie vir u e-pos. Ons kan bevestig dat u besonderhere is op ons database opgeneem. U kommentaar sal in ons finale verslag aangeteken word.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr George Lenard Johnson

gemeenskappe bespreek nie al wat Total se is dat hulle sal sorg dat daar vegoeding sal wees, maar geen konkrate Antwoord van hulle so dus in leen wat vertal... 6. Die projek sal veroorsaak da tons as inheemse mense nie ons kultuur kan uitleef op die see en langs die see nie ons spirituele erfenis sal ook verlore wees. Ons as inheemse mense sal net verder verhonger. 7. Ons kan se ja want ons verstaan goed wat hulle gaan doen. Die projek gaan net oor die \*\*\*welstand van rgloes en politieke leiers 8. Vir die afgelope drie jaar het die weskus van Noord tot suid baie swak vis seisoene gehad. Wat is die oorsaak oil en gas.

Charmaine Andrew

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

In die eerste plek gaan dit definitief die see lewe benadeel, hoe is ek gewaarbang daar gaan nie olie lek nie, die see is my erfenis ek het groot geword van die see ek het familie herinneringe by die see my oupa het sy lewe lank op die see gewerk en ons groot gemaak. Ten tweedenns. Die myn belowe werk, maar dit gaan net high skill mense wees wat werk kry.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Ann

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Ek is inwoner van Doring. Bly my lewe lank in Doringbaai, my lewe is van die see. Ek voel ons se see spesies sal uit sterf. Ons vissermanne sal nie meer kan see toe gaan nie. Ons hele oseaan lewe sal verander. Kreef seisoene wat gewoonlik die inspuiting in Doringbaai is, sal ook verlore gaan. Soos ek verstaan daar word mense van buite af gebring on op die projek (Oil drilling) te werk en masjiene. So ons sal ook nie werke kry. Geen voordele sal daar vir ons wees. Dus die rede dat ek weier dat so iets in ons mooi en ongerepte skoonheid moet krap.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Andre van der Merwe

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

I am a landowner at 6 Dick Clarke Street, Paternoster, and I would like to lodge an objection to the proposal on the grounds that I have not been given due notice and adequate timeous notification. Kindly provide me all information at my above email address and keep me

Response

Thank you for your e-mail. This is to confirm acknowledgement of your objection. We understand your concern and would like to elaborate on our Public Participation Process. We acknowledge your role as a landowner. The project in question is an offshore exploration project, of which the



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Andre van der Merwe

apprised of any further supplementary information.	block associated is approximately 120kms off the shore of Paternoster. In terms of notice, more detail on the process can be found in the project’s EIA Report, however, a key process we initiate during the initial call to register is the placement of site notices. This process essentially allows for the engagement with potential interested and affected parties who may have not been pre-identified. Several site notices were placed in Paternoster, one of which was placed at corner Mosselbank Street and St Augustine Road. This was identified as a strategic location since it is close to the filling station of the area. From my estimate, it would have been 750 meters from your residence. According to the National Environmental Management Act: EIA Regulations (2014), this is considered a recommended method of engaging the public. We do apologise that you were unaware of the project until now, but we are very grateful that you have reached out to us and were evidently aware of the deadline for the submission of comments for the public review of the EIA Report. I have attached the Initial Notification letter and a copy of the Background Information Document of the project. We can also confirm that your details have been captured in our I&AP database for further communication about the project.
--	--

Mr Lorenzo Nickolaus Vaughan

Date	2023/07/31	Method	Questionnaire
Comment	Response		
Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Visbedryf Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Ja. Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Ja.	Comments noted		

Loren Gosling

Date	2024/01/19	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Dear sir/madam of Africa Oil SA Corp With respect I object to any wells, drilling, seismic testing and blasting in out oceans for the material gain of oil and gas magnets. Some of the reasons being that: 1. The destruction of our marine ecosystems and total disregard for our marine life is eminent 2. The welfare of our communities who struggle to make ends meet, cloth, feed and educate rely on the oceans to put bread on their tables You must stop this now, if not for folks like me then for your children and their children and generations to follow. Your greed and lust for money is killing our planet and soon she will perish and so too humanity. I implore	Apologies for the delay in response to your comments. This e-mail serves to acknowledge your comments and inform you that your details have been saved in our I&AP database. The delay in response was also due to changes to the EIA which have now warranted further engagement with the public. Please find attached a notification invited all affected to further engagement opportunities in the form of public meetings. A revised version of the EIA Report will be available as of the 8 April 2024. Should you need any further information regarding these opportunities, please feel free to contact us.		

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Loren Gosling

you, to think before you ok this atrocity please.

Yolandi Parsons

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

As an employee of The Cottage Collection (Pty) Ltd, I fully support the attached letter of Mr Peter Pickford. Please also register The Cottage Collection (Pty) Ltd as an Interested and Affected Party. \*\*See P Pickford Letter and comment\*\*\*

Response

Thank you for your email. This email serves to acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford’s letter. Your details have been recorded in our I&AP database for this project.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Yolandi Parsons

terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with

considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Yolandi Parsons

only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Yolandi Parsons

	<p>activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.</p>
--	--

Deborah de Wee

Date	2023/08/19	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Hoe gaan dit ons as kUSDorp. Raak ons vrees dat die drilling ons see bronne sal weg jaag en verminder totdat daar niks meer oor is vir ons kinders se toekoms. Ons lewe vanaf die see. Soos ons verstaan word reeds opgeleide mense ingebring wat spesialiseer in oil drilling. Beteken da tons kUSDorp se mense geen baai vind by hierdie en soortgelyke projek nie. So hoekom nog die mooi en eenvoud van ons natuur aan peuter as dit ons bron van inkomste is	Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.		

Sinegugu Zukulu

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Sinegugu Zukulu

Date 2024/02/09 Method Email

Comment

This is to register my objection to the planned oil and gas project. I object to this project for the following reasons: 1) For the sake of marine life in our oceans. 2) Our oceans are sources of livelihood for many coastal communities. 3) Our shorelines support eco-tourism which is a big chunk of our tourism industry. Putting our oceans on the risk of oil spills is a much bigger risk. 4) The planet is being affected by climate change and to dig up more fossil fuels is a crazy thing to do. NB : If I'm not registered as interested party please register me.

Response

Thank you for your comment and associated objection. 1) This comment is valid and has been contemplated by EIMS. We have included relevant specialist reports which consider marine ecology and fisheries in terms of the project. Please refer to Appendix 4.6 and 4.7 of the EIA Report for the full assessment completed. 2) Considering that the project may have an impact on the livelihood of coastal communities, these communities were engaged during the review periods of this project. Further, a Social Impact Assessment as well as an Economic Impact Assessment were undertaken to ascertain what the impact in this regard would be. Please refer to Appendix 4.4 and 4.8 for more information in this regard. 3) The scope of the assessment of any economic benefits will be limited to the exploration activities proposed as part of this application only and will not consider any potential future exploration or production economic impacts, positive or negative. A detailed Economic Impact Assessment has been completed in EIA Phase includes a detailed assessment of all of the sectors operating within the receiving environment. Furthermore, the fishing sector was identified as a key sector and was proposed as the focus of a dedicated study. A Fisheries Impact Assessment was undertaken during the EIA Phase. It should be noted that the engagement strategy included a broad range of stakeholders, including members of the small-scal fishing, aquaculture, tourism, sectors to name a few. 4) This comment is noted and will be included in the Final EIA Report. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity were assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. Once again, thank you for your comments. I hope these responses provided more information related to your concerns. You details have been included in our I&AP Database.

Mr Peter Scott

Date 2023/08/03 Method WhatsApp

Comment

Please register as an interested party to refer no. 1570. Regards Peter Scott Sorry for the Yzerfontein meeting 4/8/2023 at 10.30

Response

Good day Mr Scott, Thank you for your message. We confirm that you have been registered as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) for the EIMS Project 1570. Kind regards, EIMS Public Participation Team

Ms Jacolette Adam



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Ms Jacolette Adam

Date 2023/06/19 Method Email

### Comment

Good day Kindly register me as an I&AP for this process. Thank you

### Response

Dear Jacolette, Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

## Ms Khuliso Mudau

Date 2023/06/15 Method Email

### Comment

Please register me as an interested and affected party on the proposed project. Keep me posted on all activities and provide additional information. What type of exploration activities are you applying for? Well drilling? Seismic survey? Thank you.

### Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below. The proposed project entails the drilling of an initial exploration well within the application area, and up to 4 additional wells depending on the results of the initial well. The Scoping Report will be made available at a later stage. Kind regards, EIMS Public Participation Team

## Dalene Cloete

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

### Comment

(I say no) Ek se nee vir mynbou. Omdat dit 'n geen reg het om vir ons te wees nie. Daarom moet daar geen mynbou is nie. Hulle belowe vir ons werk. Maar dan kom daar geen werk inil uit nie. Daar is net sommige mense wat werk kry.

### Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

## Mr Cedrick Wayne Bruintjies

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

### Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Hoe gaan toekomstige impakte verseker dat ons omgewing nie gepla affekteer word Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Nee, ons dit net bekommerd oor die langtermyn impak op die see lewe en die toegang lokale omgewing en die toerisme van die area Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik

### Response

Comments noted

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Mr Cedrick Wayne Bruintjies

kontakbesonderhede? Behalwe die vissers gemeenskappe, hoe sal die toegang bedreig word. Sal verseker word dat indien die omgewing bedreig word sal daar onmiddellike herstel of verhoed word Is u bewus van enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? Ja. Ons Khoi en San gemeenskappe sal hul erfenis en die impak beskermid word. Is jy bewus van enige ander belanghebbendes wat in kennis gestel/betrek moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? Nee, nie bewus van enige ander belangheddendes wat lokaal is nie Kan u asseblief vir ons 'n hoëvlakbeskrywing gee van die aspekte van die omgewing waarop die projek direk of indirek geraak kan word? (insluitend gebruike soos visvang, skeepvaart, mynbou; topografiese kenmerke; Infrastruktuur; sensitiewe flora/fauna) Ons vissers gemeenskappe se lewens hang hoorsaaklik af van seisionale visvang afhanklik. Is u bewus van enige ander aktiwiteite (huidige of voorgestelde) binne, of aangrensend aan die toepassingsarea wat relevant kan wees vir die voorgestelde projek? Nee. Baie min inligting nog beskrikbaar tot dusver Is jy bewus van enige kultuur van erfenishulpbronne (insluitend ontasbare hulpbronne) binne die toepassingsgebied en omgewing? Verskaf asseblief detail? Nee, nog nie bewus van enige kulturiere en erfenishulpbronne nie. Beskryf asseblief enige bio-fisiese en/of sosio-ekonomiese impakte wat u glo tydens die studie oorweeg moet word? Gemeenskappe het sosiale ekonomiese impakte wat plaas gaan vind, maar klerksgeleenthede wat sal bekom word opleiding en saamwerking is baie belangrik. Het jy enige ander spesifieke bekommernisse, kommentaar of besware teen die voorgestelde projek? Indien wel, kan u asseblief vir ons inligting verskaf? Alles klink goed, maar wat is die langtermyn opleiding van lokale gemeenskap belangstellendes en veral die jeugliges.

## Masonwabe Dyosi

Date 2023/11/07 Method Email

### Comment

Kindly register me as an I&AP for the EIA for Block 3B4B drilling. Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

### Response

Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your details have been registered in our database.

## Mr Trevor Benjamin

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

### Comment

Are you a user of the application area or directly adjacent areas? If so, please describe your use

### Response

Comment noted

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Trevor Benjamin

of the application area. Fish factory workers Are you aware of any communities/organisations/community groups etc which operate within the application area that should be informed? Please provide details and if possible contact details? 0\*\*\*\*\* St. Helena Bay Leaders Please describe any bio-physical and/or socio-economic impacts that you believe should be considered during the study? Will have an impact on our sea life

Patricia Stevens

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Hoekom is ek bekommerd oor olie oseaan deur die Africa Oil? Ek is bekommerd omdat dit sal ons oseaan besoedel en ons spesies wat daarin leef sal dood gaan. Hoe sal ons lewensbestaan beïnvloed? Ons mense in die omgewing kan siektes kry. Ons bronne wat 'n inkomste genereer sal nie meer daar wees sodat ons mense daaruit n bestaan kan maak nie. Ons vissers sal nie meer kan uitgaan om vis te gaan vang om kos op die tafel te sit. Sal die vis spesies geraai word? Ja ons visse sal vlug en dood gaan . Ons mense sal die vis ver moet gaan soek of nie eers meer kan uitgaan vir vis nie.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mrs Deidre Cloete

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Ek is 'n klein besigheids-eienaar en wil weet hoe ons daaruit gaan baatvind Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area Ja kleinbesigheid eienaar Is u bewus van enige ander aktiwiteite (huidige of voorgestelde) binne, of aangrensend aan die toepassingsarea wat relevant kan wees vir die voorgestelde projek? Geen Is jy bewus van enige kultuur van erfenishulpbronne (insluitend ontasbare hulpbronne) binne die toepassingsgebied en omgewing? Verskaf asseblief detail? Geen Beskryf asseblief enige bio-fisiese en/of sosio-ekonomiese impakte wat u glo tydens die studie oorweeg moet word? Geen Het jy enige ander spesifieke bekommernisse, kommentaar of besware teen die voorgestelde projek? Indien wel, kan u asseblief vir ons inligting verskaf? Geen beswaar

Response

Comments noted

Mrs Jennifer Atkinson

Date 2024/01/26 Method Email

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mrs Jennifer Atkinson

Comment	Response
Attached is my comment sheet. Comment Sheet: I am against the drilling for exploration wells in our area. We are a fishing village and this will have a negative impact on our community. Exploration may be short term but if you are successful there will be a long term affect on the marine life in the area.	Thank you for your email and attached comment sheet. Your comment has been received and details included in our database for further communication about this project.

Mr Pieter Johannes Mostert

Date	2023/06/30	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
My name is Pieter Mostert and my contact no is ***** living in St Helena bay, I want to express my view to this people please put me down as a concernd party, and keep me updated where I can submit my reasons. Sincerely P Mostert	Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that you have been included in our I&AP Database.		

Martin

Date	2023/08/21	Method	WhatsApp
Comment	Response		
Die grootste bekommernis tot hierdie project is dat ons spesies nie sal inkom om te broei nie. Dws. ons klein vissers sal genoodsaak wees om verder vis te gaan soek. Met my Jare as visser sal daar geen bestaan wees met hierdie project in aanskou nie. Petrol pryse sal ons nie in staat stel om te oppereer nie. Hoogs onmoontlik vir n gewone kleinvisser om brood op sy tafel te sit!!!! Glad nie. Eerstens sal hulle die gebede afsper net om later ligboeie in die areas te gooi vir verbonde gronde. Hoe beweeg vis tussen kettings, pype ens? Natuurlik. Die voels soos vis het ook tye van die jaar waar die vis beweeg. Met die projekte wat hier aangaan of wil gebeur sal dit ons voels, vis, die vang van vis baie hard raak. Nee. Nie vir my of die gemeenskap nie. Die voordele is nie vir ons as vissers dorpie nie. Nee. Ons sal gestroop wees van alles. Die inpakte sal so groot wees dat dit n klein eers visser dorpie tot armoede en hongersnood dryf. Met al die inpakte waar eindig alles wat ons opgebou het op. Wat word van ons vis? Waar gaan ons werk? Die vis het seisoene waarheen dit beweeg. Ons kry nie vis uit die Suid na Noord nie. Ons kry vis uit die noorde. En met dit wat hulle wil doen sien ek die donkerte van visserman gesinne.	Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.		

Mr Niel du Toit

Date	2024/02/08	Method	Other
------	------------	--------	-------

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Niel du Toit

Comment	Response
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION APPLICATION PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED AFRICA OIL SA CORP BLOCK 3B/4B OFFSHORE EXPLORATION. Good day As a resident of the West Coast and a concerned South African, please see my comments regarding the above: The public participation notice was poorly publicized. The legal prescripts were followed but the Interested and Affected parties were not sufficiently alerted to the implications of the application. In the light of the increasing effects of climate change, granting permission for this exploration is shortsighted. Finding and extracting oil may in the short term ease the cost of fuel but in the long run it will detract from our commitment, to share the duty of limiting climate, change as far as possible. These two matters should be sufficient to cast serious doubt as to the advisability of granting permission for the exploration.</p>	<p>We would like to thank you for your letter and comments. We do apologise for the late response to your comment, since we have been in the process of compiling responses to all our I&amp;APs. With regards to the Public Participation process of this project, we acknowledge your viewpoint and support that EIMS has made great efforts to ensure that all I&amp;APs are notified about the process. This included newspaper and radio advertising. More details on this process can be found in this project's Public Participation Report which can be accessed at: <a href="https://eims.datafree.co/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/">https://eims.datafree.co/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/</a> (Data-free link) With regards to the comment on Climate Change, Section 5 of the EIA Report presents the need and desirability for the project including the context of the industry, and alignment with applicable South African Policies and Plans. The strategic need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition or peaking fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. I do hope that these responses address your concerns and provide some information. Please do not hesitate to contact EIMS should you have any other concerns.</p>

Esme Andrew

Date	2023/08/19	Method	Email
Comment	<p>Hoe sal ons lewens bestaan verander-beïnvloed. Ons sal nie meer toegang het tot die see nie want myne beperk gebiede. Die vis lewe gaan beïnvloed word, ons mense maak 'n lewe van die vis die myn bedrywighede gaan ons voel lewe benadeel onse voels sal weg gaan.</p>		

Response
<p>Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase</p>

Mr Toni Tonin

Date	2024/01/22	Method	Email
------	------------	--------	-------

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Toni Tonin

Comment	Response
I hereby urgently request that I be registered as an Interested and Affected Party in the above mentioned exploration right application. I am an aquaculture professional with decades of involvement in the industry on the east, south and west coasts of the country and consult to a number of industry players. Please advise whether there is any additional information that you may require from me.	We acknowledge receipt of your email and confirm that you have been registered as an Interested and Affected Party for this project. Kindly refer to our website for this project for more details on the project and copies of the documents currently out for public review 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA – EIMS.

Chriszell Hahn

Date	2024/02/08	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
As a Manager of La Baleine (Pty) Ltd, I fully support the attached letter of Mr Peter Pickford. Please also register La Baleine (Pty) Ltd as an Interested and Affected Party. **See P Pickford Letter and comment***	Thank you for your email. We acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford’s letter, and can confirm that your details have been captured in our I&AP database. **See P Pickford Letter and comment***		

Date	2024/02/08	Method	Other
Comment	Response		
1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the	1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether		



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Chriszell Hahn

international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination

the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Chriszell Hahn

to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High

Chriszell Hahn

	<p>Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.</p>
--	---

Ms Menka Vansant			
Date	2023/06/14	Method	Email
Comment	Response		
Please see my registration form attached. Are you aware of any communities/organisations/community groups etc which operate within the application area	Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details provided. We would also like to thank you for your comments		

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Menka Vasant

that should be informed? Please provide details and if possible contact details? Are you aware of any tribal authorities, indigenous peoples, or ethnic and culturally distinct groups that may be affected by the aforementioned project? Please provide details and possible contact details? Aukotowa Fishing Cooperative Are you aware of any other activities (current or proposed) within, or adjacent to the application area that may be relevant to the proposed project? Other adjascent oil and gas, diamond mining Please describe any bio-physical and/or socio-economic impacts that you believe should be considered during the study? Consultation efforts thus far have not made it clear what the economic benefit and job opportunities will be for local communities. Do you have any other specific concerns, comments or objections to the proposed project? If so, could you please provide us with information? Lack of cumulative environmental impact assessment from ALL the proposed oil and gas and other mining activities.

provided in the registration form. We take note of these and will ensure that they are considered throughout the Scoping and EIA Process.

Mr Michael Smith

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

We would like to be registered as an Interested and Affected Party in the matter of the proposed offshore exploration reference1570. The Large Pelagic SMME Association is a Registered and Recognised industry Body in terms of Section 8(1) of the Marine living Resources Act(MLRA). Our members are rights holders active in the Tuna pole-line and Tuna longline fishing sectors and the proposed area of exploration falls within their fishing waters.

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below. We also take note of your comments regarding your members in the Tuna pole-line and Tuna longline fishing sectors being active within the application area.

Ms Lisa Cloete

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A Please note my objections to this mining bid: 1) knowing full well the painfully destructive practice of some of the survey methods incorporated by big oil companies e.g. the sonic harm inflicted on ocean life by seismic surveying. B 2) knowing full well that the Paris Agreement specifies all nations are to work towards Net Zero by 2050, the fact that agencies such as yourself are even willing to work on cases such as these where big oil companies will stand to gain untold billions even while humanity struggles to turn our energy demands to alternative sources is highly suspect. C 3) If we as humans, who have seen what big oil and gas disasters at sea can do, continue to allow big oil prospecting, drilling, mining and processing where there is \_any\_ risk to the environment at all - not 'low risk', not 'unlikely', but any chance of not being

Response

A Comment noted. This comment will be provided to the PASA and the Competent Authority, the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE), as part of the final Scoping Report submission for their further consideration. A detailed Acoustics Impact Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. The cumulative impacts associated with noise have been described in Section 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report. The results of the acoustics model will be used by the fishing and marine ecology specialists to inform impacts on the associated aspects. Impacts have been identified for further investigation in the EIA Phase and are detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Lisa Cloete

one hundred percent safe - then we are acting irresponsibly and the public must see to it that these processes are stopped immediately, if agencies such as yourself are for whatever reason unable to act with conscience and declare these processes unsafe and potentially harmful and therefore unlawful. Since we are being asked to comment, I would like to comment that on this basis alone, that there is even any risk of harm where we should, as intelligent beings on a living planet, sharing resources with other beings, be at all times acting on a 'First Do No Harm' basis, \_especially\_ in cases where we are directly invasively affecting the environment, such as drilling and mining the oceans for oil and gas, this entire process should be halted and closed permanently as unlawful and potentially environmentally harmful. 4) Unless you are prepared to guarantee your entire investment as repayment to the environment and coastal communities of SA should there be any accident that affects our coastline then we cannot for one minute trust that you will take any responsibility for your role in it and leave us as Oil companies have been known to do repeatedly to deal with it ourselves with outrageous destruction. D 5) We are tired of our resources been sold to off for international countries to profiteer from. This is neo-colonialism and is outdated and harmful to all involved. 6.) We do not want our sacred, wild and free oceans and their extensive biodiversity industrialised. Not now, not ever. 7.) Impact to all involved, fisher communities, coastal communities and of course ocean animals and sensitive ecosystems are not worth what you are offering us, in fact there is no price that can justify this.

remaining specialists' assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. B The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. EIMS' position is to responsibly fulfil our role as independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners (EAP) and in that way provide an unbiased assessment of the proposal by the Applicant. Should the results of the EIA process yield impacts that are unacceptably high and cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, then this will be detailed at the conclusion of our EIA Report and submitted to the Competent Authority for their consideration and decision making. C Please refer to the response provided in #B above. The potential for oils spills are acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. In assessing the impacts associated with an oil spill, past oil spill events and other similar case studies will be considered to inform the magnitude and residual impacts associated with a potential future event. As part of the Exploration Right process, the Applicants are required to have adequate insurances in place to ensure that in the event of an emergency the necessary funds and highly trained teams are available for any scale of response. D Comment noted. This comment will be provided to the PASA and the Competent Authority, the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE), as part of the final Scoping Report submission for their further consideration.

Susan Gelandt

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

My bekommer oor die myn in ons osean is waarvan gaan ons lewe. My ma is 'n seeman en waar gaan hy werk. 'n geborene visserman, le baie nagte wakker oor wat aan die kom is. My kinder se toekoms le van my man se werk. Hoe kan my kind haar idiaal wat sy krester kan vooltooi. Ek vyer vir dit. Ons (ons) as vrouers moet net saam staan en baklei vir dit. Maar alles le in die hande van die Here, ons moet net vertou. Die myning sal nooit-ooit plaasvind nie . Wat hulle wil aanpak is te vergeefs.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

**Lena Lazarus**

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

### Comment

Ek as inwoner op on kUSDorp voel dat die projek en soorligelyke drilling nie kan gebeur. Dit sal ons see spesies raak en ons vis weg jaag. Ons se lewe sal in gevaar wees met die olie en gasse sou daar ites verkeerd gaan. Ons weier dat daar in ons see bodem gedril en gewoed word nie net vir ons self nie, maar vir die toekoms van ons kinders.

### Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

**Mr Sindisa Jongiwe**

Date 2023/07/10 Method Email

### Comment

Dear Sir/Madam Afternoon I hope you are doing well. Please find the attached CV of mine.

### Response

Dear Sindisa, Thank you for your email. We have received your CV and will keep it on record. We have also registered you on our I&AP database for further communication about this project.

**Ms Sue Reuther**

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

### Comment

Could you please register me as a stakeholder on the database. Could you please also confirm the nature of the proposed project (e.g. seismic survey?) and the status of the EIA process (is there a report to comment on, or just pre-notification at this stage)?

### Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below. The proposed project entails the drilling of an initial exploration well within the application area, and up to 4 additional wells depending on the results of the initial well. The Scoping Report will be made available at a later stage and this notification serves as an initial call to register.

**Ps Edward Forbes**

Date 2023/08/07 Method Questionnaire

### Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Ja. Nagetiewe effek van werkloosheid bemoeilik gemenskappe Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Ja. Deel van gemeenskap Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Daar was baie gedoen om die plaaslike gemeenskappe Is u bewus van

### Response

Noted



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Ps Edward Forbes

enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? CPA Nama, Khoisan Kan u asseblief vir ons 'n hoëvlakbeskrywing gee van die aspekte van die omgewing waarop die projek direk of indirek geraak kan word? (insluitend gebruike soos visvang, skeepvaart, mynbou; topografiese kenmerke; Infrastruktuur; sensitiewe flora/fauna) Bewus van alles, voordele, nadeleorskry

## Zenowia Danster

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

### Comment

Hoekom is ek bekommerd oor mynbou in deur die Afrika Oil. Ek is bekommerd omdat daar diere leef en dat hulle kan vernietig word en sterf. Hoe sal dit ons lewensbestaan beïnvloed, dit ons vissermanne en mense baie beïnvloed mense, af vissermanne kan meer werk nie en sal ook meer op strand kan kom nie. Hoe sal dit die spesies beïnvloed? Die spesies sal dood gaan, en baie van hulle sal vlug. Hoe sal ons christelike en kulture bestaan en praktyke beïnvloed word. Ons se christelike en kulture sal beïnvloed word en sal nie meer dieselfde wees nie. Sal die vis en see spesies geraak word? Ja, dit sal geraak word want die diere sal sterf en die spesies jaag hulle weg.

### Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

## Mr Hleketani Mukhari

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

### Comment

We would like to be part of the registry for interested party for the project developments.

### Response

Thank you for your email and your interest. You will be included in our I&AP database for this project.

## Ms Thea Jordan

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

### Comment

1. The email of 13 June 2023, inviting potential interested and affected parties to participate in the environmental authorisation application process, the Department's acknowledgement of receipt of the notification sent via email on 14 June 2023, and the email notification of 19 July 2023 regarding the availability of the Draft Scoping Report ("DSR") for comments, refer. 2.

### Response

1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3.1 Comment noted. 3.2 Comment noted. 3.3 The Directorate's stance on this matter is noted. The cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Block 3B/4B will be considered as part of each of the impacts identified (refer to Sections 9.3 and 9.4 of the Scoping Report). Additionally, please refer to the EIMS Methodology

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Thea Jordan

Please find consolidated comment on the DSR and Plan of Study Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) dated 17 July 2023 that was downloaded from the website of the environmental assessment practitioner (“EAP”). 3. Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management – Mr Ryan Apolles (Email: \*\*\*\*\*@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) \*\*\*\*\*): 3.1. This Directorate notes that the area of interest within Blocks 3B and 4B does not overlap with any Marine Protected Areas and any critically endangered ecosystems, as depicted in Figure 26 of the DSR. 3.2. Figure 49 of the DSR indicates the distribution and movement of cetaceans within the northmost block of interest while Table 13 notes that most of the cetaceans encountered, are species that are allocated an International Union for the Conservation of Nature Global Assessment status of least concern, except for the killer whale and sperm whale listed as near threatened and vulnerable, respectively. This Directorate awaits the findings of the specialist studies as proposed in the Plan of Study for EIA and will provide further comment at that stage. 3.3. This Directorate is not supportive of further offshore reconnaissance, prospecting, exploration, or mining on the sea floor until such time that sufficient and strategic level information is available on the cumulative impacts of these activities. While it is acknowledged that it is not the responsibility of the applicant to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (“SEA”), the competent authority should take cognisance of this recommendation to undertake a SEA to assists specialists and EAPs to accurately assess cumulative impacts, based on spatial planning principles, to assess and manage potential cumulative impacts in a holistic manner and to identify and implement regional level mitigation measures. 4. Directorate: Development Facilitation – Ms Adri La Meyer (Email: \*\*\*\*\*@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) \*\*\*\*\*): 4.1. Please correct the typographical error on page 24 of the DSR, referencing a semi-submersible drilling unit in Figure 2. This should be amended to refer to Figure 12. 4.2. This Directorate has no further comments on the DSR and Plan of Study for EIA and awaits the Draft EIA Report with specialist studies as identified in the Plan of Study for EIA. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any or new information received.

for assessing impacts as described in Section 9.1 of the Scoping Report. It is also important to consider that the offshore activities are proposed and authorised within a framework of existing legislation, policies and management plans, such as those described in detail in Sections 4 and 8.5 of the Scoping Report. The current legislation in South Africa does not prescribe a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken as a precursor to a project receiving EA. It should further be noted that this project does not relate directly to the development of the resource that may potentially be located offshore, but the exploration for such a resource. While a SEA would provide an additional framework within which the potential future development of the resources should be considered, such a SEA would rely on the outcome of the exploration to define the nature and extent of the potential resource. Without this information an SEA for development of the resource would be purely speculative. 4.1 Thank you for pointing out the typographical error. This has been updated in the final version of the Scoping Report. 4.2 Comment noted.

Date	2024/02/09	Method	Email
------	------------	--------	-------

## Comment

1. The email of 13 June 2023 regarding the environmental authorisation application process, the Department’s acknowledgement of receipt sent via email on 14 June 2023, the Draft Scoping Report (“DSR”) dated 17 July 2023, the Department’s comments thereto dated 21 August 2023, and the email notification of 08 January 2024 regarding the availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) Report for comments, refer. 2. The Department apologises for submitting its comments one day after the commenting period and expresses its appreciation to the environmental assessment practitioner (“EAP”) for allowing the time

## Response

1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. Thank you for submitting these comments. 3. Comment noted. The comments received will be addressed and included in the final EIA Report submitted to the competent authority. 4. The Screening Tool Report was included with the Application form for Environmental Authorisation (EA) and was also included as Appendix 4 of the Scoping Report, which is still available on the EIMS website. 5. Consideration was given to the proximity of the proposed activity on the nearby MPAs and EBSAs, as detailed in Sections 9.3.1.2.2 (DISCHARGE OF CEMENT, CUTTINGS AND DRILLING FLUIDS), 9.3.1.2.3 (SEABED AND WATER COLUMN TOXICITY

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Thea Jordan

extension. Please find consolidated comment from various directorates within the Department on the Draft EIA Report dated December 2023 that was downloaded from the website of the EAP. Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) – Mr Themba Silinda (Email: Themba.Silinda@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) 483 8367): 3. Based on the information provided in the Public Participation Report dated 12 December 2023, it is noted that the requirements of regulation 41(2) of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) were met for the public participation undertaken to date. Although the requirements of regulation 41(2) of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) have been met, all comments must be adequately addressed prior to the submission of the Final EIA Report to the competent authority. 4. A Site Sensitivity Verification Report dated 12 July 2023 was provided, which indicates that the Screening Tool Report stated that “No intersection with any sensitive areas found”; however, amongst others, a Marine Ecological Assessment, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, Fisheries Impact Assessment and Air Quality Impact Assessment were undertaken as part of this phase of the application. Please ensure that the Screening Tool Report is included in the Final EIA Report if not submitted with the application form. 5. Although the proposed exploration activities will not be located within any Marine Protected Areas (“MPAs”) or Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (“EBSAs”), the necessary precautions and mitigation measures must be implemented to avoid any indirect impacts on nearby MPAs and EBSAs. Further, the proximity to nearby MPAs and EBSAs must be taken into consideration in the impact assessment ratings. 6. According to the Draft EIA Report, the greatest environmental threat from offshore drilling operations is the risk of a major release of crude oil occurring either from a blow-out or loss of well control. The risk associated with a major spill of oil occurring from a blow-out is however considered highly unlikely. Oil spilled in the marine environment would have an immediate detrimental effect on water quality, with the toxic effects potentially resulting in mortality of marine fauna or affecting faunal health. The applicant is advised to implement the recommended control measures as included in the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report during the exploration activities to prevent an unplanned well blowout event, particularly considering the sensitive marine environment and fishing activities in the surrounding coastal area. 7. In accordance with the requirements of Appendix 6 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the curriculum vitae of the Social Specialist and Acoustic Assessment Specialist (Underground Sound Transmission Loss Monitoring) must be included in the Final EIA Report. 8. The mitigation measures and recommendations of the specialists must be included in the Final Environmental Impact Assessment Report and the Environmental Management Programme (“EMPr”). Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management – Mr Ryan Apolles (Email: Ryan.Apolles@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) 483 2817): 9. This Directorate is not supportive of further reconnaissance, prospecting, exploration, or mining activity of the sea floor until such time that sufficient and strategic level information is available on the cumulative impacts of these activities. 10. Whilst it is acknowledged that it is not the applicant’s responsibility to undertake a strategic environmental assessment (“SEA”), the

AND BIOACCUMULATION EFFECTS ON MARINE BIOTA), 9.3.1.2.6 (GENERATION OF UNDERWATER NOISE), and 9.3.1.3.4 (WELL BLOWOUT), of the EIA Report. The associated impact assessment ratings considered the proximity to the MPAs and EBSAs in the assessment of the extent, duration, magnitude, reversibility and probability, as well as the cumulative impacts and potential for irreplaceable loss of resources of the particular impacts. The identified management and mitigation measures have been included in the EMPr to be complied with during the project implementation. 6. Comment noted. Should the activity receive EA, the control measures in the EIA Report and the associated Environmental Management Programme (EMPR) will have to be implemented and adhered to. 7. Comment noted. The curriculum vitae of these specialists will be included in the final EIA Report. 8. Comment noted. The mitigation measures of the specialists have already been included in the EIA Report and EMPr. 9-10. The Directorate’s stance on this matter is noted. The cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Block 3B/4B were considered as part of each of the impacts identified (refer to Sections 9.3 and 9.4 of the EIA Report). Additionally, please refer to the EIMS Methodology for assessing impacts as described in Section 9.1 of the EIA Report. It is also important to consider that the offshore activities are proposed and authorised within a framework of existing legislation, policies and management plans, such as those described in detail in Sections 4 and 8.5 of the EIA Report. The current legislation in South Africa does not prescribe a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken as a precursor to a project receiving EA. As mentioned previously, it should further be noted that this project does not relate directly to the development of the resource that may potentially be located offshore, but the exploration for such a resource. While a SEA would provide an additional framework within which the potential future development of the resources should be considered, such a SEA would rely on the outcome of the exploration to define the nature and extent of the potential resource. Without this information, an SEA for development of the resource would be speculative. 11. Comment noted. The South African National Biodiversity Institute has been included in this mitigation measure. 12-13. Comment noted. 14. Thank you for the correction in terms of the South African Climate Change Response White Paper and the Western Cape Climate Change Response Strategy. This will be updated in the EIA Report. 15. Comment noted. It is important to note that the impact assessment has been undertaken for the exploration activities only and the climate change potential of the exploration activities was found to be very low. Should future production be undertaken, the climate change impacts associated with production would have to be assessed at that stage through a new and separate EIA process specific to a production right application. 16. Comment noted. Please find below the winds speed and directions for data used in the oil spill modelling for seasons 2 and 3. The historical data shows that there are strong episodes of wind coming from the NW over a short period of time, which will have little effect on the stochastic modelling, which considers the longer-term effects. This could best be seen on the low probability of presence of condensate on the surface. Furthermore, the condensate modelled evaporates quickly and disperses naturally, and based on the modelling does not stay on the surface long enough to reach the coast. 19.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Thea Jordan

competent authority must take cognisance of this recommendation to undertake a SEA which will allow specialists and EAPs to accurately assess cumulative impacts, to assess and manage potential cumulative impacts in a holistic manner, and to identify and implement regional level mitigation measures. 11. The impact of drilling and placement of infrastructure on the seafloor notes the following mitigation measure: “The mapping of the sensitive and potentially vulnerable habitats should be done in conjunction with independent researchers and the DFFE in order to ensure that the results could be made available to other researchers”. This Directorate proposes that the mitigation measure be expanded to include coordination with the South African National Biodiversity Institute as well. Directorate: Climate Change – Ms Lize Jennings-Boom (Email: Lize.Jennings@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) 482 0769): 12. The Climate Change Assessment compiled by Airshed Planning Professionals dated November 2023 include a climate change overview of global and national trends, a dynamic downscaled climate model providing information on the anticipated trends in the area, an overview of project emissions relative to appropriate international and national benchmarks, an impact assessment and rating exercise, as well as a discussion on proposed mitigation measures to offset the identified negative impacts. 13. The methodology used for the Climate Change Assessment are appropriate for this proposal and there are no concerns on how the assessment has been undertaken. 14. With reference to the policy documents referred to in the assessment, the South African Climate Change Response White Paper should be dated 2011 (not 2014 as is in the case in the report). The Western Cape Climate Change Response Strategy, 2014 has also recently been updated and the revised document titled Western Cape Climate Change Response Strategy: Vision 2050 (2022) can be found at the following link [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/environmentalaffairs-development-planning/wcccrs\\_vision\\_2050\\_march\\_2022.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/environmentalaffairs-development-planning/wcccrs_vision_2050_march_2022.pdf) 15. The Climate Change Assessment states that the impact of greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions has been assessed by way of comparing estimated annual GHG emissions from exploration activities with South Africa’s baseline and projected annual GHG emissions. The figures are calculated at approximately 0.008% of the 2020 GHG emissions baseline for the energy sector. This is a very small contribution to the GHG emissions for the country, given the temporary nature of the development (estimated at 84 days) and given that there may be further rollout of this project, should the gas find be deemed feasible for production. Therefore, it is important that these exploration activities need to be considered in terms of the net-zero emissions by 2050 goal that the country is working towards. Directorate: Development Facilitation – Ms Adri La Meyer (Email: Adri.LaMeyer@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) 483 2887): 16. The impact assessment indicates that negative impacts associated with the activity, can be reduced to medium and low negative significance after mitigation. This Directorate has no comments on the Draft EIA Report and is satisfied that the EIA process undertaken to date has met the requirements in terms of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended). Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management – Mr Gunther Frantz (Email: Gunther.Frantz@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) 483 2975): 17. It is

Comment noted. 20. With reference to the project description in section 3 of the EIA Report, it is understood that the current proposal will not include incineration within port limits. The Applicant will be required to apply for the relevant approvals should the project description change. At present the Applicant has advised that no waste incineration is envisaged offshore. Any waste materials (excluding cuttings) would be transferred to a licenced waste management company onshore for treatment. 21 Comment noted. 22. Comment noted. The EMPr requires that the “The Applicant shall identify and comply with all relevant national, provincial and local legislation, including associated regulations and bylaws and shall establish and maintain procedures to keep track of, document and ensure compliance with environmental legislative changes.” 22. Comment noted. Should the activity receive EA, the control measures in the EIA Report and the associated Environmental Management Programme (EMPR) will have to be implemented and adhered to. 25. Comment noted. The department’s email address has been added to the I&AP Database. 26-27. Comment noted.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Thea Jordan

noted from the Oil Spill Drift Modelling Technical Report compiled by Benjamin Livas dated December 2023 that the results of the stochastic simulation for the surface presence of condensate indicate that there is no oil reaching the shore for all quarters (seasons). This is attributed to the main drift direction of the spill towards the N – NNW, due to winds from the S to SSE pushing surface currents towards the NW. This Directorate understands the complexities involved in these modelling scenarios; however, this Directorate is of the view that the model is slightly inaccurate in simulating the movement of surface oil during quarter 2 and 3, at least, when strong NW – NNW winds will drive surface currents towards the shore. 18. The prevailing wind direction experienced along much of the west coast of South Africa during quarter 2 (April – June) and quarter 3 (July – September) will be from NW-NNW, which will increase the probability of surface oil reaching the shoreline. Please clarify if this is the case and if the model has made provision for this. Directorate: Air Quality Management – Mr Mzolisi Benxa (Email: Mzolisi.Benxa@westerncape.gov.za; Tel.: (021) 483 2388): 19. The proposed activity is not listed in terms of section 21 of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004) (“NEM: AQA”). 20. The applicant indicated that the proposed activity does not require an atmospheric emission licence (“AEL”) as it is assumed that no incineration will take place. However, it also stated that if incineration of waste materials is to be undertaken within port limits, and the vessel is considered an installation, as per the NEM: AQA Minimum Emission Standards, and more than 10kg waste is incinerated per day, it will require an AEL. This will trigger Category 8.1 (thermal treatment of hazardous and general waste) in Government Notice 551 of 12 June 2015. Clarity is required if incineration will take place. 21. It is noted in the Air Quality Impact Assessment compiled by Airshed Planning Professionals dated November 2023 that the applicant advocates that the predicted maximum amounts of emissions for NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO and Particulate Matter will be relatively lower than the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (“NAAQS”) limit values as per NEM: AQA. The applicant also indicated that since the calculated maximum concentrations are lower than the NAAQS limit values, the exposure to any significant concentration levels would be insignificant. Therefore, such emissions are unlikely to have direct effect on any receptor or other activity. It is also indicated that the potential impact on the air quality emissions is of low negative significance without mitigation. 22. Land-based noise activities must comply with the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations promulgated in Provincial Notice 200/2013. 23. Mitigation measures aimed at limiting noise disturbance and the psychological effects of noise pollution and noise control measures must be strictly adhered to as per the EMPr. 24. There is a potential for noise disturbance to the marine life which need to be closely monitored and managed, as indicated in the Underwater Sound Transmission Loss Modelling compiled by SLR Consulting dated November 2023. 25. Please note that this Directorate has a dedicated email address reserved for all EIA related correspondences (DEADP.AQM@westerncape.gov.za). Kindly use this email address for any future correspondence. 26. Please note that the abovementioned comments do not pre-empt the outcome of the application. No information provided, views expressed and/or

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Thea Jordan

comments made by this Directorate should in no way be regarded as an indication or confirmation that additional information or documents will not be requested. 27. The applicant is reminded of its “duty of care” prescribed in section 28 of the NEMA, 1998 which states that “Every person who causes, has caused or may cause significant pollution or degradation of the environment must take reasonable measures to prevent such pollution or degradation from occurring, continuing or recurring, or, in so far as such harm to the environment is authorised by law or cannot reasonably be avoided or stopped, to minimise and rectify such pollution or degradation of the environment”, read together with section 58 of the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 (Act No. 24 of 2008) which refers to one’s duty to avoid causing adverse effects on the coastal environment. The Department reserve the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any or new information received.

Ms Janet Solomon

Date 2023/06/18 Method Email

Comment

EIMS Reference Number: 1570 pertains Please register the coalition Oceans Not Oil as an I&AP for this block. Please can you explain exactly what ‘reprocessing’ involves. Please can you give an indication of exactly how many exploration wells may be drilled as part of this project. We look forward to hearing from you. Sincerely, Janet

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We confirm that Oceans Not Oil have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below. In terms of reprocessing, this refers to the use of previous data gathered about the site through previous surveys. The proposed project entails the drilling of an initial exploration well within the application area, and up to 4 additional wells depending on the results of the initial well. The Scoping Report will be made available at a later stage and this notification serves as an initial call to register.

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

A Herewith comment on the draft scoping report on behalf of the coalition Oceans Not Oil. There are over 31 organisations affiliated with Oceans Not Oil (see below). The ultimate objective of Oceans Not Oil is the termination of offshore oil and gas operations off our coastline, inspiring South African policy makers to build an economy beyond gas and deal with climate change vulnerability that is the legacy of oil and gas. This letter serves to lodge an objection to the proposed exploratory drilling in Block 3B/4B (AOSAC) off the West Coast of South Africa. It also serves to highlight issues in need of review within this Scoping, listed below: B CLIMATE IMPACTS AND APPLICABILITY TO SOUTH AFRICAS OBLIGATIONS South Africa is a signatory of the Paris Climate Agreement and has committed on the global stage to reduce Greenhouse gas emissions in an attempt to limit climate change. This has resulted in a domestic

Response

A Herewith comment on the draft scoping report on behalf of the coalition Oceans Not Oil. There are over 31 organisations affiliated with Oceans Not Oil (see below). The ultimate objective of Oceans Not Oil is the termination of offshore oil and gas operations off our coastline, inspiring South African policy makers to build an economy beyond gas and deal with climate change vulnerability that is the legacy of oil and gas. This letter serves to lodge an objection to the proposed exploratory drilling in Block 3B/4B (AOSAC) off the West Coast of South Africa. It also serves to highlight issues in need of review within this Scoping, listed below: Your comment/objection has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report. Please refer to the responses listed below. B CLIMATE IMPACTS AND APPLICABILITY TO



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janet Solomon

National Climate Change Response White Paper which details South Africa's plans to shift away from fossil fuels. There is a need to evaluate what the true need for oil and gas in the South African context actually is, in other words, a thorough evaluation of the no-go option. Moreover, there is a need to go beyond the exploration phase when a review of need and desirability is undertaken, while also assessing and quantifying the impacts of emissions during the exploration phase. Therefore, two further studies are required a) a Needs and Desirability Evaluation (by an independent consultant), and b) a Climate Impact Assessment, taking into account South Africa's Nationally Determined Contributions, while it plans to shift away from fossil fuels.

C TOXICITY, RADIOACTIVITY & POLLUTION A Radioactivity Impact Assessment Report has been excluded in the list of Reports anticipated. This is a pertinent report and should provide details and describe the compound ingredients, levels of expected toxicity and radioactivity of the lubricants used, and their effects to species (including human), as well as larval stages.

D WELL ABANDONMENT Well failure is a common enough issue (Vignes et al 2008) and serious. Please advise as to which actual contractor will be used for well plugging. Will the well abandonment be permanent or temporary and what types of well barriers will be utilised, as well as the types of plugging materials utilised, their functioning and verification. Please describe the well-integrity testing methodology to be utilised. Incidents involving radiation sources in well logging have occurred mainly as a result of operator error or equipment failure. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency (2020) Radiation Safety In Well Logging: Specific Safety Guide report, the hazards involved and the necessary control measures should be identified for each of the following conditions: a. Storage of the well logging sources; b. Calibration and operation of the well logging tools; c. Transport of the sources; d. Work at the site with the well logging tools; e. Maintenance of the tools; f. Disposal of disused sources; and g. The possibility of theft and sabotage of radioactive sources. Please identify control measures for each of these conditions. Please provide a report on how the applicant will ensure well monitoring to identify bubbling/leaking events will be carried out after drilling/ logging/ production/ de-commissioning has ceased.

E NOISE EMISSIONS It is noted that a Noise Emission Impact Study has been excluded from the list of anticipated Reports. Given the extensive time period and noise of drilling activities, this study should be considered pertinent. Although this area is regarded as a high marine traffic zone, this is not a good reason to exclude a noise impact study. Furthermore, it is noted that in the draft scoping, there is no regard for cumulative impacts in the soundscape. Cumulative impacts are a pertinent consideration in this type of impact and emission. South Africa is a signatory to a resolution passed at the 67th International Whaling Commission (IWC) 2018 for the elimination of acoustic pollution that affects whales (of all 13 species and populations considered under the IWC), and therefore has a duty to cooperate. Please explain how South Africa can fulfil this duty given the extensive timeline of this project while creating significant disturbance for an extended period on protected and unprotected species. Furthermore, the identified marine noise specialist must be capable and equipped to undertake in situ measurements (if they do

SOUTH AFRICA'S OBLIGATIONS South Africa is a signatory of the Paris Climate Agreement and has committed on the global stage to reduce Greenhouse gas emissions in an attempt to limit climate change. This has resulted in a domestic National Climate Change Response White Paper which details South Africa's plans to shift away from fossil fuels. There is a need to evaluate what the true need for oil and gas in the South African context actually is, in other words, a thorough evaluation of the no-go option. Moreover, there is a need to go beyond the exploration phase when a review of need and desirability is undertaken, while also assessing and quantifying the impacts of emissions during the exploration phase. Therefore, two further studies are required a) a Needs and Desirability Evaluation (by an independent consultant), and b) a Climate Impact Assessment, taking into account South Africa's Nationally Determined Contributions, while it plans to shift away from fossil fuels. It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant. Any subsequent authorisation would be restricted to these specifically assessed activities. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration or production activities which are not addressed in the current Environmental Authorisation (EA) application, there would be a consequent need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for an Exploration or Production Right as well as a new EA. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment and public consultation prior to approval. It is premature to assess the likely impacts of further invasive exploration activities or production activities as the extent, duration, location, and magnitude applicable to these activities are unknown at this stage. The NEMA EIA Regulations make a clear distinction between the exploration, and production activities in that these are listed as distinct and separate listed activities. There is provision in law for these activities to be assessed on their merits as and when they are proposed. Please refer to Section 5 of the Scoping Report in regard to the need and desirability for the proposed activities. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed by a specialist and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janet Solomon

not already exist) of the sound scape, and have the ability to interpret hearing thresholds (both Temporary Threshold Shift-based thresholds (TTS) and Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)) of marine fauna in the proposed area. Rather than establishing the safety zone radius solely based on a fixed distance, the safety zone radius should be, at most conservative, of either 500 meters or a radius determined using propagation models based on the best available data and science for a pre-determined acoustic threshold (McQuinn and Carrier, 2005). Please ensure the following cumulative acoustic limits are included in the noise emission study for all species expected to be impacted: a. Multi beam echo-sounder (70-100 kHz) b. Single beam echo-sounder (38-200 kHz) c. Sub-bottom profiler (2-16 kHz) d. Vertical Seismic Profiling (please confirm the relevant Hz range) e. Sea bed coring f. Noise from the rig g. Noise from the many vessels operating simultaneously h. Dynamic Positioning Systems from all vessels, including support vessels. F EMERGENCY RESPONSE Please describe the protocol and time frame of response if there are accidental leakage/blowout from more than one well. Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) for Subsea and Surface Release, detailing Oil Spill Response, including the Blowout Management Protocol, Planning and Capacity, must be reported to both stakeholders and the public relevant for each exploration, extraction or decommissioning operation; must include the possibility of more than one event; and must be made available for proper stakeholder and I&AP engagement. Any deficit of technological expertise / resources / difficulty of effective co-ordination with all government or conservation agencies that have a statutory responsibility for some aspect of offshore oil and gas activities regarding incident management, should be highlighted. The delegated National Incident Commander, along with the intended lines of responsibility for inter-agency efforts, should be made available for proper stakeholder and I&AP engagement. The citizens of South Africa need assurance that incident management is fully informed and has capacity to deal with the latest technology, practices and risks associated with, and due to, the different geological and ocean environments being explored, prior to the commencement of drilling. An Assessment of Onshore Environment and Mitigation in case of oil pollution must be supplied. Buried oil contaminants can resurface as the beach erodes. Buried oil must be removed through mechanical excavation. Details on the cross-shore distribution of oil contaminants relating to beach morphodynamics to ensure optimize beach clean-up planning need to be provided. A Dispersant Use Plan must be included, where most appropriate dispersants must be listed. An explanation of their chemical components, toxicity, and potential for bioaccumulation, ecological impacts through the water column and on the shoreline, and their specific function must be also provided. G SOCIO ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT The significance of impact of both cumulative effects and extended duration should be considered high and compensation for loss of income must be established through a Cost Benefit Analysis. All fisheries should be evaluated.

outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. Additionally, the Paris Agreement and National Climate Change Response White Paper have been discussed in Section 4.8 of the Scoping Report. C TOXICITY, RADIOACTIVITY & POLLUTION A Radioactivity Impact Assessment Report has been excluded in the list of Reports anticipated. This is a pertinent report and should provide details and describe the compound ingredients, levels of expected toxicity and radioactivity of the lubricants used, and their effects to species (including human), as well as larval stages. Any radioactive sources are controlled and executed by the selected logging contractor and these will be regulated by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and under the RSA regulations specified by the DMRE. The material safety data sheets (MSDS) for the substances utilised as part of the exploration drilling activities will be scrutinised and radioactivity and toxicity of the chemicals to be used as part of the proposed drilling operations will be assessed as part of the marine ecological impact assessment. D WELL ABANDONMENT Well failure is a common enough issue (Vignes et al 2008) and serious. Please advise as to which actual contractor will be used for well plugging. Will the well abandonment be permanent or temporary and what types of well barriers will be utilised, as well as the types of plugging materials utilised, their functioning and verification. Please describe the well-integrity testing methodology to be utilised. Incidents involving radiation sources in well logging have occurred mainly as a result of operator error or equipment failure. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency (2020) Radiation Safety In Well Logging: Specific Safety Guide report, the hazards involved and the necessary control measures should be identified for each of the following conditions: a. Storage of the well logging sources; b. Calibration and operation of the well logging tools; c. Transport of the sources; d. Work at the site with the well logging tools; e. Maintenance of the tools; f. Disposal of disused sources; and g. The possibility of theft and sabotage of radioactive sources. Please identify control measures for each of these conditions. Please provide a report on how the applicant will ensure well monitoring to identify bubbling/leaking events will be carried out after drilling/ logging/ production/ de-commissioning has ceased. It is understood that drilling contractors do the well abandonment according to those set by the UK Standard Industry practise. A number of cement plugs are placed at certain predetermined positions in the well design. Pressure testing will be executed at within the annulus at every stage, against the BOP. Any radioactive sources are controlled and executed by the selected logging contractor and these will be regulated by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and under the RSA regulations specified by the DMRE. The monitoring of leakage will be executed utilising an ROV at each specific stage of the operation. The impacts surrounding well failure and abandonment have been noted and added to the list of potential impacts identified for further consideration in the EIA Phase. E NOISE EMISSIONS It is noted that a Noise Emission Impact Study has been excluded from the list of anticipated Reports. Given the extensive time

period and noise of drilling activities, this study should be considered pertinent. Although this area is regarded as a high marine traffic zone, this is not an good reason to exclude a noise impact study. Furthermore, it is noted that in the draft scoping, there is no regard for cumulative impacts in the soundscape. Cumulative impacts are a pertinent consideration in this type of impact and emission. South Africa is a signatory to a resolution passed at the 67th International Whaling Commission (IWC) 2018 for the elimination of acoustic pollution that affects whales (of all 13 species and populations considered under the IWC), and therefore has a duty to cooperate. Please explain how South Africa can fulfil this duty given the extensive timeline of this project while creating significant disturbance for an extended period on protected and unprotected species. Furthermore, the identified marine noise specialist must be capable and equipped to undertake in situ measurements (if they do not already exist) of the sound scape, and have the ability to interpret hearing thresholds (both Temporary Threshold Shift-based thresholds (TTS) and Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)) of marine fauna in the proposed area. Rather than establishing the safety zone radius solely based on a fixed distance, the safety zone radius should be, at most conservative, of either 500 meters or a radius determined using propagation models based on the best available data and science for a pre-determined acoustic threshold (McQuinn and Carrier, 2005). Please ensure the following cumulative acoustic limits are included in the noise emission study for all species expected to be impacted: a. Multi beam echo-sounder (70-100 kHz) b. Single beam echo-sounder (38-200 kHz) c. Sub-bottom profiler (2-16 kHz) d. Vertical Seismic Profiling (please confirm the relevant Hz range) e. Sea bed coring f. Noise from the rig g. Noise from the many vessels operating simultaneously h. Dynamic Positioning Systems from all vessels, including support vessels. With reference to section 3.2.2 of the Scoping Report it should be noted that the anticipated duration associated with the drilling operations is approximately 3-4 months, and as such, it is anticipated to be of short duration. Please refer to Section 9.3 and 9.4.2 of Scoping Report, which clearly detail the impacts (direct, indirect and cumulative) related to noise ("acoustics") as having been identified and described. It should be noted that all applicable sources will be included in this assessment. Please refer to Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report where it is detailed that a detailed Acoustics Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA Phase to assess the aspects relevant to this proposal. This assessment will include an assessment of the likely cumulative impacts. F EMERGENCY RESPONSE Please describe the protocol and time frame of response if there are accidental leakage/blowout from more than one well. Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) for Subsea and Surface Release, detailing Oil Spill Response, including the Blowout Management Protocol, Planning and Capacity, must be reported to both stakeholders and the public relevant for each exploration, extraction or decommissioning operation; must include the possibility of more than one event; and must be made available for proper stakeholder and I&AP engagement. Any deficit of technological expertise / resources / difficulty of effective co-ordination with all government or conservation agencies that have a statutory responsibility for some aspect of offshore oil and gas activities regarding incident management, should be highlighted. The delegated National Incident

Ms Janet Solomon

	<p>Commander, along with the intended lines of responsibility for inter-agency efforts, should be made available for proper stakeholder and I&amp;AP engagement. The citizens of South Africa need assurance that incident management is fully informed and has capacity to deal with the latest technology, practices and risks associated with, and due to, the different geological and ocean environments being explored, prior to the commencement of drilling. An Assessment of Onshore Environment and Mitigation in case of oil pollution must be supplied. Buried oil contaminants can resurface as the beach erodes. Buried oil must be removed through mechanical excavation. Details on the cross-shore distribution of oil contaminants relating to beach morphodynamics to ensure optimize beach clean-up planning need to be provided. A Dispersant Use Plan must be included, where most appropriate dispersants must be listed. An explanation of their chemical components, toxicity, and potential for bioaccumulation, ecological impacts through the water column and on the shoreline, and their specific function must be also provided. Thank you for your comments. These items will be caried into the EIA phase for consideration by the EAP and Specialist Teams and inclusion in the EMPr where required. A detailed Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) will not be detailed during the Scoping Phase, but relevant aspects of the OSCP will be addressed in the EIA Phase after input has been receive d from the oil spill modelling study. G SOCIO ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT The significance of impact of both cumulative effects and extended duration should be considered high and compensation for loss of income must be established through a Cost Benefit Analysis. All fisheries should be evaluated. The socio-economic impacts will be evaluated as part of the fishing, cultural heritage, social and economic impact assessments that have been proposed for the EIA Phase as part of the Plan of Study for EIA. In this regard, the various fishing sectors and their respective market contributions will be considered in light of the potential impacts associated with the proposal.</p>
--	--

Date2024/02/08MethodOther

Comment

This letter serves to lodge an objection by the Oceans Not Oil coalition to the proposed exploratory drilling of up to 5 wells in Block 3B/4B off the West Coast of South Africa, which covers an area of approximately 17 851 km2 and is situated between latitudes 31°S and 33°S on the continental shelf in water depths ranging from 200 m to 2 000 m. Block 3B/4B is located approximately 120 km west of St Helena Bay and approximately 145 km south-west of Hondeklip Bay off the West Coast of South Africa. Oceans Not Oil is comprised of 39 organisations, and individuals, whose ultimate objective is the cessation of seismic exploration and oil and gas exploitation off our coastline. It is a conservation imperative that has public support and engages South African policymakers with the aim of building an economy beyond gas and oil, with its consequence to its marine life, subsistence and commercial fisheries, the tourism, recreation and hospitality industries, and deal with climate change vulnerability that is

Response

Oceans Not Oil is registered as an I&AP and has been provided with opportunity to participate in the EIA process from commencement. The organisations objection to this application, and their objective to cease all seismic and oil and gas exploration is noted. Section 5 of the EIAR presents the need and desirability for the project including the context of the industry, and alignment with applicable South African Policies and Plans. The NEMA Regulations, associated appendices, and relevant Guidelines have been complied with in preparing the Needs and Desirability set out in Section 5 of the EIAR. The seriousness of global warming and climate change has not been understated in the EIAR. The activity being applied for is exploration for hydrocarbons and not the provision of energy and hence the investigation of renewable energy production as a discrete alternative falls beyond the scope of this EIA. Section 5 of the EIAR presents the need and desirability for the project including the context of the industry, and alignment with applicable

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janet Solomon

the legacy of gas and oil. Whilst we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Africa Oil Sa Corp (AOSAC), Ricocure (Pty) Ltd and Azinam Limited (the applicants) Scoping on the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (DESIA) and proposed public participation process for the proposed offshore exploration and environmental authorisation application for Block 3B/4B, let it be said that we are greatly concerned by the 'development footprint' of the proposed 5 appraisal wells, sonar and vertical seismic profiling, drilling, its wastes and cumulative impactful operations in and adjacent to critical biodiversity regions and marine protected areas. The objection is based on the following, inter alia: 1. NEED AND DESIRABILITY a) The need and desirability of the Project have not been conclusively nor consistently established, as required by regulation 18 of the EIA Regulations read with regulation 23(3) and Appendix 3 to the EIA Regulations, since impacts and benefits of the project need to be assessed using the same parameters and criteria. The seriousness of global warming is grossly understated in the DESIA and its existential risks should feature in the need and desirability section of the draft to present the DMR as decision maker with an accurate, fair and reasonable risk assessment framework on which to assess environmental authorisation. 2. ALTERNATIVES UNCONSIDERED The actual alternative to extraction of fossil fuels is an investigation into the use of renewable energy, which should have been detailed according to NEMA Regulation 982 (2014). Please provide energy-supply alternatives to this project that will not carry the externalised costs of global warming and climate change to the degree that the project's flaring and methane leakage will. These externalised costs from the fossil fuel industry to the climate emergency are well understood, meaning this project will knowingly contribute further to global temperature rise. • This DESIAR's reluctance to engage sharp reductions in the production and use of all fossil fuels is, therefore, tantamount to unlawful endangerment, since their extraction and consumption can be avoided, cannot be reversed and will cause irreplaceable loss. 1. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS a) The DESIAR of the project, as required by the NEMA EIA Regulations, including the cumulative climate impacts of the project. The DESIAR has failed to adequately assess and consider the full extent of cumulative impacts of the exploration, or future production activities, on fisherfolk or marine ecosystems. There is no evidence that climate change impacts have been at all considered in respects of increased risks to the drilling structures, and in turn, of increased environmental impacts. In failing to do so, the EIAR fails to give effect to section 63(1)(g) of NEM: ICMA, which requires the competent authority to consider the likely impact of coastal environmental processes on a proposed activity. • Increased offshore anthropogenic activities, such as offshore mining, are likely to generate additional energy costs to migrating humpback whale populations. Therefore, energy related to reproduction would be jeopardized because the demand for energy would be funnelled into other related survival activities such as having to travel greater distances to avoid an area and changing swimming speeds. While local disturbances to behaviour may be minor, the costs of repeated disruptions may accumulate over a long journey (such as a migration) and thus collectively have a major impact on the energy stores of the species, at an unknown cost.

South African Policies and Plans. The strategic need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition or peaking fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. The EIA identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with the specific activities being applied for, namely exploration. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration, production, or combustion activities which are not addressed in the current EA application, there would be a need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for new EA and where relevant an exploration and production Right, informed by a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment and stakeholder consultation assessing the merits of these specific activities. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment of the associated impacts and public consultation prior to approval. Section 9.4 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts, including consideration of our anthropogenic activities (e.g. approved mining and exploration activities, undersea cables, marine vessel traffic, fishing activities, poverty, and climate change). Section 3.3.2 of the EIAR provides a description of the forecast drilling timelines. The actual timelines will be dependant on various factors (including weather conditions, availability of equipment). It is not anticipated that more than one well will be drilled at any one time. The AOI is located far offshore of migration corridors, and the footprints of the drilling operations are highly localised when seen in the context of the shelf area. Evidence has shown (and acoustic modelling has verified) that the impacts of MBES and VSP are not of the same magnitude as seismic acquisition. Dispersion and dilution are two different concepts, and they don't necessarily require a material to be soluble, although solubility can affect them. Also, bentonite is insoluble but is also inert, presenting non-significant chemical risk for the water column. Please note that the drill cuttings modelling is being rerun to accommodate a worst case scenario, namely utilising NADF fluids and drilling to a total depth of 3750m. The updated results and total cuttings volumes will be made available for public review and comment. Section 9.3.2 of the EIAR specifically identifies and assesses the potential impact on the various fishing industries, and specifically the pelagic longline sector. Short term is defined in the impact assessment methodology and applies to an impact duration of 1- 5 years. Please refer to Section 9.1.1 of the EIAR. Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR provides a description of the stakeholder



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janet Solomon

2. TIMING b) Please clarify the total anticipated time for this project, as there are distinct variances between the different reports of operations taking between 90 days per well to 120 days per well. c) Is it correct to assume the wells be not managed concurrently? d) It is not enough to say that “the applicant’s strategy for future drilling is that drilling could be undertaken throughout the year (i.e. not limited to a specific seasonal window period)”. These exploration activities are highly invasive in terms of waste cuttings, sediment plumes and noise pollution to those below the sea surface whose lives are lived according to seasonal breeding, feeding and migrations, with a high risk of displacement from these routes for turtles, resident and migrating cetaceans, seabird populations and fish species. The proposed operation window needs to be defined by the EAP. Timing of this exploratory drilling is critical for least possible impact. Best practice to mitigate negative impacts of oil exploration on endangered marine life is to separate them in time, space, or both. e) Based on 2.a. and an understanding that bathymetric multibeam sonar acquisition Vertical Seismic Profiling surveys are man-made sonic phenomena that are actively pursued for their powerful effective qualities, and that existing guidelines do not offer adequate protection to marine turtles and mammals, given the complex propagation of airgun pulses; the side-lobes of unknown energy and propagation of multibeam sonar operations, the difficulty of monitoring deep-diving species, such as beaked whales ; limitations in monitoring requirements; lack of baseline data; and other biological and acoustic complications or unknowns, please justify why the use of sonar will “not be limited to a specific time of the year”[p.9]. f) Based on 2.a. please justify why the model parameters of the drilling discharge scenario are set at a 50-day total which appears a significant understatement of risk calculation, especially considering the proximity of Critical Biodiversity Areas to the well sites. How, for instance, should the decision maker assess impacts of smothering and range of water column impacts if discharges take place for more than twice 50 days per well? 2. DISCHARGES “The risk is short term in the water column, because of the natural dispersion and dilution induced by the currents.” [p.30 Drilling Discharge Modelling Technical Report] a) Please justify mitigation by dilution when bentonite is practically insoluble in water and in aqueous solutions, swelling to form a colloidal solution. b) Please confirm that maximum drilling fluid discharged wastes, based on 4 months for 5 wells, for this project could amount to: 3. SOCIO ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT a) The DESIA has failed to make clear that this project has the potential to reduce catch rates for large pelagic longline fisheries and small-scale fishers for well over a year, which could prove catastrophic for some of them. These fisheries spend most of its time at sea searching for fish with actual fishing events taking place over a relatively short period of time. The significance of impact of both cumulative effects and extended duration should be considered extremely high should any displacement or accidental discharges occur. b) and their constitutional rights of fishers must be accommodated by transparent, convincing, accounting utilising up-to-date data for compensation for loss of income to fisheries and subsidiary businesses. These figures should be independently audited and must include economic losses by disruptions, loss of earnings plus the effects of negative publicity, persisting

engagement process. The process complies with and exceeds the NEMA EIA requirements. This application and associated EIAR relates to proposed exploration activities only, and not production. Should production be deemed feasible then a separate application and processes (including EIA and stakeholder engagements) would be required. It should further be noted that exploration is deemed to be restricted activity in the draft Biodiversity sector plans under MSP, but not specifically excluded. With reference to Section 8.5 of the EIAR the proximity to sensitive areas is noted and consequently the defined AOI avoids overlap with any MPA’s or EBSA’s. In accordance with the hierarchy of mitigation, the option is avoidance. The defined AOI has specifically avoided overlap with these sensitive environments. This avoidance reflects pre-emptive consideration of these sensitive areas and not complete disregard as alleged. It should be noted that the exploration activities are of limited extent and duration. Drilling additives will be specified by the selected drilling contractor. As a result, MSDS are not available at this time. Environmental performance will be monitored throughout operations and reports provided to regulatory authorities. Removal of hydrocarbons from cuttings prior to disposal is done in accordance with industry standard practice. Based on feedback with the applicant offshore thermal desorption is impractical and unsafe on an offshore vessel, and there are currently no floating thermal desorption units used. Waste management contractor will be selected by the drilling contractor and will be appropriately licenced. If radioactive sources are used, these will be contained sources for use for x-ray and other purposes and will be managed according to requisite national and international regulation. Many of the additives used are propriety information and, although the additives are appropriately licensed, data on toxicological effects is not publicly available as these are industrial products. The drilling operations will be undertaken in accordance with internationally accepted best practice standards. Section 9.3.1.2.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the impact of discharges to the seabed and water column toxicity and bioaccumulation effects on marine biota. This section includes recommended management and mitigation measures including monitoring. If authorised the EMPr for this project will be an extension to the Environmental Authorisation and compliance with such will be required to be monitored and reported to the Authorities. With reference to Section 3.3.5.3 of the EIAR, “Well or flow testing is undertaken to determine the economic potential of the discovery before the well is either abandoned or suspended. One test would be undertaken per exploration well should a resource be discovered and up to two tests per appraisal well. Each test would take up to 7 days to complete (5 days of build-up and 2 days of flowing and flaring). For well flow-testing, hydrocarbons would be burned at the well site. A high-efficiency flare is used to maximise combustion of the hydrocarbons. Burner heads which have a high burning efficiency under a wide range of conditions will be used. The volume of hydrocarbons (to be burned) and possible associated produced water from the reservoir which could be generated during well testing cannot be reliably predicted due to variations in gas composition, flow rates and water content. Burners are manufactured to ensure emissions are kept to a minimum. The estimated volume of hydrocarbons to be burned cannot be predicted with much accuracy because the



Ms Janet Solomon

public perceptions and potential fishing and harvest bans. c) Please support your view in detail, how “coordinating exploration activities and fishing/logistics operations coupled with strategies for job retention and skills development can mitigate these negative effects”. d) Please define “short term disruption “given this project could last a minimum of 2 years. Have all West Coast fisheries and small-scale fishers been informed as to the potential full duration of this project? 4. BIOLOGICAL OCEANOGRAPHY / MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND OTHER CONSERVATION AREAS Since “petroleum production is classified as “not compatible” in CBAs (Harris et.al. 2022)” and that the AOI is in close proximity to the Child’s Bank and Benguela Muds Marine Protected Areas, overlapping with some Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA), the DESIA understates the project’s direct area of influence. a) A full evaluation of each of these CBAs and MPA/ ESA and their sensitivities are expected to be fleshed out in the ESIA. b) In addition, the buffer areas surrounding these areas are expected to be noted and added to the operational plan. c) Considering that the AOI is surrounded on all sides Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) alternatives to release of drill cuttings overboard must be reassessed. d) The environmental assessment process is used to understand the potential environmental impacts of a development. This project will produce intense man-made noise pollution, produce carcinogenic, radioactive and polluting wastes in the water column and on the sea bed, over an extensive area possibly for years, next to critical biodiversity areas. It is also evident that this Area of Interest was clipped out during the spatial planning processes when the CBA’s were created by SANBI. This highlights the complete disregard for marine biodiversity and conservation in South Africa when oil majors and DMRE has intent for an area. 5. TOXICITY, RADIOACTIVITY & POLLUTION a) The DESIA mentions three main additives used during the drilling process: retarders, fluid loss control agents and friction reducers, and that these additives are polymers generally made of organic material and are considered non-toxic. i. A detailed composition of these emissions and effluents regarding their toxicity, biodegradation, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon content and their metal content, need to be made public/ described in the ESIA. ii. Please provide a detailed report of their effects to species (including human), as well as larval stages. iii. Please indicate any compounds for which there is incomplete information on their chemistry and health hazards. b) What assurances are there that drill cuttings will be treated to reduce oil content before disposal overboard? c) Will the NADFs be oil based or synthetic? Please describe their classification. d) Offshore thermal desorption offers an alternative method to treat drilled cuttings offshore and reduce the oil concentration on cuttings to typically less than 0.5% by weight prior to marine discharge. Is this a method being considered? e) Please advise as to which actual licenced waste contractor will be used for disposing of volumes of NADF remaining from the project. It is in the public interest to know the name of the contractor should the option be employed. f) Radioactive sources may be used for certain types of data acquisition. Please identify, and declare the half-life/rate of radioactive decay, of the radioactive sources. Please advise as to which actual licenced waste contractor will be used for disposing of hazardous wastes from the project, for the same reasons as above. 6.

actual test requirements can only be established after the penetration of a hydrocarbon-bearing reservoir. However, an estimated 10 000 bbl oil could be flared per test, i.e. up to 20 000 bbl over the two tests associated with an appraisal well. If produced water is generated during well testing, it will be separated from the hydrocarbons”. Section 9.3.1 and 9.3.7 of the EIAR assesses the potential impacts associated with the flaring on the marine environment and air quality respectively. The Applicant is aligned with the zero routine flaring by 2030 initiative. The anticipated emissions are limited and short-term and therefore do not require a pollution prevent plan or greenhouse gas mitigation plan under the NEMAQA. No carbon budget has been allocated as far as the EAP is aware. The Climate Change Bill was tabled in Parliament in February 2022. Only once the bill is passed, must the Minister publish a list of activities (with thresholds) which emit greenhouse gases which are likely to cause or exacerbate climate change. The Minister must also allocate a carbon budget to any persons that conducts a listed activity. A person to whom a carbon budget has been allocated must implement the approved greenhouse gas mitigation plan. At the time when the carbon budget is assigned for the first mandatory carbon budget cycle, all approved pollution prevention plans (PPP) as contemplated in section 29 of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004), and the National Pollution Prevention Plans Regulations, 2017, published under Government Notice No. 712 of 21 July 2017, must be deemed to be greenhouse gas mitigation plans. The GHG emissions from the exploration project do not trigger the need for a PPP (see section 6.5 of climate change impact assessment) .

It is not clear what is being referred to as well failure (i.e. blowout or well / plug integrity failure). It is understood that well failure is not a common issue. If a well is abandoned, then this is closed permanently. Section 3.3.5.4 of the EIAR describes the anticipated well plugging activities. Section 3.3.6 of the EIAR describes the well decommissioning phase. “The integrity of cement plugs can be tested by a number of methods. The cement plugs will be tag tested (to validate plug position) and weight tested, and if achievable then a positive pressure test (to validate seal) and/or a negative pressure test will be performed. Additionally, a flow check may be performed to ensure sealing by the plug. Once the well is plugged, seawater will be displaced before disconnecting the riser and the BOP” (EIAR Section 3.3.5.4). The Operator will abandon the well to ensure compliance to their internal standards or local regulation. The objective of the plugs will be to achieve a permanent barrier across the well. Whilst cement is the primary material for these plugs, the specific cementing compositions and use of other materials, and methods will be adjusted to meet the specific requirements at each well site to achieve the stated objective. If radioactive sources are used, these will be contained sources for use for x-ray and other purposes and will be managed according to requisite national and international regulation, as well as the operators procedures. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the impacts of noise from various source on sensitive receptors. “If relevant, VSP will be undertaken in order to generate a high-resolution image of the geology in the well’s immediate vicinity. It is expected to use a small dual airgun array, comprising a system of three 150 cubic inch airguns and three 150 cubic inch

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janet Solomon

ATMOSPHERIC EMISSIONS a) Have the applicants endorsed the Zero Routine Flaring by 2030 initiative launched by the World Bank and the United Nations in 2015 for new field development, and if so what consequence does this hold for this operation? b) Please give a realistic determination of the volume of gas to be flared per test, its emissions quantity and concentration, and expand estimates given that there may be up to five wells in total. c) What carbon budget has been allocated by the Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment for this project? Has a greenhouse gas mitigation plan been prepared and submitted to the Minister for approval? 7. WELL ABANDONMENT a) Well failure is a common enough issue and serious. Please advise as to which actual contractor will be used for well plugging. 2. Will the well abandonment be permanent or temporary? 3. Please provide information on the types of well barriers utilised, types of plugging materials utilised, their functioning and verification. 4. Please describe the well-integrity testing methodology to be utilised. 5. Incidents involving radiation sources in well logging have occurred mainly as a result of operator error or equipment failure. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency 2020 Radiation Safety In Well Logging: Specific Safety Guide report, the hazards involved and the necessary control measures should be identified for each of the following conditions: a. Storage of the well logging sources; b. Calibration and operation of the well logging tools; c. Transport of the sources; d. Work at the site with the well logging tools; e. Maintenance of the tools; f. Disposal of disused sources; and g. The possibility of theft and sabotage of radioactive sources. Please identify control measures for each of these conditions. Please provide a report on how the applicant will ensure well monitoring to identify bubbling/leaking events will be carried out after drilling/ /logging/ production/ de-commissioning has ceased. 8. NOISE EMISSIONS a) Cumulative impacts must be established for single and multibeam. Bathymetric sonars, VSP, well logging, well testing, equipment in the water, machinery noise, propeller cavitation as well as the drilling . b) Please include the number and size of airguns being used. c) Please establish cumulative acoustics limits for relevant species for the following: i. Multi beam echo-sounder (70-100 kHz) ii. Single beam echo-sounder (38-200 kHz) iii. Sub-bottom profiler (2-16 kHz) iv. Vertical Seismic Profiling (please confirm the relevant Hz range) v. Sea bed coring vi. Noise from the rig vii. Noise from the many vessels operating simultaneously viii. Dynamic Positioning Systems from all vessels, including support vessels. d) Please indicate when these operations may run concurrently, such as VSP while drilling, and across wells or individually? e) Key findings and modelling must be projected for the full length of the proposed operation. f) What international operational guidelines will be followed for mitigation of noise during this operation? g) Please assess the full scale of this acoustic footprint including impacts caused by vibration through drill string and casing, vibration into the seabed, vibration of drill bit. h) Please indicate how precautionary protocols will be established in areas of steep bathymetry close to seismic surveys and multibeam bathymetric sonar. Ocean depth, multibeam echo sounders sweep a swath up to 7.4 times water depth and so affect a wide area. Potential impacts on marine mammals may range from physical damage, including gross damage to ears

airguns with a total volume of 450 cubic inches of compressed nitrogen at about 2 000 psi. VSP source will generate a pulse noise level in the 5 to 1 000 Hz range.”(EIAR Section 3.3.7.1.12). Appendix 4.1 includes the results of underwater sound transmission loss modelling. The findings of this modelling has been considered and forms the basis of the impact assessment. The report includes the relevant zones of impact for the different receptors. Relevant management and mitigation measures are recommended in the EIAR and associated EMPr. The operations will be managed in compliance with the IFC EHS Guidelines for Offshore Oil and Gas Development, 2015. In terms of which sources will possibly be run concurrently: - Multi beam echo-sounder, Single beam echo-sounder (38-200 kHz), Sub-bottom profiler, and Sea bed coring would most likely be done prior to drilling however due to water depths and the use of a deep water drilling vessel are unlikely to be used. Vertical Seismic Profiling, Noise from the rig, Noise from the many vessels operating simultaneously may depending on the circumstances be undertaken at the same time as they are part of the drilling operations. The potential unplanned blowout scenario is described in Section 3.3.8. of the EIAR and the associated impacts are described and assessed in Section 9.3. The EIA and associated EMPr requires that the operator is a member of the OSRL which will assist in ensuring rapid deployment of spill response if needed. The EIAR and EMPr also requires that the operator must: “ Develop a well-specific response strategy and plans (OSCP and BOCP), aligned with the National OSCP for each well location, that identifies the resources and response required to minimise the risk and impact of oiling (shoreline and offshore). This response strategy and associated plans must take cognisance to the local oceanographic and meteorological seasonal conditions, local environmental receptors and local spill response resources. The development of the site-specific response strategy and plans must include the following: • Assessment of onshore and offshore response resources (equipment and people) and capabilities at time of drilling, location of such resources (in-country or international), and associated mobilisation / response timeframes. • Selection of response strategies that reduce the mobilisation / response timeframes as far as is practicable. Use the best combination of local and international resources to facilitate the fastest response. • Well-specific oil spill modelling for planning purposes taking into consideration site- and temporal-specific information, the planned response strategy, and associated resources. • Develop intervention plans for the most sensitive areas to minimise risks and impacts and integrate these into the well-specific response strategy and associated plans. • If modelling and intervention planning indicates that the well-specific response strategy and plans cannot reduce the response times to less than the time it would take oil to reach the shore, additional proactive measures must be committed to. For example: o Implement measures to reduce surface response times (e.g. pre-mobilise a portion of the dispersant stock on the support vessels, contract additional response vessels and aircrafts, improve dispersant spray capability, etc.). o Schedule joint oil spill exercises including AOSAC and local departments / organisations to test the Tier 1, 2 & 3 responses. o Ensure contract arrangements and service agreements are in place to implement the OSCP, e.g. capping stack in Saldanha Bay and other international locations, surface response equipment (e.g. booms,

Ms Janet Solomon

and the ‘bends’, temporary and permanent threshold shift (deafness), to perceptual (masking biologically significant noises) and behavioural impacts (temporary or permanent displacement and stress) as well as indirect effects (reduced prey availability) (Gordon et al., 1998). High intensity, low and mid-frequency sonar has been implicated in some fatal strandings (Frantiz, 1998). i) Please indicate how precautionary protocols to limit the disruption of rest will be established for the extended period of this project. Perhaps one of the most overlooked aspects of anthropogenic noise impacts is the ‘disruption of rest periods’, which are important to migrating, or even generally moving, marine animals. Significant stress due to prolonged exposure to seismic and anthropogenic underwater noise has been measured in a number of species (Finneran et al., 2002; Eckert et al. 1998; McCauley et al. 2003; Rollard et al. 2012). These studies indicate cumulative effects could result in metabolic maladaptation, suppressing growth, immune system function, thermoregulation and the reduction of reproductive rates, with implications for individual and population fitness. Chronic problems of this kind are a legitimate conservation concern. j) Cumulative acoustic limits should be established, since there is a very real risk of displacement from feeding or breeding areas which could have far-reaching effects not only for whole, and vulnerable, animal populations, but also on the fishing sector and our food security. These limits should be appropriately matched to the spatiotemporal scale and exposure rate of the risks to individuals and populations. Measurement of noise budget, such as those under consideration under the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive (Tasker et al. 2010), should lead to limits on the source levels that are introduced on a regional scale. Please assess the various technologies available for detecting marine animals in low-visibility conditions. Technologies that need to be explored include, active acoustic monitoring (AAM), radio detection and ranging (RADAR), light detection and ranging (LIDAR), satellite, and spectral camera systems, especially infrared (IR). 9. EMERGENCY RESPONSE a) Please describe the protocol and time frame of response if there are accidental leakage/blowout from more than one well. b) Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) for Subsea and Surface Release, detailing Oil Spill Response, including the Blowout Management Protocol, Planning and Capacity, must be reported to both stakeholders and the public relevant for each exploration, extraction or decommissioning operation; must include the possibility of more than one event; and must be made available for proper stakeholder and I&AP engagement. a. Any deficit of technological expertise / resources / difficulty of effective co-ordination with all government or conservation agencies that have a statutory responsibility for some aspect of offshore oil and gas activities regarding incident management, should be highlighted c) The delegated National Incident Commander, along with the intended lines of responsibility for inter-agency efforts, should be made available for proper stakeholder and I&AP engagement. The citizens of South Africa need assurance that incident management is fully informed and has capacity to deal with the latest technology, practices and risks associated with, and due to, the different geological and ocean environments being explored, prior to the commencement of drilling. d) The DESIA must provide an Assessment of Onshore

dispersant spraying system, skimmers, etc.), dispersants, response vessels, etc. The development of a dispersant use plan falls outside of the scope of the EIA and should be covered by the OSCP once the specific details of the specific well are identified.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janet Solomon

Environment and Mitigation in case of oil pollution. Buried oil contaminants can resurface as the beach erodes. Buried oil must be removed through mechanical excavation. The DEIAR needs detailed modelling of cross-shore distribution of oil contaminants relating to beach morphodynamic terminology to help optimize beach clean-up planning. e) The ESIA must clarify a Dispersant Use Plan: i. The most appropriate dispersants must be listed. An explanation of their chemical components, toxicity, and potential for bioaccumulation, ecological impacts through the water column and on the shoreline, and their specific function must be also provided. ii. There are many situations where the net environmental benefits of chemical dispersion are not clear. The dispersant effects on local flora and fauna must be indicated for all potential choices of dispersant in order for regulators to confidently decide on dispersant use issues. iii. The ability to provide timely and scientifically sound outcome and effects information is essential to support the regulators in their decision-making role when approving the initial use of dispersants and whether to continue or cease their use during an incident. a. Predictive migration / movement maps of dispersants based on sound oceanographic and metrological science must be provided. For all the reasons stated above, it is our urgent request that the proposed exploration does not proceed.

Christie Links

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Ons omgewing loop n gevaar van besoedeling ingeval van ongelukke en olie-oorstroming. Met ons eie navorsing het ons opgemerk dat dit wel 'n impak maak op ons voort bestaan as vissers veral die Tuna -vissers. Die blok wat afgebaken is hou ook gevare in vir ons seelewe walvisse, Tuna ens. Die ekonomiese impak lyk ook nie juis roos kleurig vir ons en ook die werks-aangleenhede. Dus se ons nee vir die projek.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Ms Erika Reynolds

Date 2023/11/23 Method Email

Comment

I received an Afrikaans notification about this at my residence in Kalk Bay which is on the False Bay coast. The rationale of inviting participation of people so far from the offshore drilling site and onshore facilities/activities is not clear. I found the notice rolled up and stuffed between the planks of my palisade fence. I am aware of the community responses to other drilling/ mining projects along the SA coast. I also know that you need to prove that you have been

Response

Thank you for your email. I can confirm that you were not included in our I&AP Database for this project and hence, were never officially sent a notification related to the project. Additionally, Kalk Bay and False Bay are indeed too far away from the affected area. Our Public Participation process for this project does span across a large portion of the West Coast, but the target of this endeavour was to engage interested fishing communities reaching as far South as Hout Bay, and

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Erika Reynolds

super diligent and inclusive when it comes to public participation. But the random delivery of the notice and to places quite irrelevant to the project makes no sense and might even be seen as unprofessional, lacking a properly designed PP plan. You might even be the people who had a Public Participation exercise with people in Mitchells Plain for this project which really borders on the bizarre. Nevertheless, as an old hand in EIAs and PP I wish you well. I also want to thank you for the excellent Afrikaans terminology you used in the leaflet I "received".

not further. Furthermore, physical notifications would have been sent from our office by post and in an envelope addressed to the receiver. Therefore, the notification you have received would not have reached you via our official channels. I can only speculate that this notification was delivered to you by someone else who may have been on our database, with an interest in the project. Potentially, because of your background, they may have been of the opinion that you would have an interest in the project. We definitely did not have any Public Participation activities as far as Mitchell's Plain. All our engagements and public meetings have been more focused within towns closer to the area of interest, example, St. Helena Bay and Hondeklip Bay. We have held meetings in Cape Town and Hout Bay for this project, but these were mainly adopted following concerns from I&APs who have consulted with us in previous projects. However, your comments are very valuable as someone of the EIA field. And thank you for reaching out to us.

Boitumelo Molale

Date 2023/07/14 Method Telephone

Comment

Request for information regarding locality of the affected area

Response

Dear Boitumelo, Thank you for your call earlier. As discussed, please see the attached files to give you a better idea of the locality of the site in question. Included is a KML file, as well as the locality map for your perusal.

Mr Phillip Kwekwe

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Ek is deel van die vissers gemeenskap en baie van ons maak 'n lewe uit die see Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Nee Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Ja: Hospice Youth Service Centre Is u bewus van enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? Nee

Response

Comments noted

Mr Gerald Cloete

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gerald Cloete

Date 2023/07/01 Method Email

Comment

Hi Please accept my registration as a interested and affected party. As a resident of St Helena Bay I want to be kept updated of the different processes. Hoping to hear from you soon. Kind regards,

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that your provided details have been included in our I&AP database for this project.

Mr Carl Blomberg

Date 2024/02/12 Method Email

Comment

I understand you are the contact person for the project with the excellent scoping report regarding the Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration Right. I feel sorry about what the international supported environmental lobby achieved i S.A. and all the bureaucracy that makes S.A. somehow shoot itself in the foot. I think all the humble people at the grass root level deserve much better. This nation has the natural resources to give all people a better life. That said I would like to see this drilling happen. In what stage is this project now? Was there or will there be public participation? I can see on the EIMS project page <https://www.eims.co.za/projects/> that there was an update on it posted on October 24, 2023. Does this update have any significance? Is a decision from Department of Mineral Resources and Energy to be expected soon or what is the timeframe? Could more or less this summer be expected?

Response

Apologies for the delay in response to your comments. This e-mail serves to acknowledge your comments and inform you that your details have been saved in our I&AP database. The delay in response was also due to changes to the EIA which have now warranted further engagement with the public. As it stands, the project is in the EIA Phase at present, undergoing an extended public review period. In terms of timelines, an exact date cannot be provided at this stage, however, we do encourage you to engage with us during our upcoming engagement opportunities. Please find attached a notification invited all affected to further engagement opportunities in the form of public meetings. A revised version of the EIA Report will be available as of the 8 April 2024. Should you need any further information regarding these opportunities, please feel free to contact us.

Melissa Groenink

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

INTRODUCTION 1. These submissions are made by Natural Justice, the Green Connection and Masifundise in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR) published for comment by Environmental Impact Management Services (Pty) Ltd for the proposed exploration and environmental authorisation applications for Block 3B/4B. 2. Natural Justice: Lawyers for Communities and the Environment is a non-profit organisation specialising in environmental and human rights law in Africa – with a focus on the pursuit of social and environmental justice for local and indigenous communities. Natural Justice offers direct support to local and indigenous communities impacted by the ever-increasing demand for land and natural resources. 3. The Green Connection is a registered non-governmental organisation, that believes that economic growth and development, improvement of socio-

Response

1. Natural Justice, the Green Connection and Masifundise have been identified and registered as Interested and Affected Parties, and have been invited to participate throughout the EIA process. 2. Noted. 3. Noted. 4. Noted. 5. The comments submitted on the Scoping Report in August 2023 have been recorded and responded to and presented as an appendix to the Scoping Report submitted to the Competent Authority for decision making. 6. Many thanks for your submissions. 7. Section 9 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential environmental impacts associated with planned operations, unplanned events, as well as cumulative impacts. The potential impacts resulting from an unplanned blow-out has been identified and assessed. 8. In response to new information as well as feedback from various stakeholders, the oil spill model will be updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst



## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Melissa Groenink

economic status and conservation of natural resources can only take place within a commonly understood framework of sustainable development. The Green Connection aims to provide practical support to both the government and non-governmental/civil society sectors, which are an integral part of sustainable development. 4. Masifundise is a civil society organisation with a long track record in the small-scale fishing sector. Its aim is to promote and advance human rights and Food Sovereignty in small-scale fishing communities in South Africa, and globally. Masifundise empowers fishers and community-based activists to become agents of change in order to become agents of change within their own communities, organisations, and social movements, as well as facilitating and strengthening participatory governance, enabling fishing communities to secure their social, economic, and political rights and promoting principles of social, economic and environmental justice. 5. Natural Justice and The Green Connection submitted comments on the draft Scoping Report on 21 August 2023. In this comment, we set out our objection to the exploitation of oil and gas resources. We stand by those comments. 6. In this submission, we set our specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR) dated 21 December 2023, and shared for public comment on 8 January 2024. I. THE DEIAR'S OIL SPILL MODELLING FAILS TO MODEL A WORST-CASE SCENARIO 1. NEMA requires an environmental impact assessment to assess "each identified potentially significant impact and risk, including the probability of the impact and risk occurring." A probability is the extent to which an event is likely to occur. Because a worst-case scenario has some probability of occurring, the DEIAR must assess the impacts of a worst-case scenario. For the Project, a worst-case scenario includes a blowout event that results in the release of hydrocarbons into the surrounding environment. 2. The DEIAR claims to have modelled a worst-case blowout scenario, however this assertion is incorrect. In fact, the DEIAR and the Oil Spill Drift Modelling Technical Report ("Modeling Report") fail to properly assess the potential impacts of a worst case oil spill scenario for Block 3B/4B in three main ways. First, the Modeling Report fails to identify a worst-case release point for a blowout event. Second, the Modeling Report fails to model blowout scenarios of both condensate and crude oil releases using hydrocarbon profiles reflecting available data from nearby wells in the same basin. Finally, the Modeling Report arbitrarily uses an optimistically short timeframe for the duration of a potential release. As a result, the modeled blowout event fails to represent a worst-case, conservative scenario as the DEIAR and Modeling Report claim. 9. The DEIAR's failures to model a true worst-case blowout scenario are discussed in more detail below. The model will need to be updated to reflect a true worst-case scenario. This will require many of the DEIAR's conclusions to also be adjusted to reflect the more significant risks to marine and coastal ecosystems and organisms. The model's release point location does not reflect the worst case location. 10. The Oil Spill Drift Modeling Technical Report states that "The Release Point selected for the study scenarios represent the worst-case locations in the block" and "Usually a conservative case (worstcase) is chosen, showing for example the shortest time of impact to the coast, or the largest quantity of hydrocarbons to the coast." The release point

case of the potential five well locations identified. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts will be included in an updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. Section 2.3.2 of the Oil Spill Drift Modelling Report (appendix 4.9 of the EIAR) uses the response times in the existing OSCP's developed for other drilling campaigns in the region (namely, Block 11B/12B and Venus) and states that: "The capping stack would be mobilized from Saldanha Bay in both cases. The capping time would be 13 days and 20 days respectively. Here the most conservative duration was considered". It is understood that the use of 20 days response time represents a reasonably conservative estimate. 9. Refer to response provided to item 8. The oil spill model and associated impact assessments will be updated and made available for public review and comment. 10. Section 1.1 of the Initial Oil Spill Drift Modelling Report identifies and justifies the selection of release point D for the purpose of the model. Of the preliminary well sites identified Point D is the closest to shore. The oil spill model has been updated to reflect a release point at Point D as well as Point A. 11. Point D represents the closest of the identified well locations to the Benguela Muds MPA. The oil spill model has been updated to reflect a release point at Point D as well as Point A. 12. Please refer to responses provide in items 10 and 11. With reference to Figure 2 provided, the applicant currently has no intention to drill any exploratory wells in the areas identified by the blue points. 13. The oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts are included in the updated EIAR which is being made available for public scrutiny and comment. 14 & 15. Please refer to response provided in item 13. 16. Please refer to response provided in Item 13 above. The detailed motivation for a suitable blow-out rate and analogue is presented in the updated oil spill report. 17, 18, & 19. The existing Oil Spill Drift Modelling Report does model the release of condensate from Point D. As noted above the model has been revised to include a crude oil scenario from both Point A and Point D to represent a worst case of the potential five well locations identified. The relevant specialist studies and impact assessments have been updated accordingly. 20. Please refer to response provided above. The oil spill drift model has been revised to include a set of crude oil spill scenarios, at a rate of 34 000 bpd from both Points A and D. 21. Please refer to the response provided to item 8 above. 22. The Deepwater Horizon (DWH) disaster does not represent an example of current industry best practice and standards. The DWH has provided significant learnings to the industry and controls have been put in place to deal with a similar event, such as making pre-emptive contingency plans for well capping. As noted in the Spill Drift Modelling Specialist report, the capping stack would most likely be mobilized from Saldanha Bay in both cases. The capping time would be 13 days and 20 days respectively. Here the most conservative duration was considered. These assumptions are based on the Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) prepared for exploration drilling campaign in Block 11B/12B in 2020 and adjusted for the Block 3B-4B location 23 & 24. The EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with a blowout scenario. The EIAR and associated EMPr further recommends the following: Develop a

Melissa Groenink

used in the model does not meet the criteria for worst case since there are locations inside Block 3B/4B and the designated “areas of interest” that are closer to shore, protected areas, or critical biodiversity areas (see Figure 1 of modeling technical report included below). According to Google Earth, the release point (Point D in the figure) is about ~215 km from shore, while there are locations in the areas of interest that are just ~180 km from shore and other areas in Block 3B/4B that are only ~120 km from shore. 11. Similarly, there are areas of Block 3B/4B and the areas of interest that are much closer to the Childs Bank and Benguela Mud Marine Protected Areas (the dark green patches northeast and southeast of the areas of interest) than the selected release point. The boundary of the areas of interest comes within ~25 km of the Childs Bank MPA, while the block boundary comes much closer to both Childs Bank and Benguela Mud MPAs. Additionally, given the local currents and prevailing wind directions and the technical report’s focus on whether spills would impact Namibian or International waters, a location at the northern end of the blocks and areas of interest could reflect more of a worst case scenario. 12. Block 5/6/7 is adjacent to Block 3B/4B and the “ESIA for Exploration Well Drilling in Block 5/6/7 off the South-West Coast of South Africa” published in 2022, modeled two different release points to ensure the worst case scenario was covered. The Block 3B/4B analysis would better reflect worst case scenarios by similarly modeling two release points, one at the northern edge of the areas of interest (closer to Marine Protected Areas and Namibian waters) and one at the southeastern edge of the areas of interest, closer to shore and nearby MPAs. (See example in Figure 2 below). Figure 1. The figure below on the right is Figure 1 from the Oil Spill Drift Modeling Technical Report. Well location D was modeled as the release point. Figure 2 on the right shows the same information, with an approximate block outline added in red. The red point marks the release point used in the model. The two blue points illustrate examples of locations that would better illustrate a true worst-case scenario. Figure 1: Release points locations, area of interest and sensitivity map, Figure 2: Block 3B/4B Overlay on Release Points Oil Spill Drift Modeling Technical Report at 8. The model’s hydrocarbon profile assumption does not reflect the worst case scenario for Block 3B/4B. 13. The DEIAR states: The oil was predicted to not reach the shore at the Release Point, regardless of the season. Sensitive nearshore and coastal receptors were thus not considered in the assessment. This, however, makes the crucial assumption that the released liquid hydrocarbon is ONLY condensate with no crude oil being present ... 14. There is a probability that the hydrocarbon resource targeted by the proposed exploration wells is condensate rather than crude oil ... In the event of the well producing oil, the potential blowout rate would be higher, but this information is not available.” 15. These statements make it clear that there is a chance the well could produce oil, and if it did, the blowout rate would be higher, resulting in a larger total spill volume. This means that the worst case scenario was not properly modeled, since crude would persist in the environment longer and be released at a higher rate during a blowout. It also means DEIAR fails to analyze the full range of potential impacts of the Project, in violation of NEMA. 16. The assumption that only gas and condensates would be released during a blowout relied on an

well-specific response strategy and plans (OSCP and BOCP), aligned with the National OSCP for each well location, that identifies the resources and response required to minimise the risk and impact of oiling (shoreline and offshore). This response strategy and associated plans must take cognisance to the local oceanographic and meteorological seasonal conditions, local environmental receptors and local spill response resources. The development of the site-specific response strategy and plans must include the following: • Assessment of onshore and offshore response resources (equipment and people) and capabilities at time of drilling, location of such resources (in-country or international), and associated mobilisation / response timeframes. • Selection of response strategies that reduce the mobilisation / response timeframes as far as is practicable. Use the best combination of local and international resources to facilitate the fastest response. • Well-specific oil spill modelling for planning purposes taking into consideration site- and temporal-specific information, the planned response strategy, and associated resources. • Develop intervention plans for the most sensitive areas to minimise risks and impacts and integrate these into the well-specific response strategy and associated plans. • If modelling and intervention planning indicates that the well-specific response strategy and plans cannot reduce the response times to less than the time it would take oil to reach the shore, additional proactive measures must be committed to. For example: • Implement measures to reduce surface response times (e.g. pre-mobilise a portion of the dispersant stock on the support vessels, contract additional response vessels and aircrafts, improve dispersant spray capability, etc.). An OSCP and BOCP is not typically developed or required at EIA stage, but rather once a specific well site has been identified and detailed site specific information is available to inform the plans. These plans are developed prior to the commencement of drilling. Section 11.3 of the EMPr lists the suggested project controls relating to an unplanned blowout that must be in place. These including the following: The operator must be a member of OSRL, at the point of commencing the project. OSRL is a global oil spill response co-operative funded by more than 160 oil and energy companies, and has a base in Saldanha Bay and another base in Aberdeen, which houses well capping equipment designed to shut-in an uncontrolled subsea well. The Saldanha based capping stack is available to oil and gas companies across the industry and provides for swift subsea incident response around the world. The equipment is maintained ready for immediate mobilisation and onward transportation by sea and/or air in the event of an incident. This would significantly reduce the spill period. All of the wells must be designed to allow for effective capping. 25. Simultaneous deep water blow out events have not occurred, and the Operator will manage supply chain and logistics in accordance with their internal standards. It is also worth noting that OSRL has a global spill response network with access to 6 capping stacks and the ability to mobilise resources on a global scale. 26. Please refer to Item 23 above- the OSCP and BOCP will need to consider the equipment, resourcing and logistical requirements associated with various well blowout scenarios. 27. Please refer to Item 23 above. 28. The project / well specific Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) will be prepared and approved internally by the Operator and submitted to the South African authorities (SAMSA, PASA and DFFE) for review and approval. 29.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Melissa Groenink

assumption that the hydrocarbon profile of Block 3B/4B would be similar to those of the Brulpadda/Luiperd fields. It is not clear why the Brulpadda/Luiperd fields were used as an oil type reference or “analogue reservoir” for spill releases. These fields are located roughly 600-700 km away from Block 3B/4B off the southern tip of South Africa in a different basin, while the Graff-1 and Venus-1 wells in Namibia are located roughly 150-200 km northwest of Block 3B/4B in the same basin (see Figure 2 below). Graff-1 and Venus-1 have yielded light oil while Brulpadda and Luiperd yielded gas condensates. Figure 3: Location Map for Block 3B/4B and Africa Oil Assets from Prospective Resources report of independent qualified evaluator for Block 3B/4B, South Africa at 14, [https://africaoilcorp.com/site/assets/files/1823/risc\\_africa\\_oil\\_corp\\_prospective\\_resource\\_report\\_blo.pdf](https://africaoilcorp.com/site/assets/files/1823/risc_africa_oil_corp_prospective_resource_report_blo.pdf). 17. Block 5/6/7 is adjacent to Block 3B/4B, and the “ESIA for Exploration Well Drilling in Block 5/6/7 off the South-West Coast of South Africa” published in 2022, modeled releases of both crude oil and condensate to determine which represented the worst case and based the crude oil profile on data from the Venus well. The ESIA for Block 5/6/7 provides the following rationale for analyzing releases of both crude and condensate: “At the present time, the basin modeling studies are not finished and even if it is more likely to find oil, the condensate case is not excluded. Thus, a comparison of a “crude oil” case versus a “condensate” case was performed.” After comparing both cases, the ESIA for Block 5/6/7 concluded “that the Crude Oil case is the most impacting (worst-case scenario).” Given the uncertainty about what types of hydrocarbons would be released, the Block 3B/4B model should have analyzed releases of both crude oil and condensate and should have based the hydrocarbon profile on the nearby Venus well located in the same basin rather than the more distant Brulpadda/Luiperd fields that are in a different basin. 18. Another reason to model both condensate and crude releases is that they pose different risks and behave differently in marine environments. Condensate tends to disperse and evaporate readily, resulting in less oiling on the water surface or shorelines. Highly toxic crude oil released during a blow-out would be much more persistent on the water surface, and much more likely to impact the shoreline. Crude oil affects marine fauna it comes in contact with, and should have been included in modeling of the worst-case scenario, especially considering the presence of ‘Endangered’ and ‘Vulnerable’ seabird species and ‘Critically Endangered’ and ‘Endangered’ species of marine turtles, cetaceans, and numerous fish species in the project area. 19. It is well known that oil on the water surface can smother seabirds, and that even small oil spots may affect them, as oil on their feathers can affect their normal insulation and lead to hypothermia. Oil droplets attract, entrap and kill many smaller-sized species, while larger fish species may ingest oil when trying to catch oil-trapped organisms, or they may inhale it or get it stuck on their gill membranes. High oil concentrations are fatal for marine organisms, and low oil concentrations affect molluscs, crustaceans, fishes and all other organisms that live and breathe in the water. The model’s release rate and duration do not reflect the worst case scenario. 20. As described above, the model should have examined a scenario where crude oil was released.

Please refer to response provided in Item 20 above. 30. Please refer to responses provided in Items 20 and 23 above. 31. Please refer to response provided in item 13 above. Section 5 of the EIAR presents the Needs and Desirability. This section notes that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The updated Oil Spill Drift Modelling Specialist report now considers a crude oil scenario. 32,33, 34. Please refer to response provided to Items 13 and 16 above. The updated Oil Spill Drift Modelling Specialist report now considers a crude oil scenario. 35-38. Please refer to response provided to Item 13 above. 39, 40. The potential cumulative impacts and considerations have been identified and assessed in Section 9.4 of the EIAR. This cumulative assessment includes consideration of ongoing exploration and production activities in the region, maritime vessel traffic, vessel lighting and operational discharges, mining activities, the fishing industry, and climate change. 41-45. The cumulative assessment considers the past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities. It would be premature and unreasonable to assess the cumulative impact of a speculative production scenario in the region considering that the nature and extent of such is undefined at this stage. Rather, if there are applications for production in the future then the EIA processes required for these future activities would need to consider and assess the cumulative impacts, considering the planned activities. 46 -48. An EIA is a risk-assessment based study and is a process of predicting and evaluating the likely environmental impacts associated with a proposed development or project. The EIA is inherently a predictive tool that is based on best available information and is in most cases not able to rely on absolute scientific certainty. The specialist assessment have clearly indicated information sources, identified gaps in available information, and listed relevant assumptions and limitations. The confidence level in the assessment is also noted. Keeping these limitations and gaps in mind, the assessment of impacts has adopted a strongly precautionary approach. 50. Please refer to response provided in Item 46 above. The EIAR has relied on best available information. No suggestions are made by Natural Justice on additional or updated information sources which should be considered. 51. Please refer to response provided in Item 46 above. The EIAR and EMP includes a requirement that the operator undertakes a pre-drilling site survey. Further requirements include: • Design of pre-drilling site surveys to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of sensitive and potentially vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site. • The mapping of the sensitive and potentially vulnerable habitats should be done in conjunction with independent researchers, the DFFE and the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) and the DFFE in order to ensure that the results could be made available to other researchers. • If sensitive and potentially vulnerable habitats are detected, adjust the well position accordingly to beyond 1 000 m or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. • Limit the area directly affected by physical contact with infrastructure to the smallest area required. • Based on pre-drilling survey(s), the well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Melissa Groenink

Given that the DEIAR states: “In the event of the well producing oil, the potential blowout rate would be higher”, it is clear that the modeled release rate does not reflect the worst case scenario. It also is not clear why the DEIAR stated that the blowout rate for a crude spill “is not available”, given that the ESIA for nearby Block 5/6/7 was able to model releases of both condensates and crude oil. The EIA for Block 3B/4B and the ESIA for Block 5/6/7 used similar release rates for condensate (1,500 & 1,200 bbl per day respectively) and for the crude oil scenario the Block 5/6/7 ESIA modeled a value of 25,000 bbl of oil per day, roughly 21 times the rate of the condensate scenario. 21. The EIA modeled a release for condensate of 238.8 m3 /day, and a duration of 20 days under the assumption that a capping stack would be mobilized from Saldanha Bay and successfully deployed within that period of time. The DEIAR states this is based on “the Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) prepared for exploration drilling campaign in Block 11B/12B”. That plan’s estimate of 20 days includes the note “Provided no debris clearance requirement and suitable weather conditions.” Given this underlying assumption, it seems unlikely that 20 days represents the worst case release duration, since this area can experience periods of stormy weather and rough seas that can delay ship traffic. 22. Moreover, real-world examples demonstrate that 20 days does not represent a worst-case scenario. The IXTOC 1 exploratory oil well and the Macondo oil well (Deepwater Horizon) blowouts took nearly 10 months and 87 days respectively to cap. Other cases, such as Timor Sea in Australia, and Yum Il/Zapoteca, lasted 74 and 51 days respectively.12 II. THE DEIAR DOES NOT INCLUDE RESPONSE PLANS FOR COMMENT 23. Whilst a separate oil spill modelling report is contained in DEIAR, it does not include an Oil Spill Contingency Plan, an Emergency Response Plan, a Blowout Contingency Plan, a Well-Control Contingency Plan. These plans are essential mitigation measures, the details of which are necessary to inform the impact assessment, and without them, the EAP cannot reasonably evaluate the significance of an impact post mitigation. 24. Section 24N of NEMA requires that the EMPR include proposed mitigation and remedial measures, and measures to rehabilitate the environment affected by the undertaking of the activity. These plans must form part of the EMPR that is to be approved by the competent authority, and approval of the plans should not exist as discrete processes separate from the EMPR. 25. The DEIAR also does not indicate how it will deal with a multiple block simultaneous blowout scenario, with all authorised projects relying on the same capping equipment based in Saldanha and Aberdeen. 26. These documents should deal with specific equipment that will be available (including any offshore drilling equipment should a relief well need to be drilled), as well as the logistics informing actual response time etc, such as – but not limited to - transport or shipping requirements for both the Saldanha Bay and Aberdeen capping stack mobilisation scenarios, implications of attempting to install a capping stack at a deep sea location in potentially adverse and challenging weather conditions, implications of having to drill a relief well should capping fail, and associated time requirements for all scenarios. 27. The response is integrally connected to the mitigation of this impact. 28. The failure to make these plans available for comment by I&APs during the EIA process is

surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. These requirements will not only aim to ensure direct impact on sensitive benthic habitats is avoided/ reduced but will also provide valuable information of the receiving environment for future projects. 52 & 53. Please refer to response provided in Item 46 above. 54. The fact that Climate Change is a measurable reality is not disputed. The potential impact of climate change on the environment and specifically on the fishing industry is identified and discussed in the EIAR (refer to Section 9.4.3.2 and 9.4.3.3 of the EIAR). 55-58. The Acoustic modelling study considered sensitivities of the various hearing groups of cetaceans and concluded that the animals would have to be in very close proximity to the source for injury to occur. Climate change effects on seabird, fish and marine mammal distributions has been considered and relevant studies cited. 59 & 60. Section 9.3.1.2.6 of the EIAR specifically identifies and assesses the potential impact of noise on the marine environment, including cetaceans. 61. As noted in the response to Item 13 above the oil spill model has been revised to consider a crude oil spill scenario. The are of influence has been extended accordingly. The relevant specialist studies and associated baselines and sensitive receptors have been revised and updated accordingly. The relevant data from the 2018 South African National Biodiversity Assessment has been considered in the EIA. 62-66. Section 9.1 of the EIAR defines the impact assessment methodology. This methodology aligns with the requirements of NEMA as well as the approved Scoping Report and Plan of Study. 65.1. Section 9.3.1.1.3 of the EIAR presents the assessment of this impact. The report notes that it is estimated that there could be up to four trips per week between the drilling unit and the helicopter support base at Cape Town or Springbok (i.e. up to 68 trips per well over a 4 month period). It is clear that the impact will be relatively short term and intermittent. 65.2 and 65.3. Section 9.3.1.2.2. of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts from the discharge of cement, cuttings and drilling fluids. This section includes the potential smothering of benthic habitats. The report notes that for low-energy, deep-water environments, such as those in the Block 3B/4B, the effects of drilling discharges on benthic ecosystems are more severe and long-lasting. The report also notes that, sessile megafaunal densities and richness increased significantly with increasing distance from drilling, with partial megabenthic recovery between 3 and 10 years post-disturbance (Gates & Jones 2012; Jones et al. 2012). The potential environmental effects (both smothering and toxicity) of drilling solids discharges have been discussed in several studies (Morant 1999; Husky 2000, 2001a; CAPP 2001; Hurley & Ellis 2004), all of which concluded that exploratory drilling with WBMs has no enduring ecological impacts on the marine environment. The duration of burial would also determine the effects on the benthos. Here a distinction must be made between incidental deposition, where species are buried by deposited material within a short period of time (as would occur during drilling solids disposal), and continuous deposition, where species are exposed to an elevated sedimentation rate over a long period of time (e.g. in the vicinity of river mouths). Provided the sedimentation rate of incidental deposition is not higher than the velocity at which the organisms can move or grow upwards, such deposition need not necessarily have negative effects. The sensitivity to short-term incidental deposition is species dependent



Melissa Groenink

procedurally unfair. 29. The DEIAR indicates that the assumption that the resource would only contain condensate arises from “information provided by the Applicant for the Oil Spill Modelling Study”. The DEIAR does not indicate whether any independent expert assessment has been undertaken to confirm the veracity of the Applicant’s assumption. 30. The DEIAR indicates that there is a possibility that a heavier hydrocarbon could be found, in which case, the oil spill modelling and risk assessment must be updated, together with the OSCP and other relevant documentation. This is to close the proverbial stable door after the horse has bolted. The EIA Regulations require that XXX, and consequently, all possibly impacts must be identified and assessed prior to any environmental authorisation being granted. III. THE DEIAR MAKES INCONSISTENT ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT WHICH HYDROCARBON THE PROJECT WILL DISCOVER. 31. The DEIAR and the Oil Spill Modelling Report make inconsistent assumptions about the type of hydrocarbon that the Project will discover. Specifically, the DEIAR’s need and desirability section cites South Africa’s purported need for crude oil to justify the Project. However, the oil spill model assumes the Project will discover no crude oil, only gas and condensate, hydrocarbons that have fewer environmental risk in the event of a blowout. The DEIAR cannot have it both ways. If the EIA claims South Africa will accrue the economic benefits and energy stability of discovering domestic crude oil in the need and desirability section,<sup>17</sup> then the DEIAR must also model the environmental risks associated with that discovery in its oil spill modeling. In contrast, if the DEIAR assumes no crude oil will be discovered, then the DEIAR’s need and desirability section must be updated to clarify that no crude oil will result from the Project and that South Africa’s purported need for domestic crude oil is no basis to justify the Project. Currently, the DEIAR is presenting an erroneous picture of the risks and benefits of the project, artificially inflating the benefits while minimizing the risk. IV. THE DEIAR’S ASSUMPTION THAT ONLY CONDENSATE AND GAS WILL BE RELEASED DURING THE EVENT OF A BLOWOUT CONTRADICTS EVIDENCE IN THE DEIAR 32. The DEIAR’s oil spill model assumes only gas and condensate will be released in the event of a blowout, which contradicts other evidence within the DEIAR indicating that crude oil or other oil might also be discovered. In fact, the DEIAR specifically acknowledges that crude oil might be discovered during the Project, stating “should a heavier hydrocarbon be encountered during the drilling activities (e.g. crude oil), it would be required that the associated oil spill modelling and associated risk assessment must be updated. This would also require updates to the OSCP and other relevant documentation.” By that time, however, any updates would be too late to serve their purpose of identifying and mitigating harms from the activity and of assessing the need for the Project. Further, such retrospective oil spill modeling is not in alignment with the requirement to model the worst case scenario, and certainly not in alignment with the application of the precautionary principle. 33. It further contravenes NEMA in that it does not assess the potential consequences for or impacts on the environment. 34. In addition, the DEIAR indicates that a large portion of Block 3B/4B is “oil prone,” which is inconsistent with the Oil Spill Model’s assumption that most of the released hydrocarbon will be gas. The DEIAR bases its assumption

and also dependent on the sediment type, with deposition of silt being more lethal than a deposition of sand. It is anticipated that the impact on the benthic communities would be of long duration and not permanent. The assessment rates the reversibility as 4 which is defined as Impact is reversible only by incurring prohibitively high time and cost. 65.3. The extract cited is taken out of context and assists in defining the extent and magnitude of the impact. The assessment further states that “in the sediments, however, the impact persists beyond 5 years. Thus, the duration for sediment toxicity is MEDIUM TERM”. The impact is not permanent and falls within the Medium term rating (6-15 years). 65.4. The potential impact of underwater noise is assessed specifically and cumulatively in Sections 9.3.1.2.6 and 9.4.1.2 of the EIAR respectively. It is noted that the noise from the activities will be of limited duration and is unlikely to result in the behavioural changes perpetuating beyond the activity duration nor result in a population level disturbance. 65.6. The potential impact of lighting is assessed in Section 9.3.1.1.4 of the EIAR. Similar to 6.5 above the lighting is expected to be of limited duration and is unlikely to result in impacts perpetuating beyond the duration of the exploration in the specific location or have any meaningful impact at a population level. It should be considered that this area is within a high vessel traffic area (which also have lights) and the marine faunal population continue to persist. In conclusion the impact assessment has been completed by a qualified and experienced marine scientist. The potential for impacts to persist beyond the duration of the activities has been considered in the assessment. 67. Please refer to response provided in Item 46 above. 68. Please refer to responses provided in Items 46, and 51 above. 69-70. The statement that, “The Marine Ecology Report and DEIAR claim that because benthic impacts are unknown, they do not exist”, is incorrect. The EIAR does not make this statement and includes the assessment of the potential impact on the benthic communities in Section 9.3.1.2.1 of the EIAR specifically includes an assessment of the impact of the drilling activities on amongst others the benthic communities. It is important to consider the scale of the impact relative to the vastness of the receiving habitats. The EIAR notes that the smothering effects would potentially have a LOCALISED impact (limited to a maximum distance of 764 m from the drilling unit per well). Coupled with the intention to avoid sensitive areas through pre-drilling surveys the impact is regarded as being very low. 71, 72, and 73. Please refer to response provided in Item 46 above. The potential impact of the activities on marine mammals are identified and assessed in Section 9 of the EIAR. Data gaps and information sources are specifically cited. The exploration activities are of short duration and limited extent. 74-77. Section 9.3.6.2 of the EIAR identified and assesses the potential positive and negative impacts associated with an unplanned blowout- including the impacts on the commercial fishing industry and the maritime logistics industry. The EIAR does not conclude that an unplanned oil spill would be economically beneficial for South Africa- rather the statement is made in Section 9.3.6.2.1 of the EIAR which applies to the “economic impact of the oil spill response strategy for a well blow-out scenario”. The assessment includes and assesses other economic impacts associated with the potential blowout scenario. The following is stated in the Economic Specialist Assessment: “While the impact of the oil spill response strategy could

Melissa Groenink

that the discovered hydrocarbon will be condensate by using the Brulpadda/Luiperd gas fields, which are located 600-700 km from the Project site, as an analog reservoir. However, it is unclear why the DEIAR chose the Brulpadda/Luiperd fields as an analog, as there are closer wells within the same basin as Block 3B/4B that have yielded oil. The DEIAR's assumption that the Project will discover condensate rather than crude oil is thus not supported by the available evidence.

V. THE DEIAR FAILS TO ANALYSE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DISCOVERY OF CRUDE OIL

35. NEMA requires that EIAs include a "full description" of "the impacts and risks identified for each alternative, including the nature, significance, consequence, extent, duration and probability of impacts, including the degree to which these impacts—can be reversed; may cause irreplaceable loss of resources; can be avoided, managed, or mitigated." The DEIAR states that "[t]here is a probability that the hydrocarbon resource targeted by the proposed exploration wells is condensate rather than crude oil." In other sections, the DEIAR seems to think there is not even a probability of discovering condensate rather than crude oil but only a "possibility." This uncertainty makes sense because this is an exploratory project and no one knows for sure what hydrocarbons will be discovered. However, this uncertainty means there is also a possibility that the targeted hydrocarbon may be something other than condensate, including crude oil. If discovering crude or other oil is a possibility as the DEIAR seems to indicate, then the DEIAR must include a "full description" of the nature, consequence, significant, extent, duration and probability of the impacts associated with a blowout that releases crude oil into the environment. The DEIAR's failure to do so violates NEMA, and undermines the DEIAR's conclusions about the degree of impacts to marine ecology and fisheries as well as the DEIAR's conclusions about economic benefits in the event of an oil spill.

36. For example, the Marine Ecology Report explains that its analysis of marine impacts from a spill is predicated on "the crucial assumption that the released liquid hydrocarbon is ONLY condensate with no crude oil being present." The Fisheries Report, which analyzes impacts to commercial fisheries in the event of a blowout, makes the same crucial assumption, even while admitting there is only a "possibility" that condensate rather than crude oil will be discovered. If crude oil is discovered—which the DEIAR admits is a possibility—then the impacts to the marine ecology and commercial fisheries would be far greater. Currently, however, neither the public nor the decisionmaker are aware of these potentially greater impacts because the DEIAR fails to describe them. This omission violates NEMA.

37. Similarly, the DEIAR concludes that an oil spill will benefit the economy. This assumption is based on the premise that there will be no costs associated with an oil spill such as degradation of the coastline, costs to tourism, shoreline responses, or costs to pay for clean up personnel and the associated health impacts to clean up personnel from toxic exposure, which can be serious. These costs will only be negligible if a blowout releases condensate and gas rather than crude oil and thus disperses relatively quickly. But again, this assumption is suspect and far from certain, as the DEIAR itself acknowledges.

38. Also, the DEIAR's assertion that it can update the model and spill contingency plan later should oil be discovered<sup>33</sup> does nothing to cure the DEIAR's failure to analyze impacts from a

pave the way for new business opportunities, the temporary nature of the exploration activity may limit the realization of long-term business establishment. In summary, the oil spill response strategy could bring significant economic benefits, albeit with temporary impacts on certain industries and livelihoods during its course". DEMACON conducted an economic impact assessment for the proposed Africa Oil Block 3B/4B exploration right area. An economic impact assessment sets out to measure the impact on economic activity that is likely to materialise due to the specified (defined) exploration activity. These impacts include direct (impacts generated by the project in the industry within which it operates), indirect (impacts generated by activities downstream and upstream of affected industries) and induced impacts (additional consumption enabled by wages from direct/indirect activities). The economic impact assessment seeks to quantify the impact on the flow of economic goods and services. Whereas certain monetary effects are quantified, it is not within the domain of an economic impact assessment to assess potential environmental, societal and related welfare costs and benefits. These impacts have been identified and assessed in the various other specialist assessments. . The suggestion that all economic impacts are all beneficial is unsubstantiated. A number of impacts such as reduced commercial fishing and maritime logistics operational efficiency have been identified. The fact remains, a clean-up response will result in expenditure which, in turn, will have a multiplier effect. The "severe economic consequences" referred to have not been elaborated on (e.g. consequences listed, etc). In this manner, and for the larger part, the comments are of a generalised nature, referencing general and non-academic sources, whilst no site specific references, measurements, testing, season specific analyses are included to substantiate the claim. The economic impact assessment measurement focusses on determining the economic impact of two events. The first event measures the economic impact of the operational activities of the exploration aspects of the exploration activity (i.e., the R799 million spent on exploration in South Africa) – the event has a high probability. The second event measures the economic impact of an unplanned event or oil-spill scenario (i.e., an additional R342 million expenditure) – the event has an unlikely probability. For both events, the impact of changes to economic activity on the economy is measured. Furthermore, a literary reference to a satire published by Frederick Bastiat is cited – a French liberalist who lived during a period of French upheaval between 1800 and 1850 (French Revolution of 1789, French Revolution of 1830 and the French Revolution of 1848). This satire (the Broken Window Fallacy) is centred on War related expenditure which is by and large destructive in nature with the primary aim of resource destruction and inflicting maximum damage. In stark contrast, the proposed R799 million investment in gas exploration activity constitutes an investment in "basic" economic activity which is known to have a multiplier effect on "non-basic" economic activity and which seeks to address arguably one of mankind's current and most pressing challenges: that of sustainable and responsible energy production. In this context, the suggestion that the investment expenditure of R799 million is akin to spending money to fix a broken window as a consequence of war does not appear to be applicable in this case, even when related to the R342 million to be spent in the unlikely event of an oil spill event.



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Melissa Groenink

crude or other oil spill in the first instance. Indeed, the very reason an EIA must include a full description of potential impacts is so the decisionmaker has all necessary information before deciding whether to approve or reject a project, and so appropriate mitigation measures can be identified. Withholding information and analysis until after that decision results in mitigation measures that do not address the true scope of a project's harms. VI. THE DEIAR'S ANALYSIS OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS IS FLAWED 39. Block 3B/4B lies within the Orange Basin, which extends from South Africa as far north as the Lüderitz Arch in Namibia. The Block has been subjected to multiple previous exploration activities, including 2D and 3D seismic surveys, and more than 38 exploratory wells have already been drilled on the shelf east of the Block.<sup>36</sup> The Scoping Report acknowledges the possibility of future exploration in nearby blocks, including further proposed exploration well drilling near PEL39, in the Namibian extent of the Orange Basin. Beyond exploration, there is the intended realisation of production in Block 3B/4B if a significant discovery is made. The same holds true in other blocks in the Orange Basin in both South African and Namibian waters, meaning that the area could continue on a path to high offshore oil and gas industrialisation. 40. Despite the high volume of past, current, and potentially future oil and gas exploration activities in the region, the DEIAR fails to comprehensively assess the cumulative marine impacts of the project in conjunction with other activity the area and does not assess all "past, present and reasonably foreseeable future developments or impacts". NEMA, together with the EIA Regulations, requires that EIAs include, amongst other things, an assessment of the nature, extent, duration and significance of the consequences for or the impacts on the environment of that activity, including the cumulative impacts. 41. The DEIAR expressly declines to assess the cumulative environmental impacts that could arise from further exploration or production activities in the area. Instead, the DEIAR maintains that "[a]s these cannot at this stage be reasonably defined, it is not possible to undertake a reliable assessment of the potential cumulative environmental impacts."<sup>38</sup> 42. The proposed exploration activities are likely to lead to full-scale production activities. Similarly, it is reasonably foreseeable that proposed or approved seismic surveys (TGS Orange Basin Reconnaissance Permit); exploration (Deep Water Orange Basin Licence Block 12/3/343; TotalEnergies EP South Africa Block 567; Sezigyn ER340; PEL39 in Namibian waters); and production (Sunbird and PetroSA Block 2A) could contribute, along with the proposed exploration, to additive stressors on marine life in the region. Inshore to Block 3B/4B in the Orange Basin, Eco (Atlantic) Oil & Gas has already commenced with exploratory drilling in Block 2B (as of October 2022). The compounding effects of all these projects must be fully evaluated in the DEIAR. 43. A complete cumulative impact assessment must also evaluate the condition of existing well plugs. Concrete used in well casings and plugging degrades over time, especially in seawater. The DEIAR fails to account for the cumulative effects of the degradation of existing plugs resulting from prior exploration endeavours. These impacts should be taken into consideration alongside ongoing and forthcoming activities. 44. The cumulative impact of increased background anthropogenic noise levels in marine environments is an ongoing and

It is considered that the circumstances are thus not comparable to the present day and time. With a fledgeling free market economy, Bastiat was opposed to government intervention. Although the measurement of an unlikely oil-spill scenario can be viewed through the lens of Bastiat's Broken Window Fallacy, the aim is to measure economic activity as a result of spending in the economy. The measurement does not focus solely on GDP, but considers the transactional value of economic activity in stimulating fiscal impacts, employment opportunities, compensation of employees, additional consumption expenditure, etc. Whilst several indicators are measured, the purpose of the economic impact assessment is not per se concerned with the assessment of potential societal and related welfare costs and benefits. Measures to mitigate against a low-probability unplanned oil-spill event is planned for and aspects such as insurance and assurances are submitted to PASA in order to manage damages and compensation requirements. These forms of insurance and assurances are proactively provided and paid for by the applicant, thereby negating the need to reallocate productive resources away from other economic activity to a potential clean-up exercise as a form of opportunity cost. The Economic Impact Assessment provides an account of anticipated economic impacts based on prevailing intersectoral multipliers (outlined in Sections 9.4 and 9.6 of the Economic Impact Assessment). The assumptions affirm that the cost of the response strategy, as well as the assumed 25% local expenditure allocation, was obtained from EIMS and is based on estimates provided by the applicant. The quantitative impact assessment methodology (Section 9.2.1 of the Economic Impact Assessment) underscores the use of an input-output model to quantify changes in economic activity. This model considers the multiplier effect of direct, indirect, and induced economic activity in the economy. The economy-wide effect of increased economic activity is further illustrated in Section 9.3.1. No basis is offered for the comments offered under paragraph 76. The fact that expenditure creates a multiplier effect is beyond dispute. The combined effect of expenditure across various sectors from agriculture to government services, from resource extraction, to manufacturing, to distribution, to retailing, to disaster management, creates expenditure which ultimately through the system of national accounts is utilised to calculate GDP, employment, business sales, economic growth, taxation, imports, exports, etc. In other words,  $Y = G + I + G + (X - M)$ . The fact that a risk might occur as part of a particular exercise or activity, does not negate the need for such activity. It is again stated as fact that the probability of a disaster is rated as low. The comments are again focussed on the proportionally smaller amount that would be directed at a cleanup/rehabilitation in the unlikely event of a spillage, whereas it largely remains silent on the much larger R799 million capital investment exploration exercise. The suggestion that a singular focus on oil spills could / should be pursued to create economic growth is incorrect. Very little comment has been formulated in respect of the R799 million capital investment. The bulk of the DEMACON Economic Impact Assessment report is focussed on the R799 million. 77. Please refer to the response provided in item 13. The initial Oil Spill Drift Modelling Technical Report (25/10/2023) modelled the impact and response of a condensate hydrocarbon spill. The modelling results from this report formed the basis of the economic impact assessment. The cost

Melissa Groenink

widespread issue of concern. Impacts across large spatial scales or multiple species are rarely considered, but recent research indicates that repeat seismic surveys reduce cetacean occurrence across large marine ecosystems. Repeat seismic surveys may also disrupt fish migration patterns, as is suspected in Southern Namibian tuna fishing grounds, where catches have severely declined since 2011, and in 2017 dropped off to non-commercial catch rates.<sup>41</sup>

45. The DEIAR must also assess the immediate and chronic impacts of cumulative sonar and seismic surveys and drilling activities in the area, not just from a singular exploration project. The DEIAR must carefully examine the full footprint of impacts from sonar surveys and drilling activities in the context of their additive nature.

VII. THE DEIAR LACKS SUFFICIENT BASELINE DATA TO EVALUATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

46. Appropriate and up-to-date scientific information should be available to inform a comprehensive assessment of impacts, before a decision can be made whether to authorise a harmful activity. A comprehensive and accurate assessment of the potential impacts requires a robust understanding of the current state and potential stressors. Without a thorough understanding of the current state and potential sensitivities of marine ecosystems, it is not possible to evaluate the significance of future impacts accurately and to accurately assess the cumulative environmental effects.

47. Section 2(4)(a)(vii) of NEMA provides that sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors, including “that a risk-averse and cautious approach is applied, which takes into account the limits of current knowledge about the consequences of decisions and actions”. In *WWF South Africa v Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and others*, the Court found that “[p]otential errors are ‘weighted in favour of environmental protection’, the object being ‘to safeguard ecological space or environmental room for maneuver.

48. The precautionary approach is applicable to limits on available information during both exploration and production phases, as confirmed by the court in *Sustaining the Wild Coast NPC and others v Minister of Mineral Resources and others*.

49. The proposed activity, along with other marine exploration, production, and mining activities off the West Coast, can significantly increase the intensity of environmental stressors on the broader regional ecosystem. This could alter the current risk status to marine biodiversity and climatic conditions, given the uncertainty and poor knowledge of the extent of species-level and ecosystem level impacts.

50. The DEIAR should not rely on outdated information and data from previous environmental impact assessments for other marine exploration, production, and mining activities off the West Coast. If the DEIAR does not incorporate a comprehensive and up-to-date understanding of the regional environmental trends within the offshore areas demarcating the Orange Basin, there is a risk that it will miss critical interactions and fail to implement effective mitigation strategies.

51. The DEIAR contains no data on the benthic fauna in the project area, noting that “[i]nformation on the benthic fauna of the lower continental slope and abyss (beyond 1 800 m depth) is largely lacking due to limited opportunities for sampling.” Instead, the DEIAR cites deep water benthic sampling from a separate project area in Namibian waters, hundreds of kilometres away from Block 3B/4B. The DEIAR goes on to acknowledge “that very few national

estimation associated with the oil spill cleanup was also supplied by the Applicant.

78.1. The aforementioned Oil Spill Drift Modelling Technical Report (25/10/2023) was revised and updated in March 2024. Subsequent to the circulation of the said report, DEMACON was informed that the R342 million rehabilitation expenditure constitutes a comprehensive costing of rehabilitation and restoration activities and is not limited capping only. This revised figure was subsequently modelled. It is our understanding that the maximum R342 million accounts for a worst-case oil spill scenario. An evaporation based spillage would result in a smaller recovery/rehabilitation expense, whereas a larger oil spill based restoration/rehabilitation would result in a larger expenditure (as per the Economic Impact Assessment Report).

78.2. Whereas an economic system is subjected to daily pressures, economic impacts can and are generally modelled but systemic pressures are not measured/measurable. As with other economic activities, restoration and rehabilitation create opportunities for specialist entities to apply particular expertise and skill sets. It is not within the scope of an economic impact assessment to measure capacity and potential capacity constraints of individual firms/entities. The system absorbs the pressure, such is the nature of economics.

78.3. Natural Justice/Green Connection furthermore claims that public trust will collapse on various levels. This appears to be a broad sweeping statement without primary research foundation. No opinion poll was conducted with any audience through any apparent scientific or stratified means.

78.4. The first potential spillage risk would be condensate; condensate is said to evaporate as per the Oil Spill Drift Modelling Technical Report (25/10/2023). No health worker, recovery worker, or community will be recruited as part of such exercise. Any potential workers that will be contracted for the capping exercise will be briefed and compensated in accordance with the level of risk exposure. Such workers will be appropriately trained and equipped with protective personal equipment. Emergency protocols will also be formulated.

78.5. The applicant is primarily responsible for its own insurance premium and associated increases.

78.6. The impact does not account for the unlikely nature of such an event occurring and that according to the Marine Ecology Assessment that in the event of a condensate blow-out scenario that the loss of resources are considered to be Low, i.e., “Where the impact is unlikely to result in irreplaceable loss of resources”.

78. The Maritime Ecology Report indicates that in the event of an unlikely condensate hydrocarbon oil-spill event, the loss of resources will be low (i.e., the impact is unlikely to result in irreplaceable loss of resources). The Fisheries Baseline and Impact Assessment Report similarly concludes that, in the unlikely event of a condensate hydrocarbon spill, the potential loss of resources is considered to be low. As a consequence, the same report states that the duration of the impact on the fisheries industry could be short-term and unlikely. Natural Justice/Green Connection incorrectly states that these impacts are considered to be “significant” by either the Maritime Ecology or Fisheries experts. This low impact was quantified and modelled by DEMACON (probability rating unlikely).

79. The Deepwater Horizon (DWH) disaster does not represent an example of current industry best practice and standards. The DWH has provided significant learnings to the industry and controls have been put in place to deal with a similar event, such as making pre-emptive contingency

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Melissa Groenink

IUCN Red List assessments have been conducted for marine invertebrate species to date owing to inadequate taxonomic knowledge, limited distribution data, a lack of systematic surveys and limited capacity to advance species red listing for these groups.”44 52. The DEIAR contains no data on demersal cartilaginous species located beyond the continental shelf, citing the absence of survey data. 53. The DEIAR fails to include adequate baseline data for marine mammal populations, noting that “data [on] population sizes and trends for most cetacean species occurring on the west coast of southern Africa is lacking.” 54. Climate change is a measurable reality, and South Africa and its coastal waters are particularly vulnerable to its impacts. This means that the baseline state for marine and coastal ecological systems in South Africa is changing. Animal migrations and feeding habits shift with changing environmental drivers. As an example, since 2011, super-groups of humpback whales ranging from 20 to 200 individuals have been observed in the coastal region of the Southern Benguela current between St Helena Bay and Cape Point. A feeding strategy of densely packed individuals is unprecedented in this region, and researchers have concluded that shifting oceanographic regimes are resulting in large phytoplankton blooms that precede super-group feeding strategy events. 55. Given how quickly cetacean distribution and feeding and breeding patterns are changing due to shifting ocean temperatures, currents, and resource availability, this substantial knowledge gap must be remedied by new surveys that cover all seasons over two years at minimum. 56. There is inadequate baseline data on beaked whales in the study area, as the DEIAR admits: 57. There are almost no data available on the abundance, distribution or seasonality of the smaller odontocetes (including the beaked whales and dolphins) known to occur in oceanic waters (>200 m) off the shelf of the southern African West Coast. Beaked whales are all considered to be true deepwater species usually being seen in waters in excess of 1 000 – 2 000 m deep (see various species accounts in Best 2007). Presence in the project area may fluctuate seasonally, but insufficient data exist to define this clearly. Beaked whales seem to be particularly susceptible to man-made sounds and several strandings and deaths at sea, often en masse, have been recorded in association with naval mid-frequency sonar (Cox et al. 2006; MacLeod & D’Amico 2006) and a seismic survey for hydrocarbons also running a multi-beam echo-sounder and sub bottom profiler (Cox et al. 2006). 58. Beaked whales and dolphins are commonly observed in Block 3B/4B by marine mammal observers (MMOs) during seismic surveys. Beaked whales dive to great depths to forage and spend long periods of time deep underwater. The observations from MMOs at the surface, tho

plans for well capping. There have been different responses on various levels since 2010 in relation to managing and preventing oil spills. Section 9.3.7 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with the activities being applied for. 82 & 83. Noted. As per EIMS’s response to your comments on the Scoping Report, Scope 3 emissions and emissions associated with the potential future extraction and exploitation of the resource will not be considered further in the EIA Phase, as the project only relates to exploration activities, and it would not be possible to accurately determine size of the resource at this stage. Once exploration is complete and a resource has been defined, the Scope 3 emissions could be considered during a potential future production right application. 84. Section 9.3 and 9.4 of the EIAR identifies, assesses and suggests management and mitigation actions for the potential environmental impacts and cumulative impacts respectively. The NEMA does not in our view put an obligation on the process to identify and assess impact associated with a separate distinct production phase for which authorisation is not presently being sought. 85 & 86. Please refer to responses provided in Items 41 and 84. 87. Section 9.3.7.2 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential climate change impact and states the following: “Based on the published 2020 National GHG annual Inventory for South Africa, the maximum total CO2-e emissions from the Project, assuming a maximum survey duration of 84 days, would contribute approximately 0.008% to the 2020 South African “energy” sector total of 379 505.2 kt CO2-e and represent a contribution of 0.007% to the 2020 National GHG inventory total of 468 811.7 kt CO2-e (excluding FOLU)”. Considering the small scale and temporary nature of the proposed exploration activities, and the global nature of climate it is not anticipated that it will ‘aggravate’ the impacts of climate change in the area significantly. The climate change projections are discussed in Section 8.2 to 8.7 of the Climate Change Impact Assessment. 89. Ma

Mr Gustav Bester

Date 2024/02/07 Method Email

Comment Response

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gustav Bester

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gustav Bester

seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the



EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gustav Bester

	noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.
--	--

Solene

Date 2023/08/21 Method WhatsApp

Comment

Reference1570 3b4b ons as langebaan vissers is gekant geheel en al teen die ontwikkeling in ons oseane die ontwikkeling in die weskus moetstop want dit is ons tradisionele vis gronde en ons weier omdit met olie en gas tedeel ons voorvaders se se oorskotte le nog steeds in dieselfdenwater asb respekons gevoelens ons is nie net gewone vissers nie ons is tradisionle.vissers dit is ons gewoontereg om tevis respek dit moeniealles van ons wilwegvat nie dit behoortaanons en ons nageslagte wil ook nog.vis dis ons reg

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase. Vriendelike groete, EIMS Openbare Deelname Span

Faheemah Kolia

Date 2024/02/07 Method Email

Comment

I object to any surveying or exploration in the defined area. Impact on marine life and consequent effect on all life is detrimental. Checkbox impact scoping reports are prejudiced.

Response

Thank you for your e-mail. This is to confirm receipt of your objection and associated comments. Your details have also been included in our I&AP database for the project. For a detailed outline of the various impacts associated with the project, please take a look at our EIA report if you have not already. This is available on our website: <https://www.eims.co.za> Thank you once more for your comments.

Mr Patrick Blauus

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Response

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Patrick Blauus

Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Fabriek werkers Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Unike teenwoordige

Comments noted

Betty Don

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

My grootste bekommernis oor die mining wat die maatskappye will kom doen in ons oseaan is as volg. Eerstens dit is my brood op my tafel “it’s my livelihood”. Ek is uites afhankel van die oseaan. Die oseaan is wat ek ken as n visservrou! En die see kom al van geslag tot geslag al aan vir my famielie. Daar is so baie redes hoekom ons nie die myne naby ons kus dorpe soek nie! "Bevoedeling" die hoof rede!

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Ryan Apolles

Date 2023/07/17 Method Email

Comment

Good day, Hope this email finds you well. Would you kindly advise if this application is active already. Best regards, Ryan

Response

Dear Ryan, Thank you for your email. In terms of this project, a call to register has just been completed. A Draft Scoping Report will be made available soon. I have included your details in our database so that you can receive information and communications related to this project.

Mr Gert Gideon Jantjies

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Visbedryf Is u 'n gebruiker van die aansoek area of direk aangrensende gebiede? Indien wel, beskryf asseblief jou gebruik van die aansoek area. Visserman deelyds Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Gemeenskap Is u bewus van enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike

Response

Comments noted

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gert Gideon Jantjies

kontakbesonderhede? Koi & San gemeenskappe

Ms Carmelita Mostert

Date 2024/02/07 Method Email

Comment

Goeiedag aan wie dit ook mag gaan ek CAMELITA Mostert n vissersvrou van Saldanha comment graag op die wyse deur n epos ek teken beswaar aan dat daar in ons oseaane gedrill msg word 1.ons almal is al oor die ouderdome van 40jr waar gaan ons vissers werk kry?2.Dis ons livelihoods waarvan n bestaan uit die oseaan maak 3.so dit gedrill word in pns oseane sal vis vrek see diere sal vrek en vis sal nie weer na hul broei plekke trug keer nie die gate in die see sal ook nie toegemaak kan word nie waterstrome sal die sement weer lig of krake sal plaasvind en die gate sal weer oopgaan so my plei dooi is waarvan gaan ons lewe hoe sal ons skulde en munisipale rekeninge betaal kan word ek see nee vir drill om olie te soek in ons oseane ons gemeensjap ondersteun die vissers deur hul vangste te koop wat dink julle van ons kultuur waar gaan ons weer ons spirit kan gaan heal dit sal climate change ergerer maak tsunamies kan plaasvind ek sè nee vir drilling ek as visser het die reg ol my livelihoods julle kom belieg ons mense net werksgeleendhede dan kom julle met jul eie werkers ons kinders het al schools gedrop en het nie matric nie as gevolg van omstandighede om vir hul ouers te gaan werk en baie van ons jong mense is op see ons gemeenskappe gaan nie benefif nie so ook pns vissers nie want ons het nie geleerenteit nie weereens nee vir oil en gas drilling ek kan met sekerheidheid sè dat dit n lelike inpak op ons oseaan gaan hê vis is omega3 en ons liggame moet dit inneem so ek se nee en sal vir altyd nee sè so asseblief respek ons as tradisonele vissers se kultuur baie dankie ek wil ook net byvoeg luister na ons want ons ken die see opgegroeï met die tradisonele kennis ...RESPEK ONS SOOS ONS DIE PLAAS BOETE RESPEK .

Response

As the comment is an objection and did not need specific responses towards points made, the I&AP was thanked for their comment, and told that their comment will be included in the final EIA Report. Dankie vir u e-pos. Dankie vir die bywoning van ons vergaderings. U kommentaar is in ons finale verslag aangeteken.

Mr Jonathan van der Westhuizen

Date 2023/07/06 Method Email

Comment

Dear Lucien James Can you please register the following persons as interested and affected parties. Chief Anthony Andrews : \*\*\*\*\*I@gmail.com Chief Brett Arendze : \*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com Chief Julian Arendse : \*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com Chester du Toit : \*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com Liesel Talmakkies<\*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com>

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that the provided details have been included in our I&AP database.

Date 2023/07/06 Method Email

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Jonathan van der Westhuizen

Comment	Response
Dear Lucien Can you register the following person. Morgan Engelbrecht : w***** @gmail.com Best Jonathan	Hi Jonathan, Thanks. I've also included these details in the database.

Colleen Blankerberg

Date	2023/08/19	Method	Email	
Comment	Response			
Hoekom is ek bekommerd oor die oseaan die Africa Oil? Want hy sal ons se oseaan vernietig en die Africa sa nie water het nie. My vra is wat word van die see. Ons se viss manna gaan see toe want dit is hulle inkomste so is hulle ook bekommerd want hulle word kyk na hulle vroue en kinders wat skool gaan. Hoe sal dit on lewens bestaann beïnvloed? Die Africa sal droog wees en die manne sal ook kan niks maak nie selfs sal ons nie kan uit die huis nie. Hoe sal dit die spesies beïnvloed? Die species sal natuurlik dood gaan en hulle sal uit hulle plekke vlug.	Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.			

Ms Carmen Rodgers

Date	2024/03/26	Method	Email	
Comment	Response			
Hiermee wil ons baie sterk se nee teen enige olie en gas en dat ons gemeenskap geheel en al gekant is teen dit. Ek is n boorling van Langebaan, groot geraak in n vissers familie en ook n aktivis. Ons voorouers se spore le diep gegrond in Langebaan. Ek is n visservrou wie groot geword het met die kultuur uit die see lewe en dryf self n besigheid uit die seelewe. Die see lewe beteken vir ons baie want dis deel van ons lewe. Ons ken niks anders as die seelewe nie. Ons is gewoond aan ons vars lagoon harders, steenbras, stomp neus, snoek, ens... Maandag is dit vars hardersdag vir Langebaan waar elke huis glo ons almal eet vis. Vir ons is ons lagoon harders n dreigende spesie ons is alreeds ons maasbanker vis kwyd. Dis n vis wat so skaars is soos hoender tande mens kry dit net nie meer gevang nie. Daai vis was deel van ons kultuur. Dit was altyd gebraai, gebak of gemaal saam met die lagoon harders om frikkedella te maak en eet. Ons verneem dat dit heeltemal uitgewis is agv industriële ontwikkelinge langs die kuslyn. Namens my gemeenskap op Langebaan staan ons totaal enige gas en olie projekte aan ons Weskus kuslyn teen! My persoonlik ervaring met die publieke deel name was vir my baie agterdog gewees die manier hoe dit gedoen was. Dit was nie soos enige ander publieke deelname nie. Dit het meer voorgekom soos n publieke inligting sessie wat vir my baie agterdog en soos n lokval gelyk het. Weg met olie en gas!	As the comment is an objection and did not need specific responses towards points made, the I&AP was thanked for their comment, and told that their comment will be included in the final EIA Report. Dankie vir u e-pos. Ons kan bevestig dat u besonderhere is op ons database opgeneem. U kommentaar sal in ons finale verslag aangeteken word.			

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Priscilla Arendse

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

## Comment

As weskus kind voel ek baie ongelukkig oor hierdie drilling projek. Ek sien geen voordele vir ons op die kus nie wat gaan word van ons as daar iets moet skeefloop met die drilling en ons water word vuil gemaak met olie of gas as daar 'n lek is. Ons see spesies en vis sal verminder en dood tot daar niks meer oor is en ons dorp n spook dorp word. Hoekom will kom krap aan os mooi kus en agterna netso los. Hierdie projek hou geen werke of voordeel vir ons mense in nie.

## Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Ms Michele Rivarola

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

## Comment

A PASA COMPETENCE TO EVALUATE REPORT It is submitted that PASA lacks the competence to independently and objectively evaluate the scoping report and the objections to the granting of the exploration licence and that the report should be submitted for peer reviewing by an independent group of academics. B IMPACTS ON MARINE LIFE BIOMES AND ECOSYSTEMS Oil and gas exploration will disturb fish, marine mammals and all living marine species, their breeding grounds will be destroyed, their migratory patterns will be interrupted and result in die-offs. There is an enormous amount of evidence based on peer reviewed research to show that this is the case (the majority of SA's marine academics have publicly voiced their disapproval of this type of prospecting and development). In the gulf of Mexico necropsies of marine mammals and fish show high concentrations of oil in their main organs and gills (fish) 10 years after the Deep Water Horizon accident. The scoping report states that colossal squid and giant squid may be encountered in the project area but does not address how the impact will be controlled given that they are the principal diet of sperm whales and are also eaten by other marine mammals and fish. Whilst the report recognises that fish likely to be encountered in the offshore waters of Block 3B/4B are large migratory pelagic species, including various tunas, billfish and sharks, many of which are listed as threatened primarily due to overfishing, there is no consideration for the accumulative nature of further negative impacts such the ones that will result from prospecting and subsequent deep water drilling. C NOISE AND POLLUTION OF WATER The report states that the negative effects of seismic noise on fish populations such as baleen and toothed whales is unknown due to a lack of information however this is entirely misleading as much research has been conducted overseas concluding that continuous seismic noise will cause disorientation, destroy to plankton stocks and in extreme cases cause death (in some controlled studies up to 50% of the specimens died within one week of exposure to noise equivalent to that produced by seismic blasting). D Oil spills will have a devastating impact on

## Response

A Comment noted. This comment will be provided to the PASA and the Competent Authority, the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE), as part of the final Scoping Report submission for their further consideration. B Comment noted. A detailed Marine Ecological Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the marine ecology related impacts. The anticipated impacts and their associated impact significance ratings and/or mitigation measures will be discussed in greater detail in the EIA Phase. Your comment regarding the colossal squid and giant squid will be passed on to the Marine Ecologist for further consideration in the EIA Phase. Cumulative impacts are identified and described in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report. Additionally, it should be noted that the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the assessment of any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts identified, where applicable. It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant (i.e. exploration only). Any subsequent authorisation would be restricted to these specifically assessed activities. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration or production activities which are not addressed in the current Environmental Authorisation (EA) application, there would be a consequent need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for an Exploration or Production Right as well as a new EA. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment and public consultation prior to approval. It is premature to assess the likely impacts of further invasive exploration activities or production activities as the extent, duration, location, and magnitude applicable to these activities are unknown at this stage. The NEMA EIA Regulations make a clear distinction between the exploration, and production activities in that these are listed as distinct and separate listed activities. There is provision in law for these activities to be assessed on their merits as and when they are proposed. C A detailed Acoustics

Ms Michele Rivarola

the local environment; the Deep Water Horizon well head is still leaking over 10 years after the incident. There will be negative impacts to the fishing, tourism and aquaculture sectors as the proposed project will result in decreased fish and marine species populations in the exploration and drilling area. E The project is also unlikely to result in increased employment opportunities for the local community near the project site which is meaningful enough to justify the extreme risks of irreversible and lasting environmental damage. Jobs for highly skilled people will be mainly for highly specialised foreign nationals and not for locals. F CLIMATE CHANGE Investing in more fossil fuels will exacerbate the climate crisis. Oil and gas, once exploited, will increase the amount of Greenhouse Gasses in the atmosphere and worsen extreme weather events such droughts and propensity to flooding. Additionally investments in oil and gas risk driving away investments in renewable energy which can create immediate benefits to the economy of SA and to the employment of locals. Additionally South Africa is signatory of COP22 and it makes no sense why it should be promoting new oil and gas prospecting which is contrary to the public undertakings given by the State President more so when alternatives exist which have a considerably lesser impact on the environment and which will have far greater benefits for SA as country.

Impact Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. The cumulative impacts associated with noise have been described in Section 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report. The results of the acoustics model will be used by the fishing and marine ecology specialists to inform impacts on the associated aspects. Impacts have been identified for further investigation in the EIA Phase and are detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists' assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. D The potential for oils spills are acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios and will include the consideration listed in point 3.8. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. In assessing the impacts associated with an oil spill, past oil spill events and other similar case studies will be considered to inform the magnitude and residual impacts associated with a potential future event. E It is agreed that exploration activities typically require highly skilled employment. However, where feasible, it is anticipated that the use of local labour could be utilised, but it is anticipated that this will be extremely limited, if at all. F A detailed Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment has been proposed as per Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

Please find hereafter my objections and reasons for my objections: 1. In light of rapidly declining biodiversity across the planet, and our increasing understanding of the complex web of interactions that ensure the survival of a myriad of species in the ocean, any harm caused to living organisms, whether large or small, is potentially hazardous to the continuation of life on earth in its present form and, through association, the viability of human societal structures across the planet. Until the nature and the scope of potential harm (both to the biosphere in general and to human societal structures) has been established, the precautionary principle prescribes that oil prospecting for oil and gas should be suspended until reliable information of

Response

Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential environmental impacts in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA and its associated regulations. In all instances a precautionary approach has been taken, with due consideration to the limits of current knowledge and the potential consequences. The level of confidence in the assessment of each impact has also been stipulated. A full EIA was undertaken for this application. The reference to a Basic Assessment is not applicable to this application. Section 9.3 and 9.4 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts and cumulative impacts respectively, on the marine ecology from planned and unplanned events. This includes the impact on fish and turtle migration routes,



## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Michele Rivarola

sufficient sophistication, related to the stated concerns, has been obtained. [https://www.talkofthetown.co.za/2023/12/18/animal-welfare-body-urges-review-of-seismic-survey-approval/?fbclid=IwAR2wNZOyp89KWOMFV\\_NH7h4cT8RKE2WIE12CRD4FKoFH361YftUDsBLebz4](https://www.talkofthetown.co.za/2023/12/18/animal-welfare-body-urges-review-of-seismic-survey-approval/?fbclid=IwAR2wNZOyp89KWOMFV_NH7h4cT8RKE2WIE12CRD4FKoFH361YftUDsBLebz4) 2. The Basic Assessment Report (BAR) instead of a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is considered inadequate for the complexities of the marine environment. 3. The timing of the surveys should have covered turtle hatchling sardine run season and all pelagic fish migration routes properly assess the impact and not over a short and convenient survey window. Ditto it should have considered all fish migration routes where the fish provide an income for local coastal communities 4. Surveys should have also been near a Marine Protected Area and Kingklip spawning ground to properly assess the impact and not at convenient survey locations. 5. This survey has major impacts not only on the marine life, but the lives and livelihoods of small scale fishing communities who have been inadequately workshopped. Coastal economies are founded on healthy marine and terrestrial environments. Impacts to this equate to impacted livelihoods and economies. The public participation process for small fishers and coastal communities was not adequately advertised and did not adequately enable understanding of processes and impacts. This is a fundamental requirement and a current fatal flaw in this process as made clear in the Shell judgement 6. New oil and gas goes against IPCC and IEA recommendations and would contribute to climate change in a time where the world is on a trajectory to reduce carbon emission from fossil fuels and their use 7. SA is a signatory to COP28 and therefore has given an undertaking to phase out the use of fossil fuels. Allowing exploration with the aim and intention of developing new and additional fossil fuels is contrary to the undertakings given at COP28 and to the spirit of COP28 to which SA is a signatory. 8. The effect of carbon taxation of SA's goods exported to SA's major trading partners has not been assessed properly or at all as well as the risks to SA's export competitiveness as from next year when carbon taxation will be part of the export excise duties to countries such as the EU block, the UK, Japan and the USA inter alia 9. S24 of the Bill of Rights states explicitly: Everyone has the right— a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or wellbeing; and b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that— (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. Environmental rights are absolute rights and the activities permitted violate these fundamental rights in many ways without any justifiable economic or social development given the opposition from coastal communities and small fishers who are mostly affected. There can be no offset financial for this and the permission must be withdrawn.

as well as impacts on the fishing industry. It is unclear what 'surveys' are being referred to. This application does not include any intention to undertake regional 2D or 3D Seismic surveys. The baseline receiving environment description in the marine ecology specialist assessment was largely desktop based utilising the latest available information for the area. No site specific surveys were undertaken within the AOI. Section 7 of the EIAR presents the stakeholder engagement process undertaken for the application. The process complies with and exceeds the NEMA EIA requirements. Section 5 of the EIAR presents the need and desirability for the project including the context of the industry, and alignment with applicable South African Policies and Plans. The Guideline of Need and Desirability, which was instrumental in the approach to the EIA and EIAR, states that "a risk averse and cautious approach (the precautionary principle) in the context of the protection of environmental rights is essentially about the assessment and management of risk." In line with this, the impacts and risks associated with the proposed project were assessed and detailed in Section 9 of the EIAR. The proposed project is for exploration only and consequently will not be subject to cross border carbon taxes.

Gideon Louw

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Gideon Louw

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

## Comment

COMMENTS WITH REGARD TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION APPLICATION PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED AFRICA OIL SA CORP BLOCK 3B/4B OFFSHORE EXPLORATION. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: ⌚ The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted, and healthy environment. ⌚ This application has a high potential to affect this right. ⌚ This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. ⌚ Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted, and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. ⌚ Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application ⌚ The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? ⌚ At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. ⌚ The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long-term consequences not only for South Africa but for the planet. ⌚ The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. ⌚ To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. ⌚ This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. Overall Lack of Thorough Investigation. ⌚ The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their

## Response

Thank you for your email. This is to confirm that your comments have been received and that your details have been included in our I&AP database. \*\*Content of letter is the same as Mr P Pickford\*\*

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Gideon Louw

recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. ⌚ The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to consider overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sea life and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as wilfully incomplete. ⌚ The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. ⌚ The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short- and long-term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. ⌚ That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. ⌚ Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. ⌚ To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to wilfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. ⌚ That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a wilful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. Apprehension of Bias. ⌚ All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. Thank you for your consideration of the above

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Gideon Louw

comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

## Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated

## Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to

Gideon Louw

almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25.

register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Gideon Louw

All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Gideon Louw

well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Ms Ria Barkhuizen

Date 2023/06/20 Method Email

Comment

Good day In future, please forward all EIA applications to Khathutshelo Ramavhoya, \*\*\*\*\*@nra.co.za, SANRAL Environmental Specialist. Regards

Response

Dear Ria, Thank for the additional details. We will include these in the database as well. Future correspondence will be sent to Khathutshelo Ramavhoya.

Date 2023/06/20 Method Email

Comment

Good day In future, please forward all EIA applications to Khathutshelo Ramavhoya, \*\*\*\*\*@nra.co.za, SANRAL Environmental Specialist. Regards

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Cecilia van der Poll

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Response

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Cecilia van der Poll

Dit sal ons oseaan besoedel en ons see sal nie meer reg wees vir ons mense om uit te gaan of vir ons kinder on by die see te gaan swem nie. Dit sal ons lewens bestaan beinvleie ons sal nie meer 'n bestaan daar uit kan maak nie. Ons visse of species sal dood gaan, dit sal die bron in ons see uitvroie.

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Mr Ida Bester

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Ida Bester

would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the

the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Ida Bester

basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Ida Bester

	<p>avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.</p>
--	---

Judith Hollenbach

Date	2023/08/17	Method	Email
------	------------	--------	-------

Comment	Response
<p>Good day Sir/Madam This mail serves as confirmation that this office have received your letter. Please find attached the correspondence. Municipal greetings. Re: Notification regarding opportunity to participate in the environmental authorisation application process for the proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B offshore exploration Lady/Sir Acknowledgement is hereby received from you in writing. Your letter is referred to the following official/departmen: Ms Judith Hollenbach. For further queries and feedback on your writing please find attached for your convenience the necessary contact details: E-mail Address: ***** Contact number: ***** Municipal Greetings</p>	<p>Dear Local Municipality, This email serves to acknowledge receipt of your letter.</p>

Ilana Nel

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ilana Nel

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

I trust this message finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed seismic blasting and drilling project along the West Coast, particularly in the Yzerfontein area and its surrounding regions. In my personal capacity, I am deeply invested in the welfare and conservation of marine life, especially the seal population that inhabits these waters. Additionally, I represent the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre, an organisation dedicated to rescuing and rehabilitating seals in distress. The proposed project by Africa Oil SA Corp (AOSAC) raises significant apprehensions about its potential impact on the marine environment. Seismic blasting and drilling activities are known to cause severe disruptions to marine life, including but not limited to disturbance of breeding grounds, displacement of species, and potential harm to sensitive marine habitats. Seals, in particular, are highly sensitive to changes in their environment. The loud noises generated by seismic blasting can have detrimental effects on their behaviour, communication, and overall well-being. Pups, in their formative stages, are especially vulnerable to such disturbances, which can lead to separation from mothers, increased stress levels, and even physical injury. Furthermore, the cumulative effects of industrial activities like drilling can pose long-term threats to the sustainability of marine ecosystems. Pollution, habitat degradation, and alterations in water quality can have far-reaching consequences for the entire marine food web, impacting not only seals but also fish populations, seabirds, and other marine organisms. It is imperative that thorough environmental assessments and mitigation measures be implemented to safeguard the fragile marine ecosystems of the West Coast. As a concerned citizen and representative of the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre, I urge all stakeholders involved to consider the long-term ecological implications of this project and to prioritise the preservation of biodiversity and the welfare of marine species. In light of the above, I hereby register as an Interested and Affected Party in this matter. I remain committed to providing further input and collaborating with relevant authorities to ensure that the voices of marine conservationists and concerned citizens are heard and respected throughout the decision-making process.

Response

Thank you for your email. Apologies for the late reply. I have been away for the last few weeks. Thank you for your comments. We will be drafting a response to address your concerns.

Date 2024/03/12 Method Email

Comment

Dear Mr Lucien James, I trust this message finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed seismic blasting and drilling project along the West Coast, particularly in the Yzerfontein area and its surrounding regions. In my personal capacity, I am deeply invested in the welfare and conservation of marine life, especially the seal population that inhabits these waters. Additionally, I represent the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre, an

Response

Dear Ilana, Thank you for your e-mail and in-depth considerations. We would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge your concerns as they relate to some of our considerations when conducting our EIA. All the relevant material on the potential impacts of the project is available on our website through the following link: <https://www.eims.co.za/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/> Please refer to section 3.3.3.7 of Appendix 4.6 which



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ilana Nel

organisation dedicated to rescuing and rehabilitating seals in distress. The proposed project by Africa Oil SA Corp (AOSAC) raises significant apprehensions about its potential impact on the marine environment. Seismic blasting and drilling activities are known to cause severe disruptions to marine life, including but not limited to disturbance of breeding grounds, displacement of species, and potential harm to sensitive marine habitats. Seals, in particular, are highly sensitive to changes in their environment. The loud noises generated by seismic blasting can have detrimental effects on their behaviour, communication, and overall well-being. Pups, in their formative stages, are especially vulnerable to such disturbances, which can lead to separation from mothers, increased stress levels, and even physical injury. Furthermore, the cumulative effects of industrial activities like drilling can pose long-term threats to the sustainability of marine ecosystems. Pollution, habitat degradation, and alterations in water quality can have far-reaching consequences for the entire marine food web, impacting not only seals but also fish populations, seabirds, and other marine organisms. It is imperative that thorough environmental assessments and mitigation measures be implemented to safeguard the fragile marine ecosystems of the West Coast. As a concerned citizen and representative of the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre, I urge all stakeholders involved to consider the long-term ecological implications of this project and to prioritise the preservation of biodiversity and the welfare of marine species. In light of the above, I hereby register as an Interested and Affected Party in this matter. I remain committed to providing further input and collaborating with relevant authorities to ensure that the voices of marine conservationists and concerned citizens are heard and respected throughout the decision-making process. Please find below the required information for registration: Thank you for considering my concerns, and I look forward to constructive dialogue and meaningful action to safeguard the marine biodiversity of the West Coast for generations to come.

specifically deals with seal species. This project will not involve seismic surveys, hence will not engage the impacts associated with such. Altogether the different potential impacts associated with the project have been presented as part of the EIA. However, should you require clarity on some of the impacts listed, please do not hesitate to contact us. We would also like to thank you for engaging with us on behalf of the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre. Your input is especially important considering your experience in this space.

Date	2024/03/12	Method	Email
------	------------	--------	-------

Comment

Dear Mr Lucien James, I trust this message finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed seismic blasting and drilling project along the West Coast, particularly in the Yzerfontein area and its surrounding regions. In my personal capacity, I am deeply invested in the welfare and conservation of marine life, especially the seal population that inhabits these waters. Additionally, I represent the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre, an organisation dedicated to rescuing and rehabilitating seals in distress. The proposed project by Africa Oil SA Corp (AOSAC) raises significant apprehensions about its potential impact on the marine environment. Seismic blasting and drilling activities are known to cause severe disruptions to marine life, including but not limited to disturbance of breeding grounds, displacement of species, and potential harm to sensitive marine habitats. Seals, in particular,

Response

Thank you for your email. Apologies for the late reply. I have been away for the last few weeks. Thank you for your comments. We will be drafting a response to address your concerns.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ilana Nel

are highly sensitive to changes in their environment. The loud noises generated by seismic blasting can have detrimental effects on their behaviour, communication, and overall well-being. Pups, in their formative stages, are especially vulnerable to such disturbances, which can lead to separation from mothers, increased stress levels, and even physical injury. Furthermore, the cumulative effects of industrial activities like drilling can pose long-term threats to the sustainability of marine ecosystems. Pollution, habitat degradation, and alterations in water quality can have far-reaching consequences for the entire marine food web, impacting not only seals but also fish populations, seabirds, and other marine organisms. It is imperative that thorough environmental assessments and mitigation measures be implemented to safeguard the fragile marine ecosystems of the West Coast. As a concerned citizen and representative of the Hout Bay Seal Rescue Centre, I urge all stakeholders involved to consider the long-term ecological implications of this project and to prioritise the preservation of biodiversity and the welfare of marine species. In light of the above, I hereby register as an Interested and Affected Party in this matter. I remain committed to providing further input and collaborating with relevant authorities to ensure that the voices of marine conservationists and concerned citizens are heard and respected throughout the decision-making process. Please find below the required information for registration: Thank you for considering my concerns, and I look forward to constructive dialogue and meaningful action to safeguard the marine biodiversity of the West Coast for generations to come.

Gertruida Saul

Date 2023/08/19 Method Email

Comment

I say not to this mining project, because my heritage will be no more. We as the community won't be able to feed from the ocean and river. It also will disrupt our birdlife and we won't be able to enjoy our beloved beach anymore as we will be restricted/banned to go there. Further don't see any benefits for our community as many of our children didn't even go to high school. Some only finished primary or not at all.

Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

Jurie Erwee

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Jurie Erwee

Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take

submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Jurie Erwee

into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14.

Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Jurie Erwee	
	application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

## Mr Mkhulisi Mnganga

Date	2023/08/22	Method	WhatsApp
Comment		Response	
My name is Mkhulisi Mnganga the Chairperson of Imizamo Yethu fishing Co-operations my main concern is that we may loose our spicies through the process of oil and gas and we make a leaving through the fishing if that's happenes what protecting our future as Fisherman's would we benefit as Fisherman's for how long please we really need a meeting especially a meeting that will be specially for Fisherman thank you		Good day Mr Mnganga, we take note of your comments and will ensure that they are considered in the EIA Phase. Kind regards, EIMS Public Participation Team.	

## Mr Gerard de Villiers

Date	2024/02/08	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
Attached my comments on the above issue for your information. *** Attached - Letter of Mr Peter Pickford***		Thank you for your email. We acknowledge your support for Mr Pickford’s letter and can confirm that your details have been captured in our I&AP database.	
Date	2024/02/08	Method	Other
Comment		Response	
1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal		1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and	



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gerard de Villiers

Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and

other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gerard de Villiers

is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be

undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Gerard de Villiers

with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Ms Janeira Reddy

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

Comment

I hope you are well. I would like to register as an Interested and Affected Party. Name and Surname: Janeira Reddy Email: \*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*\*\*.co.za.

Response

Thank you for your email. We confirm that you have been registered as an interested party for this process with the details below.

Date 2023/08/04 Method Email

Comment

The attached letter is in regards to the cancellation of Block 3B/4B exploration project Cape Town and Hout Bay public participation meetings. Please provide feedback as we request a face to face public participation meeting with the communities in the Cape Town and Hout Bay area.

Response

Please see attached response to SDCEA’s letter dated 4 August 2023.

Date 2023/08/04 Method Email

Comment

The cancellation of the public meetings without notification invariably unreasonably restricts interested and affected parties from participating in public meetings seeking clarity on specific issues, raising their concerns and meaningfully participating in an environmental impact assessment process. “The general objectives of integrated environmental management laid down in the NEMA more specifically s 24(4)(a) and Section 23(2)(d) of NEMA refers, inter alia, calls for “adequate, reasonable and appropriate opportunity for public participation in decisions that may affect the environment”. The National Environmental Management Principles include the principle that “The participation of all interested and affected parties in environmental governance must be promoted, and all people must have the opportunity to develop the understanding, skills and capacity necessary to achieving equitable and effective participation, and participation by vulnerable and disadvantaged persons must be ensured” Sections of NEMA and its regulations entitle communities every opportunity to consider the environmental impact assessment reports, attend the public meetings in order to make informed decisions and participate meaningfully in those. Therefore, notice of these cancellations ought to have been made and alternative meeting dates and arrangements be

Response

Your letter dated 4 August 2023 regarding the above has reference. Please refer to the email correspondence dated 4 August 2023 in which EIMS communicated the cancellation of the Cape Town and Hout Bay public meetings for the above project. As stated in the email, EIMS was made aware of unrest and the violence in parts of in the Cape Town and Hout Bay area related to the protracted public transport protests, which took place at the time. The decision was made to cancel the meetings in order to protect all Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) and to ensure the safety of all who may have wanted to attend public meetings. A reminder of the scheduled virtual public meeting (10 August 2023) was also communicated in the same email. Please note that a second round of public meetings will be held during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase of the project scheduled for later this year. The details of these meetings will again be communicated to all registered I&APs once the EIA Report has been made available for public review. Fortunately, public meetings are just one of many opportunities to get involved in the project and we encourage all I&APs to make use of the available options to provide comments on this project. Please refer to the EIMS website for further information on how to get involved in the process and submit your comments regarding the project. Thank you for your involvement

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janeira Reddy

proposed to interested and affected parties. Further to this, we request a face-to-face public meeting with the communities in the Cape Town and Hout Bay area so that all interested and affected parties have the opportunities to participate meaningfully and interrogate the specialist reports provided by EIMS.

in this process and your organisations’ representation in the virtual public meeting held last week. Please be reminded to send all correspondence regarding this project to the dedicated project email address block3b4b@eims.co.za (or one of the other defined communication channels) in order to ensure that your comments regarding this project are accurately captured. Please do not hesitate to contact the EIMS Public Participation Team with further queries or concerns regarding the above project.

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

Response

I hope you are well. Please see comments attached regarding Block 3B/4B exploration rights. Thank you

Thank you for your email. Comments received.

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment

Response

A IMPACTS ON LIVELIHOODS There may be impacts to the fishing (subsistence, small-scale and commercial), tourism and aquaculture sectors should the proposed project result in decreased fish and marine species populations in the area. The project will affect livelihoods as many people in South Africa survive of the ocean. The project is also unlikely to result in increased employment opportunities for the local community near the project site. Job creation that is promised will be for highly skilled people, and there will be few of them. B IMPACTS ON CULTURE AND HERITAGE The oceans have critical spiritual importance to many indigenous groups. Indigenous people also have vast knowledge on ocean conservation and marine life. Oil and gas production in the ocean can disrupt the cultural way of life and livelihoods of local people who have a connection to the sea. It can lead to the destruction of cultural and spiritual resources, both built and natural, which are key to the sense of self, identity and dignity. The ocean also has significant importance to traditional healers as ocean water is often used for rituals, initiations, and healing. C IMPACTS ON FISH AND MARINE SPECIES Oil and gas exploration can result in fish and marine species being disturbed, their breeding grounds destroyed, their migratory patterns being interrupted and can even result in die-offs. The scoping report states that the colossal squid and the giant squid may be encountered in the project area. Growing in excess of 10m in length, they are the principal prey of the sperm whale, and are also eaten by beaked whales, pilot whales, elephant seals and sleeper sharks. The report further states that the fish most likely to be encountered in the offshore waters of Block 3B/4B are the large migratory pelagic species, including various tunas, billfish and sharks, many of which are considered threatened according to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), primarily due to overfishing. Additionally, it is likely that juvenile

A The scope of the assessment of any economic benefits will be limited to the exploration activities proposed as part of this application only and will not consider any potential future exploration or production economic impacts, positive or negative. A detailed Economic Impact Assessment has been proposed for the EIA Phase that will include a detailed assessment of all of the sectors operating within the receiving environment. Furthermore, the fishing sector was identified as a key sector and was proposed as the focus of a dedicated study, a Fisheries Impact Assessment, for completion during the EIA Phase. It should be noted that the engagement strategy includes a broad range of stakeholders, including members of the small-scale fishing, aquaculture, tourism, sectors to name a few. It is agreed that exploration activities typically require highly skilled employment. However, where feasible, it is anticipated that the use of local labour could be utilised, but it is anticipated that this will be extremely limited, if at all. B The impacts on cultural and intangible heritage were identified in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Additionally, it was recommended that these be assessed further in the EIA Phase and, as such, a Cultural Heritage Assessment was recommended as part of the Plan of Study for EIA (See Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report). C Comment noted. A detailed Marine Ecological Impact Assessment has been proposed as part of the EIA Phase to assess the marine ecology related impacts, including the species listed as part of your comment. A detailed Acoustics Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. D A detailed Acoustics Impact Assessment will be undertaken by the noise specialist and will provide a detailed model based on the project activities. The cumulative impacts associated with noise have been described in Section 9.4.2 of the Scoping Report. The results of the acoustics model will be used by the fishing and marine ecology specialists to inform impacts

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Janeira Reddy

great whites, right whales and whale sharks would migrate through Block 3B/4B. Oil and gas exploration has detrimental impacts on zooplankton, small organisms that are the basis of ocean food chains. Exposure to seismic noise can lead to hearing damage, behavioral and feeding changes, and even death in zooplankton populations. D NOISE AND POLLUTION OF WATER Due to the license area being located within the main vessel traffic routes that pass around southern Africa, ambient noise levels will be naturally elevated. This, together with additional noise associated with the proposed exploration project, would have a cumulative impact on marine fauna. The report also provides that the potential effects of seismic noise on fish populations such as baleen and toothed whales is unknown due to a lack of information. In addition to the increased noise impacting marine fauna, a big concern is oil spills which will have a devastating impact on the local environment. E SUBSISTENCE FISHERFOLK Thousands of subsistence fisherfolks rely on the ocean as their only means of income. Regardless of the testing zone's distance from the shore, marine ecosystems and animal migration will be impacted by the testing at a larger scale. There will be a depletion in fish stocks which will cause a devastating impact in the subsistence fisherfolk's livelihood. F INCREASE IN CLIMATE CHANGE Investing in more fossil fuels deepens the climate crisis. Oil and gas, once it is exploited, will increase the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which contributes to climate change. Climate change results in more extreme weather conditions and a warming ocean, which can impact coastal communities. G ECONOMIC IMPACT Oil and Gas exploration will also have negative impacts on tourism along the coastline. A large portion of the businesses along the testing zone's coast rely on tourism, surfing, fishing, and boating. Potential hydrocarbon spills or accidents related to oil exploration would decimate the economy along the coast by diminishing tourism opportunities. H CONFLICT AND SECURITY The scoping report failed to consider the impact that seismic testing has on conflict and potential instability in coastline communities. The growing conflict and insurgency in northern Mozambique serves as an example. The exploration and discovery of massive oil reserves in the Cabo Delgado region in the mid-2010s brought promises of huge wealth and opportunities for Mozambiquans. However, the oil discovery not only increased inequality in the region but also raised economic stakes and tensions. Due to poor management of resources and the loss of land and employment from gas infrastructure, many impoverished people became marginalized and radicalized. Violence insurgency grew, and since 2017, over 4,000 people have died and 800,000 have been displaced by the conflict. In a recent study in Cabo Delgado, 45% of respondents said that the main root cause of the insurgency was the discovery of natural gas. Although South Africa is currently at peace, oil exploration and dependency have the power to transform nations to instability and conflict, like what happened in Mozambique. Given that oil exploration is controversial and likely to cause tensions amongst poorer South Africans, potential conflict from seismic testing must not be overlooked. However, the scoping report does not address this critical potential impact on peace, security, and conflict, so it must not be approved. I For these reasons, South Durban Community Environmental Alliance opposes the

on the associated aspects. Impacts have been identified for further investigation in the EIA Phase and are detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Once this information is available, the EIMS impact assessment methodology makes provision for the remaining specialists' assessments to assess any cumulative impacts to the individual aspects/ impacts related to their fields of study, where applicable. The potential for a pollution events (e.g. oil spills) is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. E Comment noted. The fishing sector was identified as a key sector and was proposed as the focus of a dedicated study, a Fisheries Impact Assessment, for completion during the EIA Phase. Small scale / subsistence fishers, was identified as one of the affected fishing sectors. The significance of the identified impacts will be determined during the EIA Phase and where possible, the mitigation measures will be identified in an attempt to reduce the significance. F A detailed Air Quality and Climate Change Assessment has been proposed as per Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report. The GHG emissions directly related to the proposed activity will be specifically assessed and detailed in the EIA Report. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. G Please refer to the response provided in #A and #D above. H Comment noted. It cannot be said with absolute certainty that exploration within Block 3B/ 4B will necessarily lead to production within the same block. As an example of a recent case, the exploration drilling that took place in Block 2B did not yield a positive result for the holder of the right. It should be noted that this Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process only relates to the activities proposed by the applicant. Any subsequent authorisation would be restricted to these specifically assessed activities. Should the applicant or other applicants wish to undertake any additional exploration or production activities which are not addressed in the current Environmental Authorisation (EA) application, there would be a consequent need to apply for the relevant permissions. These would include a formal application for an Exploration or Production Right as well as a new EA. The impacts of such proposed activities would consequently require specific assessment and public consultation prior to approval. It is premature to assess the likely impacts of further invasive exploration activities or production activities as the extent, duration, location, and magnitude applicable to these activities are unknown at this stage. The NEMA EIA Regulations make a clear distinction between the exploration, and production activities in that these are listed as distinct and separate listed activities. There is provision in law for these activities to be assessed on their merits as and when they are proposed. The majority of the social impacts referred to in this comment has been



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

## Ms Janeira Reddy

Scoping Report for the proposed Africa Oil South Africa CORP (AOSAC) Block 3B/4B Exploration Right.

identified in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report (see “Social unrest and community conflict”), where they may relate to exploration activities. However, on the basis of your comment, we have expanded the scope of this impact to consider potential security related issues as well. I Your comment/objection has been noted and will be included in our submission to the competent authority for their review and further consideration as part of the final version of the Scoping Report.

## Mrs Sonja Smith

Date 2023/07/31 Method Questionnaire

### Comment

Word u direk deur die projek geaffekteer? Hoe word werkloosheid beveg Is u bewus van enige gemeenskappe/organisasies/gemeenskapsgroepe ens. wat binne die aansoek area funksioneer wat ingelig moet word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en indien moontlik kontakbesonderhede? Daar was baie gedoen Is u bewus van enige stamowerhede, inheemse volke of etniese en kultureel verskillende groepe wat deur bogenoemde projek geraak kan word? Verskaf asseblief besonderhede en moontlike kontakbesonderhede? CPA Kan u asseblief vir ons 'n hoëvlakbeskrywing gee van die aspekte van die omgewing waarop die projek direk of indirek geraak kan word? (insluitend gebruike soos visvang, skeepvaart, mynbou; topografiese kenmerke; Infrastruktuur; sensitiewe flora/fauna) Goed verduidelik hoop net dit gaan so goed wees soos present

### Response

Comments noted

## Ms Mashudu Mudau

Date 2023/11/22 Method Telephone

### Comment

See Telephone Attached

### Response

See Telephone attached

Date 2023/11/22 Method Email

### Comment

Please note that the proposed exploration areas do not fall within the Lower Vaal Water Management Area. Please send the Scoping Report to the DWS Western Cape office, for comments.

### Response

Thank you for your email. Do you perhaps have some contact information for the Western Cape office?

## Nokukhanya Khumalo

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Nokukhanya Khumalo

Date 2023/06/14 Method Email

## Comment

Please note that all development applications are processed via our online portal, the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) found at the following link: <http://sahra.org.za/sahris/>. We do not accept emailed, posted, hardcopy, faxed, website links or DropBox links as official submissions. Please create an application on SAHRIS and upload all documents pertaining to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process. As per section 24(4)b(iii) of NEMA and section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA), an assessment of heritage resources must form part of the process and the assessment must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA. Once all documents including all appendices are uploaded to the case applications, please ensure that the status of the cases is changed from DRAFT to SUBMITTED. Please ensure that all documents produced as part of the EA process are submitted as part of the application. In addition, there is an application fee of R2000 for the processing of development applications that are undergoing an environmental authorisation application in terms of section 38(8) of the NHRA (<https://sahris.sahra.org.za/content/what-are-sahra-processing-fees-and-banking-details>).

## Response

Thanks for the email. We have uploaded a case to SAHRIS (Case ID: 21617). This is just the initial call to register and we will make the Scoping Report available at a later date for SAHRA's review and comment. Please advise if we should pay the review fee at this stage?

Date 2023/06/15 Method Email

## Comment

Good Morning It is a once off payment for the review of the case. So you can pay now so that we are able to best provide advice on what heritage studies must be done. Kind Regards, Nokukhanya Khumalo

## Response

Comment noted

Date 2023/07/27 Method Email

## Comment

Good morning, Thank you for the response. Please ensure that an application is made to SAHRA in this regard. Please note that all development applications are processed via our online portal, the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) found at the following link: <http://sahra.org.za/sahris/>. We do not accept emailed, posted, hardcopy, faxed, website links or DropBox links as official submissions. Please create an application on SAHRIS for each EA application and upload all documents pertaining to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process. As per section 24(4)b(iii) of NEMA and section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA), an assessment of heritage resources must form part of the process and the assessment must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA. If a case already exists on SAHRIS regarding the development, please upload the documents to

## Response

Comment noted

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Nokukhanya Khumalo

that case. Once all documents including all appendices are uploaded to the case applications, please ensure that the status of the case is changed from DRAFT to SUBMITTED. Please ensure that all documents produced as part of the EA process are submitted as part of the application. **\*\*PLEASE NOTE\*\*** An application fee is now required for all section 38 applications. Please ensure that the SAHRIS application contains a proof of payment as per the notice at the following link: <https://sahris.sahra.org.za/content/what-are-sahra-processing-fees-and-banking-details>. A payment of R 2 000.00 for each application is required. Please make separate payments with the specific reference numbers. Applications that do not include a proof of payment will be considered incomplete and will not be processed until proof of payment is provided. If a case on SAHRIS has been created, please respond to this email with the case ID number. Kind Regards, Nokukhanya

Date 2023/08/02 Method Email

Comment

Good evening We have previously sent an email to you in response to your notification. Please provide SAHRA with the case ID for this project.

Response

Dear Nokukhanya, Thank you for your email. The case number for this specific project is 21617. Please let me know if all is in order?

Date 2023/09/20 Method Email

Comment

Interim Comment The SAHRA APM Unit acknowledges receipt of the BID application and request that the following is undertaken in terms of section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) as part of the EA application process. The proposed offshore drilling has the potential to impact negatively on heritage and/or cultural resources, therefore a maritime heritage impact assessment must be conducted. A field-based assessment of the impact to archaeological resources, ship wrecks, and other maritime cultural resources must be conducted by a qualified maritime archaeologist. The report must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA and the SAHRA 2006 Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Component of Impact Assessments, and the 2012 Minimum Standards: Archaeological Component of Heritage Impact Assessments. The Minimum Standards provides allowance for a Letter of Recommendation for Exemption that can be submitted by a qualified archaeologist should they deem it appropriate. In addition, a Desktop Palaeontological Study with a Fossil Chance Finds procedure must be drafted by a suitably qualified palaeontologist familiar with continental shelf that must be used in the event that some fossiliferous rocks and fossils are identified. Other exploration blocks have identified underwater fossils. The report must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA and the SAHRA 2006 Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Component of Impact Assessments, and the 2012 Minimum Standards:

Response

The interim comment detailed in the letter dated 20 September 2023 regarding the above project, has reference. This letter serves to provide a response to the interim comments and to detail the proposed way forward in this regard. 1. Introduction Africa Oil SA Corp, Ricocure (Pty) Ltd and Azinam Limited (a wholly owned subsidiary of Eco Atlantic) (the Joint Venture Partners of the Block 3B/4B Exploration Right - hereafter jointly referred to as the Applicants) have appointed Environmental Impact Management Services (Pty) Ltd (EIMS) as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to assist with undertaking the required authorisation processes (including the statutory public participation), and to compile and submit the required documentation in support of application for an Environmental Authorisation (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998 - NEMA). The comment period for the draft version of the Scoping Report was from 19 July - 21 August 2023 and the final version of the Scoping Report, incorporating all comments received, was submitted to the Competent Authority on 1 September 2023. The Interim comment dated 20 September 2023, issued via the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) requested the following: "A BID document and Scoping report was submitted to the case and it indicates that a impacts on social environment and intangible heritage impacts will be assessed as part of the Scoping and EIA process. However, the impacts to potential heritage resources on the coast and underwater

Nokukhanya Khumalo

Palaeontological Component of Heritage Impact Assessments. The Minimum Standards provides allowance for a Letter of Recommendation for Exemption that can be submitted by a qualified palaeontologist should they deem it appropriate. The assessment should include any other heritage resources that may be impacted such as built structures over years old, sites of cultural significance associated with oral histories, burial grounds and graves, graves of victims of conflict, and cultural landscapes or viewsapes must also be assessed.

cultural heritage have not been included in the study plan. Interim Comment The SAHRA APM Unit acknowledges receipt of the BID application and request that the following is undertaken in terms of section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) as part of the EA application process. The proposed offshore drilling has the potential to impact negatively on heritage and/or cultural resources, therefore a maritime heritage impact assessment must be conducted. A field-based assessment of the impact to archaeological resources, ship wrecks, and other maritime cultural resources must be conducted by a qualified maritime archaeologist. The report must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA and the SAHRA 2006 Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Component of Impact Assessments, and the 2012 Minimum Standards: Archaeological Component of Heritage Impact Assessments. The Minimum Standards provides allowance for a Letter of Recommendation for Exemption that can be submitted by a qualified archaeologist should they deem it appropriate. In addition, a Desktop Palaeontological Study with a Fossil Chance Finds procedure must be drafted by a suitably qualified palaeontologist familiar with continental shelf that must be used in the event that some fossiliferous rocks and fossils are identified. Other exploration blocks have identified underwater fossils. The report must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA and the SAHRA 2006 Minimum Standards: Archaeological and Palaeontological Component of Impact Assessments, and the 2012 Minimum Standards: Palaeontological Component of Heritage Impact Assessments. The Minimum Standards provides allowance for a Letter of Recommendation for Exemption that can be submitted by a qualified palaeontologist should they deem it appropriate. The assessment should include any other heritage resources that may be impacted such as built structures over years old, sites of cultural significance associated with oral histories, burial grounds and graves, graves of victims of conflict, and cultural landscapes or viewsapes must also be assessed.” 2. Response to Interim Comment Block 3B/4B is located approximately 120 km west of St Helena Bay and approximately 145 km south-west of Hondeklip Bay off the West Coast of South Africa and in waters ranging from 200 m – 2000 m depth. As described in section 3.2.1 (“Pre-Drilling Surveys”) of the Scoping Report: “Pre-drilling surveys may be undertaken prior to drilling in order to confirm baseline conditions at the drill site and to identify and delineate any seabed and sub-seabed geo-hazards that may impact the proposed exploration drilling operations. Pre-drilling surveys may involve sonar surveys, sediment sampling, water sampling and ROV activities.” Should any heritage features (including archaeological or obvious palaeontological feature) be identified during these pre-drilling surveys, the operator will site the final borehole location to avoid these features – in an effort to avoid destruction of these features and also to avoid damage to the equipment. It is considered that shipwrecks are among the only tangible heritage features or resources that may be discovered at the depths associated with the exploration well drilling and other associated activities. It should further be noted that the actual footprint of the drilling activities will be extremely limited (i.e. the size of a large borehole), which means that the likelihood of impacting on a potential heritage resource will be very low. Kindly refer to Section 9.3 (“Description and Preliminary Assessment of Impacts”) Table 40 of the Scoping Report, which

details the preliminary assessment of impacts and whether these will be assessed further in the EIA Phase. Impact 38 (Disturbance of Potential Heritage Features) was identified, and it was stated that: “The potential exists for the operations to discover previously unknown heritage features. Any object or site as defined in Section 3 of the NHRA is considered a heritage resource and if discovered as part of this project, must be reported to SAHRA. It is unlikely that any such features will be located within the proposed project area and the impact is therefore considered to have a low overall significance.” Additionally, the activities of the project, namely pre-drilling surveys as captured in the Final Scoping Report of the project, offer an opportunity to identify unknown shipwrecks and other palaeontological features. Therefore, it is proposed that any resulting information gathered related to unlikely discoveries following the pre-drilling surveys will be shared with SAHRA before any further activities can be undertaken, and should any fossils be discovered during the drilling activities. It must be noted that additional considerations have been made regarding the impact of the project on Cultural Heritage. As part of the specialist studies done for the EIA of the proposed project, EIMS has appointed Professor MJR Boswell, an anthropologist based at Nelson Mandela University, to conduct a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) of the affected communities and social systems. This decision was based on the understanding that the project has the potential to affect intangible heritage. The study conducted by Prof. Boswell spans across the West coast from Port Nolloth to False Bay, incorporating field research conducted from March 2022 to May 2023.

3. Environmental Management Programme (EMPR) Conditions In order to formalise the above, it is recommended that the following conditions be included in the EMPr (in addition to a chance find protocol) should the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) recommend that the proposed activity be authorised:

- All pre-survey information and documentation should be made available to an archaeologist and palaeontologist for review and confirmation of heritage features prior to commencement of drilling operations.
- Training is to be provided to the on-board ECO and drilling operator regarding the identification of archaeological and palaeontological resources, and the implementation of the chance find procedure.
- Pre-drilling surveys offer an opportunity to identify unknown archaeological features (including shipwrecks) and palaeontological features. Should any archaeological features and /or palaeontological features encountered during the pre-drilling surveys, the location of the borehole(s) should be amended to avoid these sites, by implementing a 100 m no-go buffer around the features.
- Should discoveries be made, the chance find procedure must be followed and these discoveries must be shared with the SAHRA MUCH Unit for inclusion into the national database. The further process and instructions from the SAHRA MUCH Unit need to be complied with.

4. Conclusion For the reasons above it is our opinion that the implementation of the above measures would be sufficient to provide protection for any Archaeological or Palaeontological features that may be located within the application area of interest, and further studies in this regard would not be required at this stage. It is respectfully requested that SAHRA consider the contents of this letter and provide further guidance in this regard.

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Nokukhanya Khumalo

Date 2023/12/01 Method Other

Comment

The SAHRA Development Applications Unit (DAU) acknowledges receipt of the letter however, a desktop study on potential tangible heritage that may occur must be undertaken as part of the EA application process. A maritime archaeologist must be appointed to undertake such a study and an assessment of known maritime heritage in the exploration area and what might occur along with management measures for such an event occurring. A palaeontologist must be appointed to assess potential fossiliferous nature of the seabed geology and provide management measures for potential impacts. The assessment of intangible heritage in the form of the Cultural Heritage assessment report must also be submitted along with the draft EIAr. This assessment must also indicate the particular communities researched and the locations in a map within the report.

Response

The comment was addressed through the submission of all requirements.

Raymond Brown

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen's right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Raymond Brown

Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other

on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel,

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Raymond Brown

negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as

Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Raymond Brown

post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which has will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Mr Aaron Larken

Date2023/06/26MethodEmail

CommentResponse

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

### Mr Aaron Larken

Thank you kindly – my contact details appear below. Kind regards

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your e-mail. We confirm that the provided details have been included in our I&AP database for this project.

**Date** 2024/02/01 **Method** Email

#### Comment

Dear Sirs and Madams. Please find attached Belton Park Trading 127 (Pty) Ltd's notification of its intention to commence its survey/prospecting operations within sea concessions 13C, 15C, 16C, 17C and 18C in accordance with its executed prospecting rights (with bulk sampling). Kind regards

#### Response

I&AP was informed that the activity will not intersect with those presented in provided documentation. "Thank you for your notification. We can confirm that the intended activities of Belton Park Trading 127 (Pty) Ltd will not intersect with the activities of this project."

### Mr Gert Afrikaner

**Date** 2023/07/11 **Method** Email

#### Comment

Good Day My Question is did you employ the Data Captures in the ward 2 and was opportunity advertise. Hope to hear from you.

#### Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. Advertisements and site notices were placed along coastal areas and letters were placed at the Sea point library. This was mostly because the project involves offshore activities. The call to register is still open for any who wish to be registered as I&APs for this project.

### Elmaureen Cloete

**Date** 2023/08/19 **Method** Email

#### Comment

As daar gemyn word wie se dit sal nie vlot verloop en as ding sou verkeerd gaan kan daar baie lewens verlore gaan. So baie ding kan verkeerd gaan vis en seediene kan venietig word so nou voel ek, ek se nee vir Mynbou in ons weskaap. Los ons oseaan uit A.SB. Ek sal geen toegang tot oseaan he nie want myne beperk dit.

#### Response

Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

### Ms Natasha Thomas

**Date** 2023/12/05 **Method** Email

#### Comment

Only activity 18 of Listing Notice (LN) 2 should be applied for. However, the potential impacts of all relevant listed or specified activities (i.e. any other applicable activity as contained in Listing

#### Response

We refer to our letter dated 1 September 2023 regarding the above project in response to the comment submitted by the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) on the draft version of the

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Natasha Thomas

Notice (LN) 1, 2 or 3 of 2014, required to exercise the exploration right) must be identified, considered and appropriately assessed in the EIA process, while the relevant EMPr must address all relevant impacts through appropriate impact management outcomes and actions. The intention of the amendments to the mining-related EIA Regulations Listing Notice 2 activities including activity 18 of Listing Notice 2, published under Government Notice No. 517 in Government Gazette No. 38282 on 11 June 2021, was to ensure that all the associated activities required to realise the relevant rights and permissions are included in the listing of the mining right or permission and do not require additional individual applications for such associated activities. In other words an application is submitted for the one activity (such as Activity 18 of LN2) and all associated activities will be covered under the one application. Please note that the above only applies in the case where a new mining application is required and not where there is an existing mining right. If the applicant already has a mining right or the mining right process is already underway, then any associated activities would not be part of a mining application and the provincial authority would be the competent authority (unless one of the activities contemplated under section 24C(2) is applicable, in which case the Minister will be the competent authority, if any EIA activity is indeed triggered. For further guidance on the EIA process requirements, kindly email the relevant competent authority.

Scoping Report. In PASA’s original comment letter dated 22 August 2023, the following comment was made: “2. Only listed activity 18 from the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations: Listing Notice 2 of 2014 (EIA Regulations: Listing Notice 2) is listed in the scoping report. Other potential listed activities that may be triggered by the proposed drilling activities from the EIA Regulations: Listing Notice 1 and EIA Regulations: Listing Notice 2 must specifically be included in the scoping report. In our assessment, Listing Notice 1 activities 14, 17, and 19A, including Listing Notice 2 activities 4, 6, 7, and 14 may be triggered. Should they be triggered, these must be included in the scoping report. The EA application must also be amended.” In our response submission, it was noted that: “It is our understanding that Activity 18 from Listing Notice 2 is the only applicable listed activity: Activity 18 states the following: “Any activity including the operation of that activity which requires an exploration right in terms of section 79 of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, as well as any other applicable activity as contained in this Listing Notice, in Listing Notice 1 of 2014 or in Listing Notice 3 of 2014, required to exercise the exploration right,”. Based on interpretations received from the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) it is our understanding that the underlined section was included in the Listed Activity 18 in order to ensure that it would not be required to apply for the “other applicable activity as contained in this Listing Notice, in Listing Notice 1 of 2014 or in Listing Notice 3 of 2014, required to exercise the exploration right”. We have updated the Scoping Report with a statement that the legal interpretation will be clarified and should it be required, additional listed activities as referred to in your comment will be included in the EIA Report and the Application form updated accordingly.” Subsequently, EIMS sought clarification from the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) Legal Interpretations Section (DFFE IQ) regarding the above matter. We refer to their email dated 5 December 2023 annexed hereto as "Appendix 1", which concluded that only Listing Notice 2 Activity 18 would be applicable, and the potential impacts of all relevant listed or specified activities (i.e. any other applicable activity as contained in Listing Notice (LN) 1, 2 or 3 of 2014, required to exercise the exploration right) must be identified, considered and appropriately assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment process, while the relevant Environmental Management Programme must address all relevant impacts through appropriate impact management outcomes and actions. As such, based on the above and attached, there would not be a need to update the EIA Reports, nor the EA application form, with any additional listed activities.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Executive Summary, page xxix and xxxi: The locality map is referenced as Figure 15 in the text of the executive summary, whilst it is titled as Figure 1. Similar errors were identified for other Figures in the executive summary. It is recommended that the Figure numbering used in the

Response

1. Thank you for pointing these out. We will update the relevant sections accordingly. 2. Thank you for pointing these out. We have updated the report to avoid confusion. 3. The rock cuttings are analysed and logged in terms of their depth and rock description, which forms the basis of

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Natasha Thomas

text of the executive summary correspond to the Figure number title. 2. Executive Summary, page xxix & section 3.3.3.2 page 25: The terminology of support and supply vessels appears to be used interchangeably. It is recommended that one terminology be used to avoid confusion. 3. Executive Summary, page xxxiv & section 3.3.5.2.2 page 28: The EIA Report states the following: “The cuttings are removed from the returned drill mud, sampled for analysis and the balance of the cuttings are discharged overboard.” The type and reason for analysis is not mentioned. It is recommended that an explanation be provided regarding the type and objective of the cuttings analysis. 4. Section 9.3.1.3.4 Page 384: The EIA Report states the following: “Following the Deep Water Horizon (DWH) incident, however, Mulebacks et al. (2013) undertook an empirical analysis of performance indicators on offshore platforms in the Gulf of Mexico and identified that water depth played a statistically significant role in determining the probability of an incident.” However, no further context is provided concerning the probability of a well blow-out in the context of exploration drilling vs well blowouts at production platforms as documented by Muehlenbach et al. It is recommended that the study by Muehlenbach et al. mentioned in the EIA report be contextualised concerning the probability of well-blowouts. This is because the study concerns company-reported incidents in general and platform production facilities which have different activities and durations compared to a drill ship for example. 5. Section 9.3.1.2.2 Page 349 & Section 3.3.5.2.3 page 28: In the assessment section of the EIA Report, it is indicated that the cement may remain depending on composition however earlier in the report the impression is created that the cement will dissolve. Section 9.3.1.2.2 Page 349: “This excess (50 m3 in the worst case) emerges out of the top of the well onto the cuttings pile, where (depending on its mix) it either does not set and dissolves slowly into the surrounding seawater or if it remains in a pile, may act as an artificial reef, be colonised by epifauna and attract fish and other mobile predators (Buchanan et al. 2003).” Section 3.3.5.2.3 page 28: “This cement does not set and is slowly dissolved into the seawater.” It is recommended that the information be consistent throughout the EIA Report. 6. Section 9.3.1.3.4 page 376: This section describes condensate and crude oil as having “similar composition” It is assumed the composition referred to is the chemical composition, if the assumption is correct, condensate is a much lighter hydrocarbon source compared to crude oil. Secondly, it is noted that only condensate is used in the oil spill model because there is a probability that the encountered hydrocarbon would be condensate. The recommendation is to indicate the difference between crude oil and condensate clearly and clarify what is meant by similar composition. It is recommended that the oil spill model also be based on crude oil as this would represent the worst-case scenario in terms of persistence and volume released in the event of a well blowout as indicated in the EIA report. This would also prevent any updating processes as stated in section 9.3.1.3.5 page of page 390. 7. Section 9.3.2.1.1 Page 391 and other sections: The EIA report indicates the following: “The intention is to remove the wellheads from the seafloor on non-productive wells. On productive wells, it may be decided to abandon the wellheads on the seafloor after the installation of over

building a stratigraphic record of the types of rocks penetrated. This information is used to build a stratigraphic column. Any fossils present in the rocks can be used to help establish a geologic age for the stratigraphic layers that are drilled. The relevant sections of the report will be updated to include this explanation. 4. Thank you for the comment. It should be noted that the likelihood of blowout occurring as a result of exploration activities was put into context by the preceding sentence to the sentence quoted and stated: “Global data maintained by Lloyds Register indicates that frequency of a blow-out from normal exploration wells is in the order of  $1.43 \times 10^{-4}$  (0.000143) per well drilled. While the probability of a major spill happening is thus extremely small, the impact nonetheless needs to be considered as it could have devastating effects on the marine environment.” The Deepwater Horizon (DWH) disaster does not represent an example of current industry best practice and standards. The DWH has provided significant learnings to the industry and controls have been put in place to deal with a similar event, such as making pre-emptive contingency plans for well capping. 5. Comment noted. The impact description has been updated to be consistent with the project description. The relevant Sections have been updated to accommodate only dissolving as per the project description. 6. Comment noted. The Oil Spill Drift Modelling Report has been revised and relevant specialist assessments amended. These are being made available for a second round of public participation in April 2024.. The relevant descriptions and sections in the EIAR will be updated. 7. The section quoted is from the project description, which states that the risk assessment criteria will consider factors such as water depth and the use of the area by other sectors such as fishing. Section 9.3.2.1.1 (entitled “Exclusion from Fishing Ground due to Temporary Safety Zone around Drilling Unit”) states the following: “The proposed AOI for drilling does not overlap with the fishing grounds of the demersal trawl, midwater trawl, hake- and shark-demersal longline, small pelagic purse-seine, tuna pole-line, linefish, west coast rock lobster, south coast rock lobster, squid jig or small-scale fisheries. Thus, the presence of the drilling unit will not result in an impact on these sectors.” As such, the risk assessment has been carried out as stated.



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Natasha Thomas

trawable protective equipment. The risk assessment criteria will consider factors such as the water depth and use of the area by other sectors e.g. fishing.” The potential installation of over-trawable equipment is not assessed. It is noted that a risk assessment will be conducted. It is recommended that the impacts associated with installing and leaving the over-trawable equipment on the seafloor be assessed. The assessment should include the introduction of a new and foreign habitat.

Mr Hamilton Macmillan

Date 2024/01/26 Method Questionnaire

Comment

Please see attached comment sheet regarding this project: We were informed at the meeting by two separate person; that a. there wasn’t going to be any seismic testing and b. there is only going to be drilling carried out – which is correct and why the differing answers? See also the commentary below regarding the proposed seismic testing Oil spillage at drilling rig. Oil spillage in the event of a blow out at the rig. Oil spillage during oil transfer from rig to ship. Oil spillage at harbour where oil is offloaded for refining. This will affect the entire west coast to Namibia and beyond due to the tides and prevailing winds. Thousands of kilometres of beaches will potentially be at risk What happens to cements and slurries during the drilling operation. There is no way that this can be contained completely and will spread for significant kilometres around the rig being carried by the currents. “There is a diverse community of flora and fauna in the coastal strip between the high and low watermark and in the shallow subtidal zones.” River outflows and estuarine areas such as Velddrif and the RAMSAR site will be at risk. “The sensitivity of oil pollution on critically endangered and vulnerable species such as turtles, pelagic fish, whales, could be high.” “What does mitigation mean if the biodiversity is impacted or destroyed by condensate and/or crude oil in the marine environment as a result of oil spills?” “Applications to explore and extract oil and gas are subjected to an environmental impact assessment (EIA) process, which “often grossly under-represents the likely negative environmental impacts, doesn’t assess climate risk and is funded by industry applicants.” “The minimum time for oil to reach the shoreline could be as little as three days for the East Coast and within about 10 days for the South Coast and 30 days for the West Coast.” “Illegal bilge dumping is quite common in our waters, but difficult to quantify and monitor as spills occur far out at sea. Oil bunkering [ship-to-ship transfer of fuel oil] has been the source of oil spills in Algoa Bay in recent years, notably in 2019.” “During the survey, air guns or vibrators are used to produce controlled shockwaves that penetrate the seabed and interact with different rock layers, bouncing back to the surface where they are detected by arrays of sensors, a process which can harm marine life and kill fish, particularly those with swim bladders.” What will be

Response

We would like to thank you for your participation during our meeting in St. Helena Bay. It was a great pleasure to engage with everyone and gather feedback and sentiments on the exploration project. Your comments have been well received and recorded. Should you need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact us.

## Mr Hamilton Macmillan

the noise effect once seismic testing is complete and the drilling commences and the noise of shipping (rig supply vessels and oil transport ships) “Evidence that seismic blasting harms marine life is growing. According to Dr Cat Dorey from the Australian Marine Conservation Society, the noise generated by seismic airguns underwater reaches a massive 250 decibels — it needs to penetrate rock — and this sound travels underwater faster than it does through air, for hundreds or thousands of kilometres. “It can kill or injure marine animals close by ... damage the hearing of whales and keep them away from key feeding and breeding grounds. Other large animals like dolphins, sea turtles and sea lions could suffer similar effects. We can only imagine how distressing seismic blasts must be for marine animals, like whales and dolphins, that rely on sound to navigate and communicate.” “According to expert reports, the behaviour of the snoek may be disrupted due to the seismic blasting, and may affect their feeding grounds and reproduction behaviours, which may affect the future survival of the fish.” “Noise from a single seismic airgun survey, used to discover oil and gas deposits hundreds of kilometers under the sea floor, can blanket an area of over 300,000 km<sup>2</sup>, raising background noise levels 100-fold (20 dB), continuously for weeks or months (IWC 2005, IWC 2007). Seismic airgun surveys are loud enough to penetrate hundreds of kilometers into the ocean floor, even after going through thousands of meters of ocean. Since this exposes large portions of a cetacean population to chronic noise, the International Whaling Commission’s Scientific Committee noted “...repeated and persistent acoustic insults [over] a large area...should be considered enough to cause population level impacts.” (IWC 2005). A recent report by the Convention on Biological Diversity noted that “...there are increasing concerns about the long-term and cumulative effects of noise on marine biodiversity...” and “...there is a need to...take measures [to] minimise our noise impacts on marine biodiversity...” and “...effective management of anthropogenic noise in the marine environment should be regarded as a high priority for action at the national and regional level...” (CBD 2012). Nieukirk et al. (2012) analyzed 10 years of recordings from the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, finding that seismic airguns were heard at distances of 4,000 km from survey vessels and present 80-95% of the days/month for more than 12 consecutive months in some locations. When several surveys were recorded simultaneously, whale sounds were masked (drowned out), and the airgun noise became the dominant part of background noise levels.” “According to The Green Connection, that particular area has a very rich and productive ecosystem, which underpins much of the commercial fishing industry of SA. However, equally important is the integral role of this part of the ocean plays in sustaining the livelihoods of the small-scale fishers who live along this part of the coast. Hake and snoek are particularly important here,” she says. “Snoek, which is endemic to region and very popular with local consumers, plays an especially critical role in the livelihoods of most local fishers. However, according to expert reports, the behaviour of the snoek may be disrupted due to the seismic blasting, and may affect their feeding grounds and reproduction behaviours, which may affect the future survival of the fish.”

References  
<https://www.knysnaplettherald.com/News/Article/General/off-shore-drilling-could->

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Hamilton Macmillan

[endangerknysna-estuary-202311090931 https://mg.co.za/news/2023-07-15-oil-spills-from-offshore-exploration-drilling-in-sa-waters-a-realpossibility/](https://mg.co.za/news/2023-07-15-oil-spills-from-offshore-exploration-drilling-in-sa-waters-a-realpossibility/)  
<https://mg.co.za/the-green-guardian/2022-01-17-battlelines-drawn-over-new-seismic-survey-onthe-west-coast/>  
<https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2023-12-20-cape-town-paddlers-protest-against-imminentarrival-of-seismic-survey-ship/>  
<https://thegreenconnection.org.za/2022/01/23/civil-society-heads-back-to-court-this-time-to-stopseismic-survey-in-west-coast/>  
<https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/mar/mcbem-2014-01/other/mcbem-2014-01-submissionseismic-airgun-en.pdf>

Ashwin Lewis

Date 2023/06/30 Method Email

Comment

Good day Lucien James. We would like to thank EIMS for the necessary information publicly made and for us to participate within the EIA for the above said subject. Herewith please find attached our registration form as Intrested and Affected party and stakeholder to above said. We are waiting on all relevant documentation and further information in participation. Regards

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that the provided details have been included in our I&AP database for this project.

Mr Charles Chaplin

Date 2024/02/08 Method Other

Comment

1. Comment with regards to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration 2. As the entire Environmental Authorisation Application is a document of hundreds of pages, I have chosen as a matter of expediency, rather than address each matter individually, to comment on the application as a whole. 3. Overall Omission and Fatal Flaw: 4. The application fails completely to address the constitutional right of each citizen’s right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment. 5. This application has a high potential to affect this right. 6. This omission represents a Fatal Flaw. 7. Further, the right to a clean, unpolluted and healthy environment is fundamental to the lives of all South Africans and the application should then address ALL South Africans not just coastal communities. The fact that it has only been circulated to the local communities, by the minimum prescribed method, falls short of the NEMA requirements of notification to all potentially Interested and Affected parties and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 8. Further, to only perform the minimum prescribed notification fails to address a very large portion of the community who live close to the poverty line and for whom a cell phone or internet access is an

Response

1. Title of letter. Many thanks for your submissions on this application. We have attempted to respond to the comments and concerns raised. All comments and associated responses will be submitted to the Competent Authority for consideration in the decision making process. 2. Comment noted as it proceeds to following comments. 3. 4. The comment is understood to relate to Section 24 of the constitution which states: Everyone has the right:- (a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and (b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:- (i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation; (ii) promote conservation; and (iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development. We would like to thank you for this comment and reference to a key feature of the constitution. It is indeed an important element in the constitution and acts as the foundation of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. This act has informed much of the laws which guide processes around development, for example, the need for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and subsequent

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Charles Chaplin

unattainable luxury and who are then wilfully excluded from the comment process, even though they represent perhaps the largest portion of potentially affected parties by this application. Again, this fails to satisfy the requirements of NEMA and thereby represents a Fatal Flaw. 9. Desirability of the Outcome of the Application 10. The application itself begs the query as to why we (South Africa) are even contemplating seeking oil when the trend of the international community is clearly on a move away from this reliance and its drastic effects on the planet? 11. At COP23 on December the 23rd 2023, the United Nations stated unequivocally that the phase out of fossil fuels is inevitable. o The argument that the application, if successful, will potentially bring relief to the cost of fuel in South Africa, must be tempered by the term of its feasibility for doing this, which, at possibly three decades, is brief in terms of history. The consequences of which, however, will have a far deeper reach with very long term consequences not only for South Africa but all the planet. 12. The science of climate change is now irrevocably evident to all, except perhaps the very few who choose to ignore it because it runs counter to their personal investment in acknowledging it. 13. To those who would heed the warning that the time to change is now, the staunch refusal of large oil conglomerates (the applicant in this case) to do so must bring about the disturbing realisation that this application and multiple others for the same off our coasts, are in fact motivated almost exclusively by profit with a sincere disregard to the cost of the planet and all humanity. 14. This is contravention of the concerns of both NEMA and our constitution. 15. Overall lack of thorough investigation 16. The fact that an application of this nature, where the consequences for our ocean, our coast and our citizens who depend on the ocean for their livelihood and their recreation, has been proposed as acceptable through the vehicle of a desktop investigation is wholly unsatisfactory and renders the conclusions of the application deficient in their validity. For the application to exhibit a bona fide wish to reveal the possible impact of the operation, specific and thorough onsite investigation is an unquestionable necessity before any drilling (or seismic) work is begun. The application's dismissal of the potential negative effects of the operational phase on ocean life with a maximum anticipated 'Medium Negative' fails to take into account overwhelmingly well documented evidence that the effect of drilling operations on the seabed can have a potentially disastrous effect on local sealife and thereby renders the conclusions of the application deficient at best, with a potential to be construed as willfully incomplete. 17. The fact that the application conveniently ignores the fact that the proposed activity lies right within some of the most productive portions of the coastal Atlantic Ocean and is actually proposed within Marine Protected Areas is an omission, or dilution of the reality, that renders the application chronically deficient both in its completeness and, too, in the will to thoroughness with which the application has been compiled. 18. The proposed activity cannot be seen as separate from the associated oceanic regions and before the application can be viewed as entire and complete, a thorough investigation of all, near, far, short and long term potential impact have been scientifically investigated, then the application is, within the requirements of NEMA, Fatally Flawed. 19. Misrepresentation of the Facts and Dilution of the

Environmental Authorisations (EA) for developments with substantial footprints as prescribed by the NEMA. As such the process of undertaking an EIA in accordance with the NEMA regulations is in itself a legal instrument which aims to give effect to the constitution and the bill of rights. It is on this prescription and associated regulations that an EIA would be necessary for this project, which would provide the Competent Authority with information to make a decision as to whether the project should be given an EA. 5. This comment is valued and relates to the above in terms of the necessity for an EIA and EA prior to development. The EIA process undertaken aims to give effect to the bill of rights and has been conducted in accordance with the NEMA EIA regulations. The EIA identifies and assesses potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed activity and through the consultation process provides for inputs from the community to be considered in the decision making process. 6. It is unclear what specific omission is being referred to. 7. In terms of this comment, it is here contemplated that this comment refers to the Public Participation Process and associated steps taken to inform the public of the project. The EIA process, including the stakeholder engagement process has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA EIA regulations. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. A National Gazette notice including all the details of the project was placed on 15 June 2023 as part of the initial call to register. This was in accordance with the following as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014): (c) placing an advertisement in- (iv) one local newspaper; or (v) any official Gazette that is published specifically for the purpose of providing public notice of applications or other submissions made in terms of these Regulations; (d) placing an advertisement in at least one provincial newspaper or national newspaper, if the activity has or may have an impact that extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan or district municipality in which it is or will be undertaken: Provided that this paragraph need not be complied with if an advertisement has been placed in an official Gazette referred to in paragraph (c)(ii); and This would have allowed for the project to be advertised nationally, addressing the consideration of this comment. Please see Appendix 2(2) for proof of the Gazette Notice in question. Any interested and / or affected party has the right to register for this process and be provided access to the opportunities for engagement. 8. This concern is very valuable and has been contemplated by EIMS. The stakeholder engagement process undertaken does not only prescribe to the minimum required. In fact substantial efforts were undertaken to notify and engage the communities at grassroot level. Please refer to Section 7 and Appendix 2 of the EIAR for a full description of the consultation process undertaken. It was contemplated that for such a project, poorer communities may wish to have information about the potential development. As such, for those who may not have access to communication channels such as those internet-based, this project engaged a novel approach to Public Participation. The Grassroots Communication Framework (GCF) was initiated. As part of this process (in summary), the Abalobi Express was contracted to conduct on-the-ground surveys and the distribution of information through media such as pamphlets and posters. For more information on this process, please refer to Appendix 2(6) for the full report related to the GCF

## Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Mr Charles Chaplin

Potential Impact. 20. That the application has seen fit to represent the maximum potential impact of the proposed activity as 'Medium Negative' for any and all mishaps, accidents, potential terror attacks, shipping accidents, destruction by extreme weather and any other negative incident whereby oil winds up in the ocean and on our coasts, is arguably the pivotal point on which the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) has revealed their inclination to dilute the negative to the point where an unacceptable level of risk is diminished in their desktop assessment to permit a truly very hazardous exercise to be allowed to proceed. 21. Ocean and shoreline pollution events are well recorded throughout the world and their consequences on all aspects of life and livelihood are sufficiently disastrous to attract worldwide news headlines and result in billions of dollars of expense in attempted remedy with only marginal success. 22. To propose that such potential environmental disaster carries a 'Medium Negative' risk is to chronically undermine the reality of the risk and thereby to willfully place our oceans, oceanic life and coastal communities in extreme jeopardy. 23. That the EAP has seen fit to submit the application with these chronic misrepresentations included as the basis on which sound judgement can be made, reveals a willful inclination to dilute the negative without regard for the potentially disastrous consequences and is seen by many, such as myself, as requiring an investigation of an Apprehension of Bias. 24. Apprehension of Bias. 25. All of the above general concerns and deficiencies lead myself and many members of the public to request an investigation by the department to whom this application is submitted, to investigate the EAP, EIMS application for the Proposed Africa Oil SA Corp Block 3B/4B Offshore Exploration as being Fatally Flawed by bias. 26. Thank you for your consideration of the above comment and I trust that a real and considered review of the over or under sights specified above will result in a more realistic review of the potential impact and validity of the application.

initiative. 9. 10. According to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019 (IRP 2019), which is the country's energy planning strategy, there is a need for gas in South Africa's energy mix in the future. This need is driven in part by the expectation that natural gas may act as a transition fuel, whilst other greener technologies mature. According to the National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), targets have been determined to achieve our national GHG Emissions commitments. These targets consider the likely GHG emissions outcome of the implementation of current South African policies including the IRP. The proposed exploration activities may be used to determine whether a viable gas or oil resource is present. The outcomes of this could provide insight into potential alternative supply options to inform the future energy planning and policy for South Africa. Considering this, and other new information on supply options, as well as the rapid technological advancements in the energy sector (and specifically in the low carbon alternatives), it is crucial that the energy planning for South Africa is continually reassessed and revised to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable strategy is defined. It is agreed that pending the outcome of an appraisal on the viability of extracting any oil or gas resource, which this exploration activity is likely to inform, due caution will need to be taken to ensure that South Africa complies with its international commitments and ensure a safe environment in line with our constitution and the prevailing environmental legislation that gives effect to thereto. 11. Please see the above response. The EIAR states that the proposed project aims to identify oil and gas resources and does not include any production activities. The identification and assessment of impacts (both positive and negative) is therefore limited to the activities associated with the exploration for oil and gas as outlined in Section 3 above. Should a viable resource be identified then such specific production activities would require a separate EIA, including description of the need and desirability, the identification and assessment of impacts, and a specific stakeholder engagement process. 12. Comment noted. The science and impact of climate change in relation to the proposed project are acknowledged throughout the EIAR report. Please refer to Section 9.3.7 and Appendix 4 of the EIAR for the assessment of the impact on climate change. 13. Comment noted. However, please refer to above comments. 14. Please refer to above comments in relation to the NEMA and constitution. 15. 16. As it pertains to the EIA process, this process is regulated and mandated by the NEMA and associated regulations including the NEMA: EIA Regulations (2014). The EIA in question considers several potential impacts which also relate to the well-being of surrounding communities and how their livelihoods could be affected. In terms of on-site investigation, pre-drilling surveys will be undertaken. Pre-drilling surveys also typically include Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) surveys of the seabed in the immediate vicinity of the proposed well site. The well(s) will specifically be sited to avoid sensitive hardgrounds, as the preference will be to have a level surface area to facilitate spudding and installation of the wellhead. Pre-drilling site surveys will be designed to ensure there is sufficient information on seabed habitats, including the mapping of potentially sensitive and vulnerable habitats within 1 000 m of a proposed well site thereby preventing potential conflict with the well site. If vulnerable habitats are detected, the well position will be

Mr Charles Chaplin

adjusted accordingly or implement appropriate technologies, operational procedures, and monitoring surveys to reduce the risks of, and assess the damage to, vulnerable seabed habitats and communities. In relation to the rating of impacts, impacts are rated pre-mitigation, as well as post-mitigation. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures would adjust pre-mitigation scores. The maximum score associated with pre-mitigation impacts is indeed a High Negative as seen in Table 49 of the EIA Report. However, it can be confirmed that post-mitigation, all impacts are rated between Medium Negative and Medium Positive. Section 9.3 of the EIAR provides a detailed assessment, using best available information, to predict the potential impact and suggested management and mitigation measures. As such the potential impact on ocean life is not dismissed as claimed. 17. The considerations of this comment in terms of other activities within the Block, as well Marine Protected Areas have been contemplated in the EIA Report. Please refer to Section 8: Environmental Attributes and Baseline Environment for information pertaining to these considerations. The statement that the proposed activity falls within a Marine Protected Area is incorrect. As noted in the EIAR, the AOI for drilling specifically avoids both the MPA's and associated EBSA's. In terms of Marine Protected Areas, it is anticipated that these will not be affected by the activities of the project. 18. Please refer to above comments as this comment relates to the overall investigation prescribed by the NEMA, as well as pre-drilling surveys. 19. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. 20. Please refer to the above comment as this comment relates to how impacts are rated or scored. Section 9.3 of the EIAR identifies and assesses the potential impacts associated with unplanned events, including a well blowout of condensate. In an effort to further consider this blow out impact the oil spill model has been updated to accommodate a high volume crude oil spill from 2 locations which is likely to represent the worst case scenario. The results of the updated model and the potential environmental impacts have been included in the updated EIAR which will be made available for public scrutiny and comment. 21. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 22. Comment noted. Please refer to response provided above. 23. There has been no misrepresentation of the facts associated with this application. The content of the EIAR and the associated outcomes have been prepared by a team of independent, qualified and experienced specialists. The findings are clearly articulated and substantiated in the EIAR. This accusation is unsubstantiated. 24. 25. As per law, the associated EA application will be submitted to the Petroleum Agency of South Africa (PASA) who is the Competent Authority in terms of such applications. The application will be submitted together with all comments received from the public, including this letter. The Competent Authority will thereafter be provided all information pertaining to the application and make a decision to either grant or deny the EA applied for. 26. Comment noted. Thank you for your submissions.

Bianca Swartz

Date	2023/08/19	Method	Email
------	------------	--------	-------



# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Bianca Swartz

Comment	Response
Omdat die myne kan ons diere in die oseean kan vernietig en die olie kan baie diere dood maak. Dit sal dat ons mense nie meer sal kan by die oseean kom nie en dat ons vissermanne nie meer kan werk nie. Dit sal ons spesies beïnvloed deur hulle te laat vlug. Ons se christelike en kulturele sal nie weer die selfde wees nie. Ja dit sal want myne jaag al ons spesies weg.	Ons wil u graag bedank vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van die kommentaar en bevestig dat die verder ondersoek sal word in die Omgewingsimpakstudie fase.

EWT

Date 2023/06/18 Method Email

Comment	Response
Good day Please could you register the EWT as an I&AP for this project?	Dear I&AP, This email serves to acknowledge receipt of your message. We will include EWT in our I&AP database.

Barend Fredericks

Date 2023/08/21 Method Email

Comment	Response
A BIGAI FISHERS IS A CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION, WHO ARE STANDING IN SOLIDARITY AGAINST ANY RIGHTS, LAWS OR ORGANIZATIONS, WHO ARE TRYING TO RESIST US IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING A LIVING OUT OF THE OCEAN.WE EXPERIENCE FOR A SHORTAGE OF FISH SPECIES AND BAIT ON OUR FISHING SPOTS.OUR PEOPLE AND OCEAN IS TOTALLY DEPENDABLE ON EACH OTHER. *WE AS COMMUNITY CAN'T ALLOW THAT ANY KIND OF OBSTRUCTIONS CONTRIBUTE TO OUR FEARS OF NO FOOD ON THE TABLE* OUR FISHERS ASHWELL AS OUR ANCESTERS WHERE PRACTICING FOR COUPLE OF MANY,MANY YEARS OUR CULTURAL RIGHTS IN FISHING, ALSO FISHING TRAPS,WHERE VERY EFFECTIVE IN OUR COASTAL AND LAGOON AREAS AT KNYSNA.SMALL SCALE FISHERS BIGAI CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION-KNYSNA OUR FISHERS ASHWELL AS OUR ANCESTERS WHERE PRACTICING FOR COUPLE OF MANY,MANY YEARS OUR CULTURAL RIGHTS IN FISHING, ALSO FISHING TRAPS,WHERE VERY EFFECTIVE IN OUR COASTAL AND LAGOON AREAS AT KNYSNA.THE OCEAN IS ALSO THE PLACE OF SPIRITUALITY,RELIGIOUS PRACTICES AND HOLY.WE STAND IN SOLIDARITY WITH COASTAL COUNTRIES LIKE MAXICO AND NIGERIA WHO'S LIVELIHOOD, WHERE DANGEROUSLY THREATEN WITH FIRES,OIL SPILLS, AND CLIMATE CHANGE.WE NEED DRASTICALLY ALL OIL AND GAS COMPANIES TO RESPECT OUR RESOURCES,LAND SEA AND AIR.OUR COMMUNITIES IS NOT INCLUDE IN A FREE PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT,WHICH IS THE ABORIGINALS AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN AFRICA ESPECIALLLY KNYSNA , THIS IS OUR GOLDEN CARD FOR ANY NEGOTIATIONS OR IMPACT ASSESMENT STUDIES. B ANY KIND OF POLLUTION LIKE OIL AND GAS	A Thank you for your comment. Please note that this project relates to an exploration activity on the West Coast of South Africa and not the South Coast close to Knysna. The impacts on cultural and intangible heritage were identified in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. Additionally, it was recommended that these be assessed further in the EIA Phase and, as such, a Cultural Heritage Assessment was recommended as part of the Plan of Study for EIA (See Section 10.3 of the Scoping Report). B The potential for a pollution events (e.g. oil spills) is acknowledged and considered a key part of the study, especially given that it has the potential to have impacts of high significance on the receiving environment, as is detailed in Section 9.3 of the Scoping Report. As such, a detailed oil spill modelling study has been commissioned in order to detail the extent and magnitude of potential spills under various scenarios. The results of the oil spill modelling study will be used by the specialist team to inform impacts on the associated aspects. C The right to a healthy environment is recognised in the guiding principles of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 1.7 of 1998 – NEMA), as amended (please refer to Section 4.3 of the Scoping Report. As stated in Section 4.1 of Scoping Report, The Bill of Rights in chapter 2 section 24 of the Constitution of South Africa Act (Act No. 108 of 1996) makes provisions for environmental issues and declares that: “Everyone has the right - a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that: i. prevent pollution and ecological degradation; ii. promote conservation; and iii. secure

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Barend Fredericks

IN OCEAN WILL OBSTRUCT OR DISTURBED FISH SPECIES, LIKE SEAHORSE, OCRA WHALE, SEA ALGE'WHICH IS WORLD ATTRECTION FOR TOURISM.....FISH COMING AND LAYING EGGS IN THE LAGOON,AFTER BREEDING, SPECIES MOVING BACK TO A SAVER ENVIRONMENT,FISH SPECIES CAN DIE A PRE-MATURE DEATH,INHAILLING GAS AND OIL. THE OIL DRILLINGS AND SEIZMIC SURVEYS NEED TO BE STOPPED, UNTIL COURT CASES OUTSTANDING, WHEN PROCEDURES NOT FOLLOWING EXCECTALLY AND WITH PROPER CONSIDERATION OF BIGAIYSNA AND COASTAL TOWNS.( MAKANDLA HIGH COURT ). C THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ROLEPLAYERS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS THE FUTURE GENERATIONS,FOR THEIR HEALTH,NATURAL RESOURCES, INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND ECOSYSTEMS,WHICH IS ALSO IN JEORPADY OR UNDER DANGER OF EXTINCTION....!!! D VOORSTELL MET BETREKKING TOT BESOEDELING IN DIE OSEAAN. VERWAGTINGE VAN GEMEENSKAP IS, DAT U HULLE ONS SAL KONSIDEREER MET BETEKENISVOLLE BEKENDSTELLING EN BEHOORLIKE OPENBARE DEELNAME/ PROSESSE,VOORDAT U ENIGE AKSIES VIR DIE SOEKTOG NA OLIEEN GAS SAL BEGIN. DAAR HEERS EGTER 'N EMOSIONELE ONSEKERHEID BY DIE VISSERS OOR HUL TOEKOMS AS PERMANENTE VISSERS, EN CUSTODIANS VAN OCEAAN EN LAND,WAT ONS NEGATIEF ONS SAL AFFEKTEER . DIT IS VIR ONS KOMMERWEKKEND, DAT DIE WERKLOOSHEID SYFER BO DIE 50% MERK GESTYG HET,DIT IS EGTER 'N 'GROOT KOPSEER'VIR ONS AS 'INDIGENOUS PEOPLE'.DAAR WORD EGTER GEEN SEKERHEID AAN DIE GEWONE ARBEIDER EN HALFGESKOOLDE WERKER GEGEE VAN 'N INKOMSTE NIE.

ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development” The Scoping and EIA process as well as associated impact mitigation actions are conducted to fulfil the requirement of the Bill of Rights. D Please be advised that the applicant has not received Environmental Authorisation (EA) for this project. It is important to remember that the public participation being undertaken as part of this Scoping and EIA process, provides an opportunity for an independent presentation of the proposed project. The uncertainty regarding the activities and their impact on fishing has been identified and for this reason we have proposed a detailed Fisheries Impact Assessment as part of the EIA Phase.

Ms Christine Marais

Date 2023/07/06 Method Email

Comment

To whom it may concern Please register me as an I&AP to this proposed exploration, mentioned in the title above. Christine Marais c\*\*\*\*\*@gmail.com O\*\*\*\*\* I live in Britannia Bay and will be impacted by the proposed exploration. Kind regards Christine Marais

Response

Dear I&AP, Thank you for your email. We can confirm that the provided details have been included in our I&AP database.

Date 2023/08/04 Method Email

Comment

1. Ek rig hierdie skrywe om my teleurstelling met die kwaliteit van julle afrikaanse vertaling van hierdie dokument te lug. Dit skyn asof julle dit bloot as 'n formaliteit sien, en nie 'n poging om werklik seker te maak dat belanghebbendes goed ingelig is nie. Hiermee lig ek slegs 'n paar van die growwe nalatighede uit: 2. - bl. 1: Die kaart is onakkuraat en laat 'n mens wonder of enige van julle mense al ooit aan die Weskus was? Paternoster le in werklikheid suid van St.

Response

1. Dankie vir u kommentaar. Ons neem kennis van u misnoeë met die Afrikaanse vertaling. 2. Ons het die dorpe op die kaart aangedui met groen kolletjies. Die dorpsname op die kaart word outomaties geplaas deur die geografiese inligtingstelsel wat ons gebruik om die ligging van die dorpe aan te dui. Ons erken dat die plasing van hierdie dorpsname wel oor die onderliggende groen kolletjies voor kom, maar volgens ons inligting is kolletjie vir Paternoster wel suid van die

# Comments and Responses 1570 Block 3B/4B Exploration Right EIA

Ms Christine Marais

Helenabaai, en Jacobsbaai le noord van Saldanha. 3. - bl.2: Die vinnigs-groeiende dorp aan die Weskus word glad nie eens genoem as een van die naaste dorpe nie, nl. St Helenabaai. Dis ook hier waar 'n menigte inwoners geraak sal word deur die beoogde boorbedrywighede. Ek sou dink dink dis uiters belangrik om erkenning te gee aan die bestaan van die mense van St. Helenabaai, nie waar nie? 4. - bl. 3: "Impact Assessment Process" is verseker nie eens afrikaans nie! Was hierdie vertaling 'n blote nagedagte? Word dokumentasie nie deur verskeie persone hersien, voordat dit versprei word nie? 5. - bl.3: Onder "Omgewingsimpakte": "boor sny impakte" is een woord en nie drie nie. Daar is vele voorbeelde van hierdie soort fout in die dokument en uiters steurend. 6. - bl.4: "Modellering van oliestorting en boorsteggies". Wat op dees aarde is "boorsteggies"?! Steggies verwys na stukkie plante, wat afgesny word. Ek sien hierdie swak vertalings as absolute minagting van die hele afrikaanse gemeenskap, wat ook by verre die meerderheid van Weskusinwoners uitmaak. 7. Ek hoop jy kan my verseker dat hierdie ongelukkige indruk van EIMS se dokumentasiekwaliteit 'n eenmalige uitsondering was en nie julle normale praktyk nie. Ek hoor graag van EIMS in hierdie verband.

kolletjie vir St Helenabaai – die dorpname is net nie duidelike geplaas langs elke kolletjie nie. 3. Ons erken dat die lys van dorpe nie die volledige lys van alle dorpe aan die kus is nie. Die punt van die lys is om te help om die ligging van die aansoekarea aan die leser oor te dra. Ons verstaan die belangrikheid van St. Helenabaai en het spesifiek melding gemaak van die dorp in die eerste sin van paragraaf 2 onder die opskrif "LIGGING, SKAAL EN OMVANG VAN DIE VOORGESTELDE PROJEK" op dieselfde bladsy. Ons wil graag ook u aandag vestig op die feit dat ons 'n publieke vergadering gereël het by die Steenberg's Cove Gemeenskapsaal om juis vir die gemeenskappe van St Helenabaai en die omliggende areas die geleentheid te bied om met ons te kon gesels oor die projek. 4. U is heeltemal korrek. Die opskrif moes gelees het "IMPAKBEPALINGSPROSES". 5. Dankie dat u dit vir ons uitgewys het. Ons neem kennis hiervan. 6. Dankie dat u dit vir ons uitgewys het. Ons neem kennis hiervan. Ons kan u verseker dat ons nie op enige stadium die Afrikaanse taal of gemeenskappe probeer minag nie. Ongelukkig is die meeste van die wetgewing, literatuur en verslae in Engels. Ons het dus probeer om ons dokumentasie te vertaal na Afrikaans, juis omdat ons bewus is van die feit dat die meerderheid van die gemeenskappe langs die Weskus Afrikaanssprekend is, en op so 'n manier, die inligting te probeer beskikbaar stel in hul moedertaal. Vir dieselfde rede het ons in al die onlangse publieke vergaderings die inligting in Afrikaans voorgedra. Ons het ook verseker dat daar altyd 'n tolk beskikbaar was vir die Engelse lede van die projek span. 7. Alhoewel die primêre fokus van ons studie nie noodwendig taalkwaliteit is nie, stem ons saam dat dit wel 'n belangrike rol speel. Dankie dat u die tyd en moeite geneem het om ons te help met ons Afrikaanse vertaling. Ons waardeer dit opreg.

Date 2023/08/15 Method Email

Comment

Baie dankie vir die volledige terugvoer. Ek waardeer dit en sien uit na keuriger afrikaanse-taalversorging in die toekoms.

Response

Email received and comment noted

Mr Freddie Danster

Date 2023/07/28 Method WhatsApp

Comment

Dear Mr Lucian James I want to inform you that on the 2nd of August we as fishers have a meeting with Cederberg municipality start at 4pm and there after we have another meeting with the Department of Seafisheries Deaf at 7pm so we can't attend of you on that day so hereby im asking if the meeting can be postponed till the 3rd of August if possible.Sorry for the inconvenience Mr FDanster fisher in the community of Elandsbay

Response

Good day Mr Danster, Thank you for your message. We were unfortunately not able to postpone the Elandsbay meeting, as these meetings had been planned in advance, and would have conflicted with a meeting on the following day in another town. Please note that there is another opportunity to attend the virtual public meeting today from 15:00-17:00. Please refer to the website for this project (<https://eims.datafree.co/2023/06/08/1570-block-3b4b-exploration-right-eia/>) for the notification of the public meetings. There will be further opportunities to

Mr Freddie Danster

engage with the EIA project team during the EIA Phase. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further queries. Kind regards, EIMS Public Participation Team