

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Ms Mariette Liefferink

Date 2025/10/02 Method Email

Comment

Dear Stakeholder Engagement Team, I thank you sincerely for the notification. Will it be possible to engage with you virtually on the project? Our interest is in the risk classification of the proposed expansion of the Mponeng TSF. Sincerely yours,

Response

Good Day ***, As indicated in the notification, we have scheduled a public meeting for 9th October between 12H30 and 14H30 in Carletonville, it would be great and/or more effective if we could engage in person on during the meeting. However, if you prefer a virtual meeting, we can schedule one for Friday the 10th of October.

Date 2025/10/08 Method Email

Comment

Dear ***, I apologise for my late response. I shall unfortunately not be in the position to attend in person tomorrow due to the Roundtable discussions on sinkholes with COGTA, the SAHRC and others. The discussion is scheduled for the full day. Please accept my sincere apology. May I kindly request if it will still be possible to meet virtually on Friday? Sincerely yours,

Response

Good Day ***, I have sent a teams invite for 12H00 today as discussed. P.S: It is ***

Date 2025/10/10 Method Email

Comment

1. Concerns regarding complex corporate structures, since the applicant is a subsidiary of Harmony Gold which is Golden Core Trade and Invest (Pty) Ltd. Specifically, concerns regarding who will be responsible for closure and rehabilitation of the Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) when it does reach its Life of Mine (LoM). The problem comes when a subsidiary has financial constraints, the parent companies tend to divest themselves from the subsidiaries. They do this so that they can avoid taking accountability for non-compliance and other related things. 2. Clarity on the alternatives, GN R982 of 2014 was not considered. In this case, an alternative deposition site. Additionally recommending an alternative deposition location which is the TSF that is regional and the largest TSF in the world (DRD Mega Dump). 3. Will the proposed TSF be lined with the geomembrane barrier? The understanding is that all new TSFs need to be lined, however this historical TSF is not lined, will there be retrofitting? Concerns regarding the TSF not needing a liner, because the Scoping Report identified significant seepage at the southeast corner of the starter wall. Suggesting that you do something similar to the Kareerand TSF where the expansion of the TSF was lined. 4. Shocking that the site was allowed to be a general waste Landfill site because it now possibly contains compressible waste material which may lead to uneven settlement over time. There might need to be a dynamic compression of the two different waste materials whether or not the TSF is lined. 5. It seems that the Savuka TSF has reached its deposition capacity, What is Harmony's closure objectives and what will be the

Response

1. Golden Core Trade and Invest (Pty), a subsidiary of Harmony Gold Mining Company ("Harmony"), is responsible for the closure and rehabilitation of all environmental liabilities at the time of closure. The environmental liabilities related to the Mponeng operation are funded through the Rehabilitation Trust Fund. To date, the trust fund is fully funded against the liability, guaranteeing that there will be sufficient funds available to carry out all rehabilitation obligations for the Mponeng operation at closure. As a good corporate citizen, Harmony Gold Mining Company will ensure it fulfills its rehabilitation obligations at closure. Harmony also continues to undertake concurrent rehabilitation at all its operations, including Mponeng, to lessen the financial burden the company would face at closure. 2. The I&AP should remember that GN R982 of 2014, as amended, states that feasible and reasonable alternatives must be identified and considered. There were other nearby TSFs previously considered by the applicant, however, there were disregarded for various environmental and engineering constraints, therefore, at the time of compilation of the Scoping Report, feasible and reasonable alternative TSF locations were not identified for the project. Section 5 of the Scoping Report has been updated to reflect discussions around the potential alternative sites and reasons why they were not considered further. This information summarized below will be available to all registered I&APs during the EIA Phase. i. Height Extension of Deelkraal TSF This scenario includes re-utilising the existing and dormant Deelkraal TSF by extending the height of the TSF. This TSF is located further away than

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Ms Mariette Liefferink

predetermined agreed upon future land use for the TSF. Basically, what are their plans for rehabilitation for the TSF. The EIA report for the Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF has to address cumulative impacts so the Savuka TSF needs to be considered in this regard. Request for Savuka closure plan along with rehabilitation objectives. 6. In terms of the draft national mine closure strategy which will hopefully be put into effect soon, revegetation is not a rehabilitation strategy. Revegetation only acts as a stabiliser, however, a rehabilitation strategy needs to align with the principles of sustainable development, has to be agreed upon by I&APs, and also has to offer livelihood opportunities. It is also important to look into diversification of economic activities and economic succession after closure of the Savuka TSF. 7. Which river is the Spring you plan to divert a tributary to? Is the stream being diverted to the one that contains the gooseneck? Where did the spring emerge from? 8. Is there is a wetland associated with the spring, are there mitigation measures in place for an offset? 9. Since you plan on expanding the Mponeng TSF in both volume and height. How will you classify risk in terms of catastrophic failure? What was the historic classification and how will it now be classified? 10. According to Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (GISTM) principles to the proposed project, Two of the principles deal with the safety of a tailing storage facility because the aim is 0 harm to communities, 0 harm to the environment and 0 tolerance for human fatalities. It will be good practice to indicate the flow path in the unlikely event of a catastrophic failure. 11. Steel pipes with flanches are now at a higher risk of being illegally removed, which results in the spillage of hazardous waste material. How will the spillages be contained and prevented from going into the environment? 12. Is the return water dam currently lined or not? Is a dew membrane barrier going to be used to line the dam 13. It is noted that the return water dam falls within the Mooi river and Loepspruit catchment management area, will you be presenting at the catchment forum for this project. An invitation is only received once one has previously attended the forum. There are presentations done before EA, mostly for Water Use Licenses (WULs). Recommends that the project team undertakes a presentation at the next catchment management forum meeting. Everyone at the catchment forum is a participant with equal influence. It could be used as an additional Public Participation Process (PPP) and that she could also suggest that the applicant be invited. 14. Sulphate and electrical conductivity are elevated in the application area. Requests that more attention be focused on water quality monitoring. 15. I am heartened to see that there will be a health and radioactive assessment conducted and the consultant that has been appointed to do that. Does Harmony Gold Mining have a certificate of registration, what are the current levels of radioactivity, and what the limits within the operation are. Our main concern is the chemical toxicity of Uranium, the current legislation does not allow more than 30 Micrograms per litre uranium. 16. Do you have a dust management plan along with your dust monitoring plan because new regulation requires this? 17. As a company we do not subscribe to the POPI Act, you can publish my name and comments to the public.

the proposed alternative to the Savuka Plant and is not connected to the plant. In considering the environmental permitting requirements for the height extension of these TSFs, the following aspects need to be considered: • The facility is dormant. • It is assumed that the facility is at its final design height. • It is assumed that new deposition pipelines will be required. • The pipelines from Savuka Plant may cross, or be within 500 m of wetlands or watercourse. This option would require additional infrastructure including inter alia pipelines from the TSF to the Savuka Plant to pump tailings to the TSF and these pipelines will have to cross water courses and or wetlands. Therefore, based on the nature of the activity and its potential environmental and economic impacts, this option has not been considered in the EIA Process. ii. Old DRD Tailings Storage Facility This option proposes to re-deposit on the footprint of the Old DRD TSF. The Old DRD TSF is located approximately 6 km north-east of the proposed alternative. This option would firstly require engagements with the owner of this footprint as Harmony is not the owner of the property. In addition, this option would also require additional infrastructure including inter alia, TSF and starter wall, solution trenches, Return Water Dam, pipelines and access roads. Therefore, based on the nature of the activity and its potential environmental and economic impacts, this option has not been considered in the EIA Process. iii. Old Savuka Tailings Storage Facility This option proposes to re-deposit on the footprint of the Old Savuka TSF. The Old Savuka TSF is located immediately north-east of the proposed alternative and TSF 5a & 5b. This option would require additional infrastructure including inter alia, TSF and starter wall, solution trenches (existing and extension of existing), Return Water Dam (existing), pipelines and access roads. In addition, the mine is currently reclaiming this footprint, which means that there would not be sufficient space available to start redepositing on this footprint for some time. Therefore, based on the nature of the activity and its potential environmental and economic impacts, this option has not been considered in the EIA process. iv. Savuka Valley Tailings Storage Facility This option proposes to deposit within the valley between the Savuka 5b TSF and the Savuka 7a TSF (refer to Error! Reference source not found.). This option would require additional infrastructure including inter alia, TSF and starter wall, solution trenches (use and extension of existing trenches), Return Water Dam (use of existing Return Water Dam), topsoil stockpile, subsoil stockpile, pipelines (assuming existing slurry pipeline will be used) and access roads (use of existing access roads). In addition, it will not provide sufficient space for the costs associated thereto. Therefore, based on the nature of the activity and its potential environmental and economic impacts, this option has not been considered in the EIA Process. v. Height Extension of Savuka 7A&7B TSFs This scenario includes continuing to deposit tailings onto the existing and operation Savuka 7a & 7b TSFs by extending the height of the approved height of the TSFs. These TSFs is located the closest to the Savuka Plant and is connected to the plant. The TSFs are included in the 2014 EMPr amendment. The facility is further included in the current Water Use Licence (WUL). In considering the environmental permitting requirements for the height extension of these TSFs, the following aspects need to be considered: • The facility is already operational and connected to the plant. • The facility is not yet at its final design height. • It is mentioned in the EMPr as an active facility.

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Ms Mariette Liefferink

• No new infrastructure is required to keep the facility operating. • The facility is licensed in the Water Use License. This option would not require additional infrastructure and will therefore, not have additional impacts on the surrounding environmental, except for slight increases in existing impacts e.g. in air quality, mainly due to the increased height and duration of the operation of the TSFs. Therefore, based on the nature of the activity and its potential environmental and economic impacts, this option was considered and assessed through a Basic Assessment Process as an alternative deposition site. However, the height extension of Savuka 7A and 7B is a temporary measure as additional deposition space will still be required. Subsequently, the Mponeng Lower Compart TSF has been identified as potential suitable deposition space. It must be noted that DRD RTSF (Sibanye Mega Dump) was considered, and Harmony had previously engaged Sibanye to acquire deposition space. However, Sibanye informed Harmony that their plans have changed and that they could no longer accommodate any Harmony tailings on the RTSF. Therefore, this option is not feasible and could not be assessed as an alternative. 3. The applicant is currently consulting the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) regarding the lining requirements of the TSF. The lining requirements will be determined once engineering designs, the geohydrological assessment are finalised and once the DWS officials has conducted a site visit which is scheduled for November 2025. As indicated in Section 2.2 of the Scoping Report, the applicant proposes Inverted Barrier System should DWS require lining. Currently, the engineers are looking at various options because they have identified potential risk of differential settlement due to existing materials that form the base of the Mponeng TSF. Alternatives need to be studied in terms of the safety and effectivity of the lining. It should also be noted that the geohydrologist study found that the local geology is not porous. The main priority for Harmony is a stable TSF that is able to withstand the test of time. 4. Only a small portion of the TSF is used as a general waste deposition site. Approximately 200m² of the 102ha footprint of the TSF was converted to a general waste facility. The site conversion was approved by Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD) through a legislated process. Section 2.2 of the Scoping Report indicates that there will be a requirement for ground improvement measures that should be taken into account such as dynamic compaction. It should also be noted that since there will be a surrendering of the general waste license, GDARD will stipulate measures required to be implemented to successfully accept the withdrawal of the license which may include dynamic compaction. 5. Savuka TSF is not part of this Application process but a separate process and thus comments / or concerns regarding Savuka TSF need to be directed to the correct application / team for consideration. It should be noted that cumulative impacts for identified activities are considered and assessed in Section 8 of the Scoping Report and will be refined in the EIA process where necessary. 6. A Closure and Rehabilitation Plan will be compiled in the EIA Phase of the project and will detail the closure and rehabilitation objectives as well as final land use of the TSF. 7. The spring will be directed towards the aquatic dam which if fed by the Elandsfonteinspruit which flows south of the Mponeng Lower Compartment. Deposition on Mponeng Lower Compartment ceased around 2004 when the natural spring was identified north

of the TSF. The spring started daylighting only a few years ago and the water that comes out of the spring stays within the footprint of the lower compartment in a natural state. The spring water is currently diverted into a channel around the TSF and discharged into the Aquatic Dam south of the Mponeng TSF. The proposed plan is to stop the spring daylighting into the TSF, intercept the water that is coming from upstream in the topography and divert the clean water around the TSF to the east and down into the Elandsfonteinspruit, so keeping it within the clean water system. 8. According to the specialist studies, the spring is not associated with any wetland in the area. Mitigation measures have been identified and will be included in the EMPr. 9. The relevant risk classification is still to be determined pending the engineering studies that are currently underway. The information will be provided in the EIA Phase. 10. The recommendation is noted. The applicant will consider the comment when they have more information during the EIA phase. 11. In areas where the pipelines will be in close proximity to the watercourse or crossing the watercourse, there will be contingencies in place to prevent and/or react to accidental spillages. Preliminary mitigation measures indicated in Section 8 of the Scoping Report specifies that these areas will have secondary containment. Exact measures will be indicated in the EIA Report once the engineering studies are finalised. An Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) will have a requirement in place that to prevent and address potential spillages. 12. The RWD is not currently lined, however, the plan is to merge the North and South return water dams and that bigger RWD will then be lined with a class C barrier liner. 13. The requirement for attending and presenting at Catchment Management Forums only becomes applicable once a holder receives a Water Use Authorisation. VM further added that there were no plans to attend the forums for this project unless invited to do so with reason. The EAP acknowledges the request, and it will be taken into consideration should it align with the public participation process of the project. 14. Water quality monitoring is currently undertaken for the mine and will continue to be undertaken for the TSF in line with DWS Requirements if/once the Water Use License is issued. 15. Harmony has a Certificate of Registration (No. COR-294) in Terms of The National Nuclear Regulator Act, 1999 (Act No. 47 Of 1999). The exposure to members of the Public is below 1 mSv/a from all pathways based on the 2025 Public Safety Assessment conducted by Aquisim Consulting. The reports are available on request. Although the South African National Standard (SANS) 241, sets the maximum standard limit for uranium in drinking water at 30 micrograms per litre ($\mu\text{g/L}$), the applicable limits per litre uranium for Harmony are in relation to quality of water containing waste to be disposed, specifically in relation to Purified sewage effluent and Process Water Limit, not drinking water. As per the Harmony Gold Mining Company Limited Water Use License Number 68/C23E/AFGJCEI/12157 (Reference Number WU25700) issued in September 2022, the Prohibited and Special Effluent Limit for Uranium is 70 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and a Process Water Limit of 45 $\mu\text{g/L}$. 16. The mine currently has a Dust Management Plan and implements it continuously. Dust Management will be undertaken for the proposed project. 17. Comment is noted and will be taken into consideration.

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Ms Mariette Liefferink

Date 2025/11/15 Method Email

Comment

Dear *** Thank you sincerely. My comments were correctly captured, except the regulatory limit for U in the WUL’s conditions is 30 micrograms per liter. The numerical limit was omitted. Kindly add the limit. Sincerely yours,

Response

Good Day ***, Kindly see revised Issues and Responses Report with the numerical limit. We hope the concerns have been addressed. Please note that all comments and associated responses have been included in the submission of the Scoping Report to the competent decision-making authority for consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you have any questions or further comments.

Date 2025/11/15 Method Email

Comment

Dear *** Thank you sincerely. My comments were correctly captured, except the regulatory limit for U in the WUL’s conditions is 30 micrograms per liter. The numerical limit was omitted. Kindly add the limit. Sincerely yours,

Response

Good Day ***, As per your request during the Mponeng Scoping Phase Focus Group Meeting, kindly find attached comments and responses raised to be consolidated in our public participation report and submitted to DMPR as part of the Final Scoping Report. If there are any questions/comments/concerns which you raised during the meeting, may you kindly ensure you indicate and share them by no later than 17H00 on Tuesday 18th November 2025 as we will be submitting the FSR on Wednesday 19th November 2025.

Mr Bobby Peek

Date 2025/08/29 Method Email

Comment

To whom it may concern: Please take ***** off your mailing list. Thanks

Response

Good day, We acknowledge receipt of your email. Kindly note your email address has been removed from the project’s I&AP database

Mr Itani Mashaba

Date 2025/10/30 Method Email

Comment

1. ENVIRONMENTAL APPLICATION FOR THE PROPOSED MPONENG LOWER COMPARTMENT TAILINGS STORAGE FACILITY HEIGHT EXTENSION PROJECT, IN MERA FONG CITY LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, GAUTENG, SOUTH AFRICA. (GP) 30/5/1/2/2 (01) MR The Environmental Management Sub-Section acknowledges receipt of the Scoping Report. Golden Core Trade and Invest (Pty) Ltd -Mponeng Operations (a subsidiary of Harmony Gold Mining Company Limited), hereafter referred to as Golden Core Trade and Invest /, “the applicant”, has appointed

Response

1. Acknowledgement. No response required. 2. Project location. No response required. 3. Project location. No response required. 4. Project geology. No response required. 5. Project activities. No response required. 6. The specialist studies indicated in the Scoping Report and Department’s letter will be undertaken as per the plan of Study for the EIA.

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Mr Itani Mashaba

Environmental Impact Management Services (Pty) Ltd (EIMS) as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake the necessary environmental authorisation and associated consultation processes for a proposed redeposition on Mponeng Lower Compartment Tailings Storage Facility (TSF) and associated infrastructure. The applicant is undertaking a feasibility assessment to recommence deposition on the Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF. The proposed project is located on the Remainder of portion (RE) 23 of the Farm Elandsfontein 115IQ, RE/5 Farm Elandsfontein 115IQ, Portions 3, 4 and 5 of Blyvooruitzicht 116 IQ, and the RE/27 of Farm Elandsfontein 144IQ, in the Merafong City Local municipality, Gauteng Provinces. The centre point of the site is located at 26°27'11.18"S; 27°24'43.88' . Please refer to the Table for important notification regarding participation opportunities. All inputs received by EIMS will be included in subsequent submissions to the relevant competent authorities for consideration in their decision-making process.

2. LOCATION The project area falls within the West Rand District Municipality in Gauteng Province. Development area falls within Wards 11, 14 and 27 of Merafong City Local Municipality administrative area. The Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF is located 26°27'10.53"S; 27°24'39.93"E in Wedela, immediately north of the N12. The site is approximately 7km northwest of Fochville, 10km south of Carletonville central and 20km west of Westonaria.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF (existing TSF) is located on Remainder of Portion 23 of the Farm Elandsfontein 115IQ. The pipelines traverses through Remainder (RE) of Portion S Farm Elandsfontein 115IQ, Portions 3, 4 and 5 of Farm Blyvooruitzicht 116 IQ, and the Remainder of Portion 27 of Farm Elandsfontein 144IQ.

TOPOGRAPHY AND LANDSCAPE The area north of the Mponeng TSF is characterized by a series of parallel hills that form the Gatsrand and have an elevation of approximately 1 770 metres above mean sea level (mamsl) (Figure 34). The Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF is located at approximately 1 538 mamsl. The difference in elevation of approximately 230mamsl symbolizes the ridge between the TSF and the Savuka Plant.

4. GEOLOGY The geology of the study area has been described in detail by several authors and mine geologists. The following section describes the regional and local geology abstracted from the Baseline Report - Hydrogeological Assessment for The Proposed Tailings Redeposition on The Harmony Mponeng Lower Compartment Tailings Storage Facility.

5. Description of the Project The Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF will store approximately 43 megatonne (Mt) of tailings material. It is anticipated to accommodate tailings deposition for a period of 10 years at a rate of 350 kilotonnes per month (ktpm). The end-of-life limiting factors considered were a rate of rise below 4 meters per annum and a final facility height of 60 meters, ensuring safe and sustainable deposition over the operational life of the facility. In order to redeposit on the Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF from the Savuka Plant, slurry pipelines will need to be constructed, either from the Savuka Plant to the TSF, or from the Kuasasaletu Plant to the TSF. The residue deposition pipelines will have a Nominal Bore (NB) diameter of more than 360mm with a peak throughput of more than 120 t/s. The pipelines will be flanged steel pipelines and installed

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Mr Itani Mashaba

above-ground on pre-cast concrete plinths. The proposed main activities are as follows: • Commencement of deposition on Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF; • Construction of slurry and return water pipelines; • Construction of pipeline bridge; • Construction of pipe culvert; • Upgrade of Return Water Dam (RWD); • Installation of Clean Water Diversion System (Spilling Diversion); • Installation of Dirty Water Systems; • Installation of sub-surface drainage system; and • Undertaking of ground improvement. 6. Recommendations Based on the review of the Report Environmental Management Section has no objection to the report and is satisfied with the following; The Sub-Section recommend that the following aspects that has been identified be assessed further during the EIA phase as indicated: • Soils and Agricultural Impact Assessment; • Air Quality Impact Assessment; • Surface Water (Hydrological) Assessment; • Geohydrological (groundwater) Impact Assessment; • Aquatic Ecology and Wetland Impact Assessment; • Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment; • Cultural and Heritage Resources Assessment; • Visual Impact Assessment; • Health Risk & Radiological Impact Assessment; and • Palaeontology Assess.

Date 2025/10/30 Method Email

Comment

Good day Mbali Please find attached comments for the Scoping Report for the proposed Mponeng Lower Compartment Tailings Storage Facility Height Extension Project, in the Merafong City Local Municipality, Gauteng, South Africa.

Response

Good day ****, Your comments have been received with thanks, and they have been forwarded to the EAP for further consideration. If there is any further response from the EAP a formal response to your comments will be forwarded to you once we receive it.

Khanyisile Bonile

Date 2025/08/18 Method Email

Comment

Good day, 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 that case using the "Make an additional submission to an existing case" in the application selector wizard <https://sahris.org.za/form/application-selector>. Please ensure that all documents produced as

Response

Good day, Apologies for the delayed response, the application was/will uploaded onto your website by the applicant.

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Khanyisile Bonile

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.org.za/help>. 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. Please make use of the SAHRIS Case ID in the payment reference. e.g. 12345/38.8. Please upload the PoP using the "Make an additional submission to an existing case" in the application selector wizard <https://sahris.org.za/form/application-selector>. The case officer assigned to your case will approve the submission and begin to process the case

Kind regards

Thami Hadebe

Date 2025/08/18 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sir/Madam Your wayleave application with project reference number 1658/VM/am dated 15 August 2025 has reference. Transnet Pipelines, a division of Transnet SOC Limited, is not affected by the proposal. Your awareness of the existence of Transnet’s pipeline servitudes and concern for their integrity is highly appreciated. This authorisation shall be valid for 48 months from the date - 18 August 2025.

Response

Good day, Thank you for your email. We take note of you comment and authorisation of the proposed project.

Vhudzisani Mudau

Date 2025/11/05 Method Email

Comment

Good day, ****. I hope you are doing well. Kindly be informed that the Department did not have any comments regarding the submitted draft scoping report. Therefore, you may proceed with compiling the Final Scoping Report and submit it to the Department. Regards,

Response

Good Day ***, Noted with thanks, we will proceed with the submission of the Final Scoping Report shortly.

Nnana Direro

Date 2025/08/19 Method Email

Comment

Good day, This serves as acknowledgement of receipt of the Initial Notification regarding the

Response

Good day, Thank you for your email. We take note of your acknowledgement.

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Nnana Direro

Environmental Authorisation and Water Use Licence Application for the proposed Mponeng Lower Compartment Tailings Storage Facility. With kind regards

Canny Mosebjadi Mothapo

Date 2025/10/03 Method Email

Comment

Good morning, Thank you for the EIA notification, may you kindly resend the attachments to ***** and delist all other SACAA email addresses on your database. Kindly save and send your environmental impact analysis reports/meeting requests and request for comments to *****, going forward please. Regards

Response

The I&AP mentioned was already on our database and received the notification.

SANRAL Contact

Date 2025/09/03 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sir / Madam NEW PIPELINE CULVERT TO CONNECT SAVUKA PLANT AND MPONENG LOWER COMPARTMENT TSF Your application dated 27 August 2025 has reference. The South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited (SANRAL) has no objection to the above- mentioned application as no roads or interchanges under the jurisdiction of SANRAL are affected. Yours sincerely

Response

Good Day, Kindly find attached locality map and kml files of the proposed activities. The only activity which may affect a road if the proposed activities are approved if the construction of the culvert. The culvert is located at 26°26'53.22"S; 27°24'39.53"E. In order for the pipes to connect Savuka Plant and the Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF, a new pipeline culvert of approximately 1 2m long and 1 0m wide will be required to cross the surfaced road immediately north of the Mponeng Lower Compartment TSF. The culvert will either be an arch, circular or box culvert. The culvert will be made of concrete or corrugated metal (see Figure 9). Detailed designs will be provided in the EIA Phase once the engineering designs have been completed.

Tebogo Thaba

Date 2026/01/08 Method Email

Comment

Good day, We acknowledge receipt of your notification and kindly request confirmation on whether the proposed project will have any impact on Transnet railway lines or infrastructure. Best regards,

Response

Good Day Tebogo, Thank you for your email. Kindly note that there are no foreseen impacts on any Transnet Infrastructure. However, please do advise if there may be underground pipelines in the area that need to be surveyed prior the development phase?

Ria Barkhuizen

Comments and Responses 1658 Harmony Mponeng TSF EIA

Ria Barkhuizen

Date	2025/09/03	Method	Email
Comment		Response	
Good day Please find attached SANRAL’s comments. For any new applications and request for comments, use **** email address. Regards		Good Day, Your comments are received and noted with thanks.	