



Project number	1002569	Meeting date	2025-03-19
Project name	OMMP-BRWSP	Recorded by	ZPX
Meeting/subject	OLIFANTS MANAGEMENT MODEL PROGRAMME BULK WATER SUPPLY STUDY PHASE: PHASE 2D, IN THE LIMPOPO PROVINCE.	Reviewed by	Deon Esterhuizen and Natanya Whitehorn
		Total pages	3

A “post-application” meeting for Phase 2D was held between the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) and the Zutari Ndodana Joint Venture (ZNJV) [Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)] on 19 August 2025. The meeting was held to discuss and determine the approach that the Department will take to consolidate the existing and approved site-specific Phase 2D Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) and the new EMPr that will be compiled to support the current Basic Assessment (BA) process.

Present	Apology	Copy	Name	Initials	Role	Organisation	Contact Details
☒	☐	☐	Deon Esterhuizen	DE	Social and Environmental Lead	Zutari Ndodana Joint Venture (ZNJV)	deon@mdte.co.za
☒	☐	☐	Natanya Whitehorn	NW	Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)	ZNJV	Natanya.Whitehorn@zutari.com
☐	☒	☐	Zinzi Portia Xakayi	ZPX	EAP	ZNJV	Zinzi.Xakayi@zutari.com
☒	☐	☐	Thabile Sangweni	TS	Official	Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE)	TSANGWENI@dffe.gov.za
☒	☐	☐	Trisha Rene Pillay	TSP	Official	DFFE	tpillay@dffe.gov.za
☐	☒	☐	Sindiswa Dlomo	SD	Official	DFFE	SDLOMO@dffe.gov.za
☒	☐	☐	Coenrad Agenbach	CA	Official	DFFE	CAGENBACH@dffe.gov.za
☒	☐	☐	Matlhodi Mogorosi	MM	Official	DFFE	MMOGOROSI@dffe.gov.za
☒	☐	☐	Makhosi Yeni	MY	Official	DFFE	MYeni@dffe.gov.za

Meeting Agenda and Discussion

The meeting was chaired by DE, who also led the presentation. It took place according to the agenda below:

Welcome and introductions

1.

Introduction: Project Background
2.

Phase 2D background (2024-07-0026)

a.

Authorised Infrastructure

b.

Proposed infrastructure

c.

Existing Authorisations
3.

Project Timeline
4.

Closing/Way forward
5.

End

Numbering of the items below differs, as additional items were discussed.

Minutes:

Item	Description	Action by
1.	Welcome and Introductions All attendees of the meeting introduced themselves.	DE
Introduction: Phase 2D (2024-07-0026)		
2.	DE provided a background on the project, highlighting the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) as the applicant and the Lebalelo Water User Association (LWUA) as the implementing agent. He explained that the DWS applied for Environmental Authorisation (EA) in 2005, and that a Record of Decision (RoD) was granted. A revised RoD (rRoD) was subsequently issued in October 2006. This approval included Phase 2D as a component of Phase 2 of the Olifants Management Model Programme Bulk Raw Water Study Project (OMMP-BRWSP) ¹ . He further elaborated on the phases of the OMMP-BRWSP that have already been constructed, as well as those that are still outstanding. DE also highlighted that encroachment on the approved pipeline servitudes has necessitated a proposed change in the scope of Phase 2D.	DE
a)	Phase 2D Background	

¹ Previously referred to as Phase 2 of the Olifants River Water Resources Development Project (ORWRDP-2).

Item	Description	Action by
i.	DE explained the infrastructure included in the site-specific EMPr and the proposed changes to be authorised in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) as follows: - Spoil sites, borrow pits, and the Ga-Mathipa reservoir were previously included in the 2016 site-specific EMPr. However, these have been removed from the current Phase 2D infrastructure. - The proposed changes currently seeking authorisation include the proposed Break Pressure Reservoir (BPR) on the farm Groothoek 256 KT, internal/access roads along the entire Phase 2D alignment, and the realignment of sections along the authorised 2016 pipeline alignment. DE further mentioned the existing authorisations, stating that Phase 2D received a positive rRoD in 2016 under the Environmental Conservation Act (ECA). It was also noted that the initially approved 2011 EMPr was amended and approved again in 2016. Now, further changes are being proposed in 2025. <i>(See slides 6 and 7 of the presentation)</i>	DE
b)	Queries and Way Forward	
i.	DE inquired about the approach the Department intends to take in consolidating the site-specific Phase 2D Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) with the new EMPr to be compiled in support of the current BA process. Key points raised include: - The Ga-Mathipa reservoir has been removed from the current Phase 2D infrastructure. - Spoil sites and borrow pits are no longer included in the new application. - A Bulk Pipeline Reservoir (BPR) on the farm Groothoek 256 KT will be included in the application. - Internal and access roads for the entire Phase 2D pipeline alignment are included in the application. DE further proposed that the site-specific EMPr will be updated during the BA process to include the newly proposed infrastructure, associated impacts, and relevant mitigation measures. He suggested that: - Rather than producing two separate EMPrs (the existing site-specific EMPr and a new EMPr for the BA application), the existing EMPr could be updated and subjected to a 30-day Public Participation Process (PPP), alongside the Basic Assessment Report (BAR). - A clear distinction should be made in the report between items previously assessed (in 2016) and the newly proposed infrastructure, including their associated impacts and mitigation measures. - Maps should be revised to reflect only the relevant infrastructure associated with the entire Phase 2D scope. DE then shared his screen to present the proposed alignment changes in comparison to the old alignment and its associated infrastructure. He also inquired whether the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) team should develop a separate EMPr for the changes under the BA process. He noted the concern that this may result in the project having a rRoD for some components of Phase 2D and a new EA for others, each with a potentially separate EMPr. DE reminded the attendees that the current rRoD requires the appointment of an Environmental Monitoring Committee (EMC) and an Environmental Control Officer (ECO). He questioned whether, if a separate EMPr is developed for the new components, this would result in the need for two EMCs or ECOs, or whether these roles would be consolidated. Finally, he mentioned that Ms. Sindi Dlomo, during the pre-application meeting held on 24 July 2024, expressed a preference for the entire OMMP-BRWSP to be covered under a consolidated EA. However, DE noted that this could pose legal challenges, as the existing and proposed approvals fall under two different pieces of legislation—namely, the ECA and the NEMA.	DE
c)	Open Discussion	
i.	CA asked for confirmation regarding who the case officer is for the presented component of the project and further stated that he is unable to provide an informed response, as he is not the official case officer for the project.	CA
ii.	NW explained that a case officer has not yet been assigned, as a formal application has not been submitted to the Department.	NW
iii.	DE mentioned that nothing needs to be confirmed on the spot and that the EAP team is open to proposing a way forward to share with the Department, as this is a complex project. It requires agreement with the Department on the appropriate process to follow, which will be aligned with the administrative and legislative requirements of the Department.	DE
iv.	MM reiterated that this meeting had been held previously and mentioned that it is difficult for the case officers to engage on this matter. She also stated that she has no opinion moving forward on the case presented.	MM
v.	CA mentioned that there are a couple of issues to unpack and highlighted that Ms. Sindi Dlomo sent an email indicating that a new regulation allows for the consolidation of EAs. He further noted that DE mentioned separate EMPrs are required for each phase, even though a consolidated EA will be issued. CA stated that the Department is in agreement with a consolidated EMPr that will make things easier for everyone, including the contractor. However, he cautioned that they do not want to reopen old issues by simply updating the 2016 EMPr. At this stage, the Department is still undecided, but both options are acceptable. CA further mentioned that the Department will need to assess whether it is possible to package the conditions of the rRoD into the new consolidated EA. He also cautioned against making substantial changes that would require the team to engage with the public, as the public would have the authority to appeal the Department's decision.	CA
vi.	DE reiterated that he wants to present a single EMPr to the public, clearly distinguishing between already approved infrastructure and the new infrastructure that has been assessed and can be commented on so that the project is managed under one EMPr. He expressed his satisfaction with CA's proposed way forward but inquired how the appropriate way forward will be confirmed. He suggested that the EAP team should provide the Department with an opportunity to discuss and come to an agreement. DE suggested resubmitting all the old information previously shared regarding the project and the meeting minutes to aid in the discussions with the Department.	DE
vii.	MM indicated that she does not agree with DE's approach of putting the decision back on the Department, but she is comfortable with CA's approach of letting the EAP team decide on the most appropriate approach and then notifying the Department. She further stated that the Department currently does not have the capacity to hold multiple meetings regarding a single project.	MM

Item	Description	Action by
viii.	TS indicated that she supports MM and CA's positions and advised that the EAP team should submit the approach they deem best for the project, allowing the Department to make a decision based on what is presented.	TS
ix.	CA further added that it is difficult to understand what is going to be applied for and to provide a way forward, as they have not received any applications or draft reports for their review. He opined that in the EMPr, the EAP team should clearly show what is authorised, what is new, and what requires authorisation in the consolidated EMPr. CA inquired about the timeline for submitting the applications.	CA
x.	DE indicated that the team will be going public in April, as specialist assessments have been completed, and draft reports are currently under review.	DE
xi.	DE thanked officials for their attendance, insightful advice and recommendations.	DE
	Meeting Closure: The meeting adjourned at 11:51.	

Following the post-application meeting with the Department, the ZNJV EAP team decided to submit a **consolidated EMPr** (updating the 2016 EMPr), clearly distinguishing the new infrastructure being applied for, as well as the impacts and proposed mitigation measures by the respective specialists. These will be the only sections open for public comment, and the subsequent EA will be open for public appeals where necessary.