

APPENDIX L

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MOSSDUSTRIA AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RACEWAY ON THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 8 OF THE FARM RIETVALLEY 225, MOSSEL BAY, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

DRAFT EIA REPORT

AUGUST 2026



GIBB
ENVIRONMENTAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	SCOPING AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTING PROCESS	1
3	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT	1
4	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES – Review of Draft Scoping Report.....	2

1 INTRODUCTION

GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd (GIBB), now part of Nemai Consulting (Pty) Ltd, has been appointed by the Mossel Bay Local Municipality (MBLM) as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to manage the application process for Environmental Authorisation (EA) for a proposed development in Mossdustria, Mossel Bay. GIBB has been appointed to undertake the application process for the EA, contingent on a Scoping and Environmental Impact Reporting (S&EIR) Process. This pertains to the proposed expansion of Mossdustria, which will include a motorsport arena and a renewable energy facility on the remaining part of Portion 8 of Farm Rietvalley 225, situated in Mossel Bay, Western Cape Province, South Africa.

2 SCOPING AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTING PROCESS

An Application for EA is being undertaken for the proposed Project according to the process prescribed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations of 2014, published under Government Notice (GN) No. 982 in Gazette No. 38282 of 4 December 2014 and amended by GN 326 of 7 April 2017 published in Gazette No. 40772 (the "EIA Regulations"). The EIA Regulations were promulgated in terms of the NEMA. In terms of the NEMA, the lead decision-making authority for the environmental assessment is the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEADP).

A Scoping and Environmental Impact Reporting process (S&EIR) is being undertaken for this project, based on the triggering of activities listed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations of 2014 (as amended).

3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

This Comments and Responses Report (CRR), which accompanies the draft EIA Report, serves to record the comments received from authorities and Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) to date during the course of the process. This CRR also attempts to address these comments through responses and input provided by the Applicant, project team, EAP and environmental specialists (as relevant).

The CRR will be updated during the course of the S&EIR Process.

4 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES – Review of Draft Scoping Report

The draft Scoping Report was lodged for public review from **23 October until 23 November 2025**. At the request of the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEADP), the 30-day public review process of the draft Scoping Report was repeated from **9 March to 9 April 2026**. In addition, DEADP, as the competent authority, issued a Notice of Suspension of Application in respect of this project on **12 March 2026**, in terms of the EIA Regulations of 2014, as amended. The suspension was administrative in nature and related to procedural matters associated with the EIA process. The suspension was lifted by DEADP on **25 March 2026**, and the remaining portion of the 30-day public comment period on the draft Scoping Report closed on **21 April 2026**.

The comments received during the 2025 and 2026 review period are captured below.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
Comments Received 23 October 2025 to 23 November 2025					
1.	Email: Ek is n eiendoms eienaar in Mosselbaai omgewing en wil graag registreer as belanghebbende. Kan u asb. alle kommunikasie na die epos ook stuur aangaande aangehegte. English translation: “I am a property owner in the Mossel Bay area and would like to register as an interested party. Could you please also send all communication regarding the attached to my email.”	Email: Nico Fivaz. Managing Director Cape Con Property Developers Western Cape (Pty) Ltd	Email (24/10/2025)	Nemai Consulting	Baie dankie vir u e-pos en belangstelling in die voorgestelde projek. Ek registreer u as 'n belanghebbende party. U kan die konsep Omvangsverslag aflaai by die onderstaande webtuiste: https://nemai.co.za/downloads/ English translation: “Thank you very much for your email and interest in the proposed project. I have registered you as a stakeholder. You can download the draft Scoping Report from the website below: https://nemai.co.za/downloads/
2.	Email: Thank you for your submission to HWC regards to the above application. Please see attached response for your records. Letter: The matter above has reference. Heritage Western Cape is in receipt of the above matter received. This matter was discussed at the Heritage Officers meeting held on 20 October 2025.	Email: Stephanie-Anne Barnardt-Delport. Specialist Heritage Officer (Archaeologist) Heritage Western Cape.	Email (22/10/2025) Letter (22/10/2025)	Nemai Consulting	Thank you very much for the email. I acknowledge receipt of the attached letter and response from Heritage Western Cape (HWC).

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	You are hereby notified that, since there is no reason to believe that the proposed extension of Mossdustria and establishment of a motorsport raceway and associated facilities on Erf 6, Mossdustria and Remainder of Rietvalley 225/8, Mossel Bay, no further action under Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) is required. HWC Chance Finds and Accidental Finds Procedures to be included in the EMP and Environmental Authorization. However, should any heritage resources, including evidence of graves and human burials, archaeological material and paleontological material be discovered during the execution of the activities above, all works must be stopped immediately, and Heritage Western Cape must be notified without delay. This letter does not exonerate the applicant from obtaining any necessary approval from any other applicable statutory authority. HWC reserves the right to request additional information as required. Should you have any further queries, please contact the official above and quote the case number.				
3.	Email: Aangeheg ons kommentaar. English translation: "Attached our comments" Letter: CKI conduct the slaughter and processing of ostriches for meat and leather for the export market. To ensure productive use of our slaughter facility, ostriches are brought to and offloaded at the holding pens on occasional Saturdays, and most Sundays, ready and rested for slaughter Monday morning. It is obvious that during motorsport activities a lot of noise will be generated. Looking at the GPS co-ordinates of the development layout, using Point 8 of the motorsport zone and point 8 of the industrial expansion zone, it is clear that the nearest point of the motorsport track will turn 187m from the edge of the ostrich holding pens. Ostriches by nature are easily frightened, particularly when danger is audible, but the source is not obviously visible to them or approach them at a fast pace.	Email: Francious de Wet, Managing Director of Cape Karoo International.	Email (30/10/2025) Comment Sheet (30/10/2025)	Nemai Consulting	Thank you for your comments. You are correct that a Noise Assessment Study will be included in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), along with the other specialist studies identified during the Scoping Phase for the proposed Project. A 30-day Public Participation Period will be held for the draft EIR, and you will receive notification once the review period begins. We encourage you to review the relevant studies during this time, and any comments or concerns submitted will be addressed accordingly.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	The noise from motorsport, specially the intermittent and cyclic manner of the emitted sound as the vehicles changes direction and the sudden approaches will be disturbing to them. As the pens are designed for temporary holding, they have limited space to run when frightened, resulting in injuries and thus devaluation of meat and leather with resulting reduction in income. CKI have very strict animal welfare regulations that we have to comply with to be able to export to international markets. Any disturbance of the birds in the pens that will be deemed by international auditors as poor animal welfare will have far reaching consequences for CKI. It is stated in section 4.10 of the application that a noise assessment was done and results will be included in the forthcoming Draft EIR. None of our management group are aware of such a study being done, nor that any competent employee of our abattoir was approached for comment regarding noise impact on the ostriches in the holding pens. Can we ask for a copy of the report as without it is difficult to comment on the only issue that will influence us about this development.				
4.	Email: My apology for the delay in submitting CapeNature's comments, with the year end approaching we are inundated by applications for comment. I have attached our comments for the application and previous consultations regarding the applicability of a biodiversity offset. If you require anything else from CapeNature, please do not hesitate to contact me. Letter: CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the above report. Please note that our comments only pertain to the biodiversity related impacts and not to the overall desirability of the application. CapeNature wishes to make the following comments: According to the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (Pool-Stanvliet et.al. 2017) the property has Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA 1&2: Terrestrial), Ecological Support Areas (ESA 1: Aquatic and ESA 2: Restore), and Other Natural Areas. The fine-scale vegetation map describes the vegetation as Hartenbos River & Floodplain, Petrosa Inland Pans, Petrosa Fynbos-Renosterveld, and Proteus Fynbos-Renoster-Thicket (Vlok and de Villiers 2007). The National Biodiversity Assessment	Megan Simons, CapeNature	Email (27/11/2025) Letter A (27/11/2025) Letter B (27/11/2025)	Brian Collotty (Biodiversity Specialist) and Nemai Consulting	We acknowledge receipt of CapeNature's comments dated 27 November 2025 and appreciate the detailed input provided regarding the draft Scoping Report for the proposed extension of Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway on the Remainder of Portion 8 of Farm Rietvalley 225. All comments have been noted and will be fully addressed during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) phase. We acknowledge and concur with the sensitive environmental features referred to by CapeNature (Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA 1 & 2: Terrestrial), Ecological Support Areas (ESA 1: Aquatic and ESA 2: Restore), Other Natural Areas, the Endangered vegetation type and sensitive Aquatic features). These have been considered in the Scoping Report as well as in the Terrestrial

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	(Skowno et al. 2018) mapped the vegetation unit as Hartenbos Dune Thicket which is Endangered (NEM:BA,2022) and North Langeberg Sandstone Fynbos which is Least Concerned (SANBI 2022). The proposed site is within Quaternary Catchment K10A, a non-perennial river is to the southeast which is associated with the seep wetland on the neighbouring property. Furthermore, another seep wetland is in the corner of the southwest which spans over the neighbouring properties. CapeNature has reviewed the application and has the following comments: 1. CapeNature notes the botanist's (Mark Berry) concerns regarding inconsistent vegetation mapping, which is a known challenge throughout much of the Mossel Bay region. According to the specialist, the vegetation on site appears more representative of Albertinia Sand Fynbos, Langeberg Sandstone Fynbos, and Mossel Bay Shale Renosterveld. 2. The cumulative impact assessment currently focuses only on the proposed development's impacts within the property boundary. It does not consider cumulative habitat loss/impacts resulting from existing developments or other developments in the surrounding area that have already received Environmental Authorisation (EA). These must be fully assessed and addressed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). 3. Section 3.3 of the Draft Scoping Report may give the impression that CapeNature contributed to the development of layout alternatives. For clarity, CapeNature was invited to pre-consultation meetings with GIBB Environmental and Nemaï Consulting at the end of 2021 and again in early 2025, during which the project was presented to us for comment. During these engagements, CapeNature highlighted the findings of the 2006 report by Jan Vlok, who recorded numerous species of conservation concern. The findings of the report by Mark Berry (2020), concluded similar observations. CapeNature also emphasised the need for a spring botanical survey, as supported in the Berry report. Discussions were held regarding the potential for a				Site Sensitivity Verification (SSV) conducted by Dr. Colloty in 2022 (Appendix D) and will be assessed further in the EIA phase. As per CapeNature's comments: 1. As outlined in the Scoping Report, the EIA phase will include the completion of all relevant specialist studies, including a Terrestrial Biodiversity Impact Assessment (fauna and flora), an Aquatic Biodiversity Impact Assessment and the other specialist studies identified. These studies will incorporate the latest available information, including reviewing the findings from the 2020 Report from Mark Berry and the 2006 Report from Jan Vlok. These studies will directly respond to the comments from CapeNature, and will be made available for public and authority review as part of the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). 2. The EIR will incorporate various specialist studies' impact assessments to determine the overall cumulative impacts. 3. Thank you for the provided clarity. The appointed Terrestrial Ecology specialist has confirmed that multiple site visits have already been undertaken across different seasons to ensure a robust understanding of the site's ecological characteristics. An additional summer survey will also be conducted (January 2026 – February 2026) to further strengthen the dataset and address concerns regarding seasonal variability,

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	biodiversity offset; however, CapeNature's correspondence (attached) outlines our reasons for not supporting an offset for this site. 4. The Vlok (2006) report identified seasonal wetlands (Fig.1) and several species of conservation concern, concluding that no mitigation measures would adequately prevent negative environmental impacts. The two seasonal wetlands in the eastern portion of the property overlap with areas of medium to high sensitivity. The property's seasonally wet characteristics support highly localised species, including <i>Disa hallackii</i> (EN), <i>Haworthia pygmaea</i> var. <i>argenteo-maculosa</i> (CR), and <i>Satyrium muticum</i> (CR). 5. The Berry (2020) report did not map the seasonal wetlands; however, it did identify medium- to high-sensitivity areas (Fig.2) containing high-quality vegetation and threatened plant species requiring protection. Additional species of conservation concern recorded include: <i>Aspalathus obtusifolia</i> (VU), <i>Cephalophyllum diversiphyllum</i> (NT), <i>Cullumia carlinoides</i> (NT), and <i>Polygala pubiflora</i> (VU). Regional endemics such as <i>Protea lanceolata</i>, <i>Bobartia robusta</i>, <i>Trichodiadema cf. fergusoniae</i>, and <i>Tulista minima</i> were also recorded, with the latter two noted as rare in the area. 6. CapeNature recommends that the applicant consult with both Jan Vlok and Mark Berry regarding their findings and the species of conservation concern. A spring botanical survey is strongly supported and must be undertaken. A freshwater assessment is also required to confirm and map the seasonal wetlands. 7. In 2008, the property was assessed by CapeNature's Stewardship Review Committee. At that time, Mossel Bay Municipality proposed using the area for a cemetery or extending the neighbouring light industrial zone. The site was found to contain vegetation in good to excellent condition, with threatened vegetation types, SCCs, and wetlands—qualifying it for consideration as a Contract Nature Reserve. A recommendation was also made to investigate the geological structure.				species of conservation concern, and the delineation of sensitive habitats. 4. Refer to response no. 3 above. 5. Refer to response no. 3 above. 6. Refer to response no. 3 above. 7. The sensitivity of the site will be assessed further during the EIA phase, it is noted that a portion of the site has been set aside as a conservation area. Further details regarding geotechnical conditions of the site will be included in the EIA report. 8. CapeNature's concern is acknowledged regarding the long-term management of the proposed conservation area. The identification, protection, and appropriate management of remaining Renosterveld fragments are recognised as key considerations. The possible opportunities for coordinated conservation will be assessed in more detail during the EIA phase and discussed with relevant stakeholders. 9. Specific note will be made of the Petrosa Inland Pans and will be brought to the attention of the Ecological Specialist undertaking the Terrestrial- and Aquatic Impact Assessments. Additionally, the Terrestrial and Aquatic Impact Assessments during the EIA phase will indicate the buffer zones around sensitive features (including the conservation area

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	8. It is currently unclear who will manage the proposed conservation area. Remaining renosterveld fragments typically have high conservation value and must be treated as threatened and prioritised for protection. The applicant should consider engaging with neighbouring landowners. The neighbouring property to the east has received EA requiring the protection of 15 ha of Renosterveld to the south. This may provide an opportunity for collaborative conservation management and the establishment of an ecological corridor. 9. The Petrosa Inland Pans should be included within the conservation area. The conservation area must be rezoned for conservation purposes only, with no development permitted. An appropriate buffer must be established between the conservation area and the proposed development, and all watercourses must be adequately buffered. 10. Given the proposed raceway and associated solar PV facility, CapeNature recommends that a faunal assessment be undertaken. A noise impact assessment may also be necessary. 11. CapeNature further recommends Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency (BOCMA) provide comment on the applicability of a Water Use Authorisation in terms of the National Water Act (NWA). Inputs can also be obtained from BOCMA regarding the seasonal wetlands. In conclusion, CapeNature currently does not support the proposed development. Key concerns relate to discrepancies in specialist findings and the need for further consultation with the botanists. A spring survey must be completed, and the seasonal wetlands must be fully assessed before the application can be reconsidered. CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.				and waterbodies) as determined by the Specialist. 10. Refer to response no. 1 above. 11. All specialist findings will be integrated into the draft EIR that will be made available for public and authority review. This will allow Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency (BOCMA) the opportunity to review and comment on the comprehensive assessment before final decision-making. All specialist findings, including updated vegetation mapping, wetland verification, cumulative impact considerations, and recommendations regarding conservation management, will be integrated into the Draft EIR. This will allow CapeNature and other stakeholders the opportunity to review and comment on the comprehensive assessment before final decision-making. We appreciate CapeNature's continued engagement in this process and remain committed to ensuring that all biodiversity-related considerations are thoroughly and transparently assessed during the EIA phase.
Comments Received February 2026 to 21 April 2026					
5.	Email: Please find attached the comment from this Department regarding the aforementioned subject.	Mr. Francois Naude and	Email (24/02/2026)	Nemai Consulting	An online meeting was held between Nemai Consulting and DEADP 24 February 2026 to

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	Letter: - The submission made regarding the above-mentioned proposal, compiled by your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA Registration Number: 2020/1217) of from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd. and received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3) hereinafter referred to as “this Directorate” and on 24 October 2025 refers. - This Department has no record that a standalone application form (in the format determined by the competent authority) was submitted to this Department in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (Government Notice No. R.982 of 4 December 2014, as amended) (“EIA Regulations, 2014”). Therefore, as the administrative norm has not been followed by the EAP, this Department did not have a reasonable opportunity to review the Application Form in terms of Regulation 17 and comply with Regulation 3(6) of the EIA Regulations, 2014. However, it is noted that a copy of an application form was appended as Appendix B to the merged draft Scoping Report that was submitted on 24 October 2025. Although such information may be appended to the Scoping Report, it is highly irregular to submit the application form in such a manner, which does not comply with Regulation 16. In further support of the regulatory framework, please be reminded that since the onset of the requirement for applications in terms of the previous EIA Regulations, an administrative norm has been established and implemented by this Department to receive Application Forms, and the required appendices, as a standalone document. Therefore, a valid application has not yet been registered on the NEAS and the documents received thus far have not been processed. - Considering the above, please be advised that should you wish to pursue the application, a new application process would have to be initiated. Therefore, a new Application Form would have to be	Ms. Shireen Pullen, DEADP.	Letter (24/02/2026) Letter (27/02/2026)		discuss the letter received from DEADP dated 24/02/2026, and a way forward. Subsequently a separate submission of only the Application Form was made 27 February 2026 to DEADP with a cover letter. Letter: GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd, which was subsequently acquired by Nema Consulting (Pty) Ltd, was appointed as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) by the Mossel Bay Local Municipality (MBLM) to apply for Environmental Authorisation for the proposed extension of the Mossdustria industrial area, establishment of an alternative energy facility (solar photovoltaic facility) and development of a motorsport facility on the Remainder Portion 8 of Farm Rietvalley 225, Mossel Bay, in the Western Cape Province (the Project). Based on the listed activities triggered by the Project, a Scoping and Environmental Impact Reporting process needs to be conducted. The proposed development entails the extension of the Mossdustria industrial area, establishment of a solar photovoltaic facility and a motorsport facility (approximately 90 ha in extent). Cables of 11 kV in capacity will connect the development to an existing municipal substation on Portion 6 of Farm 225 within Mossdustria. Given the strict timeframes prescribed by the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), for submission of the Final Scoping Report, the EAP kindly requests that the Department's Case Officer, Mrs Shireen Pullen, contact the EAP as soon as possible to enable the submission of the Draft Scoping Report. In line with the project programme, the Draft Scoping Report is intended to be made

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	submitted and the application process prescribed in Part 3 of Chapter 4 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 must be followed. 4. Guidance on the nature and extent of any of the processes that may or must be followed or decision support tools that must be used in order to comply with the NEMA and the EIA Regulations, 2014: 5. Please ensure that the new application form (and supporting information) which must be submitted to this Department complies with the following requirements: The new application— • is properly completed and that it contains all the information required in the application form; • is accompanied by the documents as required in the application form and in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (Government Notice R.982 of 4 December 2014, as amended) ("EIA Regulations, 2014"); • conforms to the instructions or guidance provided by the competent authority to the submission of the application, or • conforms to the requirements of the EIA Regulations, 2014, any protocol or minimum information requirements relevant to the application as identified and gazetted by the Minister in a government notice. 6. Once a new application form has been submitted to this Department, and found to be in order, the Department will confirm that the EAP may continue with the assessment process to which the application must be subjected. Kindly afford this Directorate a reasonable period (preferably a 10-day period reckoned from the date of submission of the application form) to check if the application form is in order and provide advice where applicable or appropriate, before the Draft Scoping Report is submitted in terms of Regulation 21. However, considering the strict timeframes prescribed by the EIA Regulations, 2014 for the submission of the Scoping report, the EAP should when submitting the application form, request in the cover letter that the case				available for a 30-day public review period from 9 March to 9 April 2026.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	officer contact the EAP as soon as possible, and the EAP must also indicate when they intend to submit/make the Draft SR available for public participation process (PPP), for example on a date within the 10-day period. It is also important for the EAP to contact the office after submitting the application form and to speak to the case officer to discuss the situation (this is usually the same officer who has been assigned the case previously, namely Mrs Shireen Pullen (Shireen.Pullen@westerncape.gov.za)). 7. Public Participation Process - It is also noted that the legal advertisement to notify all potential interested and affected parties, was placed in a local newspaper on 9 July 2021, which is approximately 5½ years ago. This Department is concerned that the potential interested and affected parties may have changed substantially during this period, and that a 5-year-old notice does not comply with the relevant requirements to ensure an inclusionary public participation process will be followed. Prior to embarking on the new application process, you have the opportunity to demonstrate how the current public participation process undertaken to date complies with Regulation 41 in order for this Directorate to determine the additional Public Participation requirements. 8. Roles and Responsibilities of the appointed EAP - This Directorate notes from the reports and Appendix B of the Draft Scoping Report, that the person appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) is Donovan Henning (EAPASA Reg. 2020/1217) from Gibb International (Pty) Ltd.; however, the correspondence has been submitted by Marilie Pretorius, furthermore, the Draft Scoping Report indicates that Marlie Pretorius is one of the authors who has prepared the reports. It is noted from the EAPASA register that a Dr. Marilie Pretorius is registered as a Candidate EAP (EAPASA Reg. 2024/8345). This information is not included in the reports or application form, so an assumption must be made that this is the same person. It is further of concern that the Site Sensitivity Verification Report has been prepared (author) by the Candidate EAP, Marlie Pretorius. This is contrary to the requirements of the relevant Protocols. Please be reminded that the appointed Environmental				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") must manage all aspects of the application and ensure compliance with the EIA Regulations, 2014 to compile and submit the Scoping Report ("SR") and Environmental Impact Assessment Report ("EIR") to the competent authority for decision-making. In this regard, please be advised that in terms of Regulation 14(1) of the section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016 that only a person registered as an EAP may perform tasks in connection with an application for an environmental authorisation. Furthermore, Regulation 14(6) of said Regulations states that when acting under supervision of a registered EAP, a registered Candidate EAP may assist with the performance of tasks in connection with an application for an environmental authorisation contemplated in Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 ("NEMA"), read with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 ("EIA Regulations, 2014"). While it is acknowledged that a registered EAP, Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA Reg. 2020/1217) has signed an EAP declaration, it appears that Mr. Henning has acted as a "review EAP" and not as the person who holds the primary responsibility for the performance of tasks. Whereas a "Review EAP" has a specific meaning in the context of the EIA Regulations, 2014, care must be taken when such statement is used in respect of the section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016. This aspect must be corrected in the new application process, and each document/report must clearly demonstrate how the Candidate EAP may have assisted the EAP, without taking the primary responsibility for the performance of such tasks. 9. The Department awaits the submission of the application form as prescribed by Regulation 16 of the EIA Regulations, 2014. 10. Please note that it is prohibited in terms of Section 24F of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA") for a person to commence with a Listed Activity unless the Competent Authority has granted an Environmental Authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. Offences in terms of the NEMA and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014, will render the offender liable for criminal prosecution.				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	11. Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of this application. 12. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any new or revised information received.				
13.	Email: Please find attached correspondence from this Department regarding the aforementioned subject. Letter: 1. The above-mentioned document submitted on your behalf by your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA Registration Number: 2020/1217) as assisted by the registered Candidate EAP, Dr Marilie Pretorius (EAPASA Registration Number: 2024/8345) from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd. and received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3) hereinafter referred to as "this Directorate" on 27 February 2026 refers. 2. The application form appears to be in order in accordance with regulation 16. This letter serves as an acknowledgment of receipt of the aforementioned document by this Department on 27 February 2026. 3. It is understood that the proposal entails the extension of Mossdustria industrial area and establish an alternative energy and motorsport facility on the Remainder Portion 8 of Farm Rietvalley 225. The extension will include industrial development with associated infrastructure to the extent of approximately 3 ha); alternative energy production area (solar PV facility) to the extent of approximately 22ha, including a substation, battery energy storage system, overhead powerlines and ancillary buildings and infrastructure); a conservation area with the extent of approximately 15 ha; and a motorsport arena including tracks, parking, ablution facilities, training facilities, fuel storage (5000 litres), 80 workshops, pavilions and associated infrastructure to the extent of approximately 38 ha.	Francois Naudé, Control Environmental Officer: Environmental Impact Management Services, DEADP	Email A (04/03/2026) Letter (04/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	We acknowledge receipt of correspondence Please note that all points will be addressed in the draft Scoping Report, containing all the information outlined in Appendix 2 of the EIA Regulations, 2014. Reference nr 16/3/3/2/D6/29/0001/26 will be utilised in all future correspondence.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	4. Roles and Responsibilities - Please remind your EAP that the requirements in terms of the Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA") and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (as amended) ("EIA Regulations, 2014") must be complied with in respect of the application for Environmental Authorisation. Also be reminded that the appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") must manage all aspects of the application and ensure compliance with the EIA Regulations, 2014 to compile and submit the Scoping Report ("SR") and Environmental Impact Assessment Report ("EIR") to the competent authority for decision-making. In this regard, please be advised that in terms of Regulation 14(1) of the section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016 that only a person registered as an EAP may perform tasks in connection with an application for an environmental authorisation. Furthermore, Regulation 14(6) of said Regulations states that when acting under supervision of a registered EAP, a registered Candidate EAP may assist with the performance of tasks in connection with an application for an environmental authorisation contemplated in Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 ("NEMA"), read with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 ("EIA Regulations, 2014"). 5. Applicable listed activities- Only the listed activities applied for can be considered for authorisation. Kindly note that the onus remains on the applicant to ensure that all the applicable listed activities are applied for and assessed as part of the Scoping & EIA Process. 6. Scoping Requirements- The Scoping Report must contain all the information outlined in Appendix 2 of the EIA Regulations, 2014. Failure to submit any information prescribed in Appendix 2 of GN No. R. 982 may result in Environmental Authorisation being refused. The Scoping and EIA phases of the EIA process are two distinctly separate phases, each having its own requirements and reports to be submitted. The Department will not accept Scoping and EIA Reports where the processes or information of the two phases were combined into a single process or report. The Department awaits the submission of the draft Scoping Report for comment as prescribed by Regulation				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	21 of the EIA Regulations, 2014. In accordance with Regulation 21, the Department hereby stipulates that the Scoping Report must be submitted to this Department for decision within 44 days from the date of receipt of the application by the Department, calculated from 27 February 2026. If the Scoping Report is not submitted within the prescribed timeframe, the application will lapse in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 and your application file will be closed. Should you then wish to pursue the application again, a new application process would have to be initiated. A new Application Form would have to be submitted and the prescribed application fee would have to be paid. The Scoping and EIA phases of the EIA process are two distinctly separate phases, each having its own requirements and reports to be submitted. The Department will not accept Scoping and EIA Reports where the processes or information of the two phases were combined into a single process or report. 7. Public Participation Process- It is noted that a public participation process was undertaken as part of the pre-application process. The public participation undertaken in terms of Regulation 41 thus far is deemed to be acceptable for this application; however, the EAP must ensure that for the duration of this application, the site notices [Regulation 41(2)(a)] remain at a place conspicuous to and accessible by the public at the boundary, on the fence or along the corridor of the site where the activity to which the application or proposed application relates is or is to be undertaken. The EAP must also comply with all other public participation process requirements (inter alia Regulation 21 (1) must still be complied with). It is also noted that the details of the persons notified had been redacted / blacked out. Although this Directorate is aware of the requirements of the Protection of Personal Information Act, 2013 (Act No. 4 of 2013 (POPIA), when submitting the copy of Registered I&AP register and reports / documents to the Competent Authority, the EAP must ensure that this detail is visible and legible. The redacted documents have made it near impossible for the reviewer to determine compliance with Public Participation requirements. Please ensure that this Directorate receives a list with all least names of the parties notified during PPP (refer to Regulation 42).				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	8. The National Web based Environmental Screening Tool Report ("STR") and Site Verification Report submitted as part of the application form. Despite the previous concern raised regarding Dr. Marlie Pretorius (Candidate EAP) being listed as the author of the Site Sensitivity Verification Report (SSVR), Ms. Pretorius is still listed as one of the authors of the SSVR and this is contrary to the requirements of the relevant Protocols. It therefore remains unclear how the Candidate EAP may have assisted the EAP, without taking the primary responsibility for the performance of such tasks. Please clarify. 9. Government Policies and Plans, Guidelines, Environmental Management Instruments: Government Policies and Plans, Guidelines, Environmental Management Instruments: You are advised that when undertaking the EIA process, it is the responsibility of the EAP and Specialists to take into account all the government policies and plans, guidelines, environmental management instruments and other decision making instruments in respect of the application. process or the kind of activity which will be the subject of the application, including the guidelines, information documents or circulars developed by this Department which include inter alia, the following: • Guideline for determining the scope of specialist involvement in EIA processes, June 2005. • Guideline for the review of specialist input in the EIA process, June 2005. • Guideline for Environmental Management Plans (June 2005). • Guideline for involving visual and aesthetic specialists in the EIA process, June 2005. • Guideline for involving heritage specialists in the EIA process, June 2005. • Guideline for involving social assessment specialists in the EIA process, February 2007. • Guideline for involving economists in the EIA process, June 2005. • Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework, November 2014 (as amended)				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	DEA (2017), Guideline on Need and Desirability, Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), Pretoria, South Africa (ISBN: 978-0-9802694-4-4) 10. Alternatives - Be advised that in terms of the EIA Regulations and NEMA the investigation of alternatives is mandatory. It must be noted that alternatives are not limited to site alternatives. It may also include, but is not limited to lay-out alternatives, design, operational and technology alternatives, etc. You are therefore strongly advised to consider alternatives to avoid potential impacts. The final BAR must comparatively assess the feasible and reasonable alternatives in order to select the best practicable environmental option. All identified alternatives must be comparatively assessed, including the cumulative impact of all identified alternatives, even if it is only the no-go and the preferred alternatives. 11. Synchronisation- The application form states that Section 21 (c) and (i) water uses may be applicable to the proposal. Please be reminded that the National Environmental Management Laws Amendment Act, Act 2 of 2022 (NEMLAA), came into effect on 30 June 2023. This Act added sub-section 24C(11) to the National Environmental Management Act, Act 107 of 1998, as amended (NEMA) which requires that "a person who requires an environmental authorisation which also involves an activity that requires a licence or permit in terms of any of the specific environmental management Acts (i.e., NWA), must simultaneously submit those applications to the relevant competent authority or licensing authority, as the case may be, indicating in each application all other licences, authorisations and permits applied for". Failure to synchronise the processes may prejudice the application. In light of the above, you are hereby reminded that the processes required for water use authorisation and the Heritage authorisation must be synchronised with the EIA application as to ensure that these processes duly inform one another. Failure to do so may prejudice the success of this application. 12. The Department awaits the submission of the Scoping Report (SR) as prescribed by Regulation 21 of the EIA Regulations, 2014. In				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	accordance with Regulation 21, the Department stipulates that the SR must be submitted to this Department for decision within 44 days from the date of receipt of the application by the Department, to be reckoned from 27 February 2026. If the SR is not submitted within the prescribed timeframe, the application will lapse in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 and your file will be closed. Should you wish to pursue the application again, a new application process would have to be initiated. A new Application Form would have to be submitted and the prescribed application fee would have to be paid again (if applicable). 13. Please note that it is prohibited in terms of Section 24F of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA") for a person to commence with a Listed Activity unless the Competent Authority has granted an Environmental Authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. Offences in terms of the NEMA and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014, will render the offender liable for criminal prosecution. 14. Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of this matter. 15. This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw initial comments or request further information from you based on any information received.				
14.	Email: Please find attach comments from the WCDoA: LUM. Letter: Although, Remainder of the Portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley No. 225, Mossel Bay, is considered having medium potential agricultural land and a part of it being cultivated for dryland crop production, the farm falls within the approved development area for industrial and related development, as strategic development zone for Mossel Bay. Therefore, the Western Cape Department of Agriculture has no objection to the extension of the underlined Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway on the Remainder of Portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley No. 225, Mossel Bay. Please note:	Brandon Layman, Administrative Assistant, Land Use Management, DEADP	Email B (04/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Thank you very much, Mr Layman, Your comments will be included in the Comments and Response Report.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	- Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. - The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on the information received.				
16.	Email: Ons as die Gourikwa Khoisan stamhuis bring onder u aandag dat indien enige Inheemse histories eartefakte, grafte, rotstekeninge op beoogde grond vir ontwikkeling is Die Eerste Inheemse Nasie ingelig en ingetrek word. Verder dat die Eerste Inheemse nasie so ver as moontlik sal deel uit maak in n mate van hierdie Ontwikkeling. English translation: "We, as the Gourikwa Khoisan tribal house, bring to your attention that if any Indigenous historical artifacts, graves, rock paintings are on the intended land for development, The First Indigenous Nation must be informed and involved. Furthermore, the First Indigenous Nation should participate as much as possible to a degree in this Development."	Chief Barry Jacobs, Gourikwa Khoi-San Stamhuis	Email A (09/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Baie dankie vir u terugvoer en belangstelling in die projek. U kommentaar word in ag geneem en sal ingesluit word in die finale Omvangsverslag. English translation: "Thank you very much for your feedback and interest in the project. Your comments are taken into consideration and will be included in the final Scope Report."
17.	Email: Water use authorisation to be applied for where necessary through the DWS Regional Office	Pieter Ackerman, Chief Landscape Architect Department of Water and Sanitation.	Email B (09/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Thank you for your response. It will be included in the comments and response report
18.	Email: Please see attached HWC comment. HWC previous comment still stands.	Stephanie-Anne Barnardt-Delport, Specialist Heritage Officer, HWC.	Email (11/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Refer to response in row no. 2 above.
19.	Email: NOTICE OF SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION: APPLICATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MOSSDUSTRIA AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RACEWAY ON THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 8 OF THE FARM RIETVALLEY 225, MOSSEL BAY, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE. Please find attached the comment from this Department regarding the aforementioned subject. Letter: 1. The following has reference: (a) The application submitted on by your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA No.: 2020/1217) and assisted by the registered Candidate EAP, Dr Marilie	Mr. Francois Naude, Ms. Shireen Pullen and Mr. Gavin Benjamin, DEADP.	Email (12/03/2026) Letter (12/03/2026) Letter (16/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Email: Please find attached a letter containing our responses to the Notice issued by the Department. We remain available to engage further with the Department and to provide any additional clarification that may be required. Letter: This letter serves as a written response to the Notice of Suspension of Application (the "Notice") issued by the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	Pretorius (EAPASA No. 2024/8345) from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd. and received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3) ("this Directorate") on 4 March 2026. (b) The Draft Scoping Report ("SR") submitted by the registered Candidate EAP, Dr Marilie Pretorius (EAPASA No. 2024/8345) on behalf of your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donavan Henning (EAPASA No.: 2020/1217) from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd. and received by this Directorate on 9 March 2026. (c) The meeting held on 24 February 2026 attended by officials from this Directorate, officials from Mossel Bay Municipality as well as your appointed EAP and the Candidate EAP. (d) The guidance provided to you and the respective appointed EAP's in the correspondence issued by this Directorate on 30 November 2021 (DEA&DP Ref. 16/3/3/6/7/2/D6/29/0180/21) and more recently on 24 February 2026 (DEA&DP Ref. 16/3/3/6/4/2/1/D6/29/0403/25) regarding the roles and responsibilities of the appointed EAP. 2. In accordance with Regulation 3(6) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (Government Notice No. R.982 of 4 December 2014, as amended) ("EIA Regulations, 2014"), this letter also serves as an acknowledgment of receipt of the Draft Scoping Report by the Department on 09 March 2026. Note: Notwithstanding the fact that title of the Scoping Report refers to "Final Scoping Report" the document is deemed to be a draft document received in terms of Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, and is hereinafter referred to as such. 3. This Directorate has reviewed the information submitted on 9 March 2026 by the Candidate EAP. The review of the information has revealed the following issues of concern: 3.1 Please be advised that matters regarding the proposed public participation process for the Scoping Phase; and the roles and responsibilities of the EAP, have been identified which may prejudice the success of your application for environmental authorisation. The issue regarding the roles and responsibilities of the appointed EAP were raised during the meeting held on 24 February 2026 and highlighted in the correspondence which was issued on 24 February 2026 (DEA&DP Ref. 16/3/3/6/4/2/1/D6/29/0403/25). 3.2 Sub-regulation 3(6); 21(1) and 40(1)(b) clearly prescribe that the public participation process to which the Draft Scoping Report must be subjected, must be for a period of at least 30-days. The Draft Scoping Report received on 9 March 2026 does not specify the 30-day commenting period to which				Development Planning (DEA&DP) ("the Department") on 12 March 2026 in respect of the above-mentioned application. At the outset, we want to express our commitment to ensuring that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is conducted in full compliance with the EIA Regulations of 2014, as amended. The intention of this response is to cooperate constructively with the Department in order to resolve the matters that have given rise to the suspension. A. Roles of the Registered Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) and Candidate EAP It is hereby confirmed that Donavan Henning (the registered EAP), holds primary responsibility for the EIA process in terms of Regulation 12 and 13 of the EIA Regulations of 2014, as amended, as well as Regulation 14 of the Section 24H Registration Authority Regulations of 2016. Assistance has been provided by Marilie Pretorius (the Candidate EAP) under the direct supervision and oversight of the registered EAP. Page viii of the Draft Scoping Report lists Donavan Henning (the registered EAP) as the author of the document together with Kate Flood and Umeshree Naicker, who are registered EAPs that previously contributed to the report. While the Draft Scoping Report also lists Marilie Pretorius (Candidate EAP) as one of the authors, this will be corrected in the Final Scoping Report to accurately reflect that her role was limited to assisting the registered EAP with the compilation of the report, under supervision.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	it must be subjected, an no cover letter is attached to the Scoping Report proving such details. However, a separate e-mail notice has been received from the Candidate EAP on 9 March 2026, titled "GE39111 Notice of Review of Draft Scoping Report for the proposed extension of Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway on the remainder of portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley 225, Mossel Bay, Western Cape Province" wherein it is stated that the Scoping Report will be available for comment from 09 March 2026 to 09 April 2026. The e-mail notice contains a "Comments Sheet" which clearly states that the contact person is Marilie Pretorius and all enquiries must be forwarded to the Candidate EAP. Considering the reckoning of days/periods prescribed in Regulation 3 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, the period from 09 March 2026 to 09 April 2026 is reckoned to be a period of only 28-days and therefore does not conform to the regulatory minimum period of 30-days. Please note that all the provisions of Regulation 3 must be considered when reckoning the specific period, therefore considering– • Sub-regulation 3(1) - the 30-day period must be reckoned as from the start of the day following the receipt of the documents on 9 March 2026 (i.e., start counting on 10 March 2026) to the end of the last day of the period, namely Thursday, 9 April 2026. Please be reminded that the SR document and notice were both received on 9 March 2026; and • Sub-regulation 3(5) - the timeframe 09 March 2026 to 09 April 2026 is affected by three (3) public holidays¹, and therefore the timeframe must be extended by the number of public holiday days falling within that timeframe. It is apparent from the information received that the person managing the application has not properly considered the regulatory requirements contemplated in Regulation 21 as well as Regulation 3 and 40 of the EIA Regulations, 2014. It must be emphasised that the prescripts for the public participation process must be complied with meticulously to not only ensure that the process is lawful, reasonable and procedurally fair, but that the final decision (administrative action) also complies with these aspects. 3.3 Roles and Responsibilities of the appointed EAP- In accordance with Regulation 12(a) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, an applicant must appoint an EAP to manage the application for Environmental Authorisation. Please be reminded that as of 8 August 2022, the person appointed to hold the primary responsibility for the planning, management, co-ordination, and execution of the tasks contemplated in Regulation 14 of the Section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016 (Government Notice 849 dated				Although the site and newspaper notices provide the contact details of the Candidate EAP, it is confirmed that all notices were reviewed and approved by the registered EAP prior to publication. Furthermore, the planning, oversight, and implementation of the public participation process were undertaken under the supervision and direction of the registered EAP, who retains full responsibility for ensuring compliance with the regulatory requirements in this regard. B. In correction Version of Draft Scoping Report Reviewed by the Department The dedicated folder on the Directorate's OneDrive / Sharepoint for this application contains 4 folders, which comprise the Application Form, submission of previous versions of the Scoping Report, as well as the submission of the Draft Scoping Report on 6 March 2026. Evidence confirming the aforementioned submission date includes the following: 1. The dedicated folder on the Directorate's OneDrive / Sharepoint for this application shows that the date that the file was modified is 6 March 2026, consistent with the date of submission. 2. Proof of the upload was forwarded to the Department by Nemai Consulting on 6 March 2026, with screenshots of the folder. It is evident that an incorrect version of the Draft Scoping Report was reviewed and commented on by the Department, based on the following comments provided in the Notice: 1. On page 1 of the Notice, it is incorrectly stated that the Scoping Report refers to "Final Scoping Report". The Draft Scoping Report submitted on 6 March 2026 clearly refer to a "Draft" version of this report.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	22 July 2016, as amended) must be registered with Environmental Assessment Practitioners Association of South Africa (EAPASA). As from the 8th of August 2022, if anyone is found practicing without being registered as an EAP, such a person is engaging in fraudulent or illegal practices. Please be reminded that the appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") must manage all aspects of the application and ensure compliance with the EIA Regulations, 2014 to compile and submit the Scoping Report ("SR") and Environmental Impact Assessment Report ("EIR") to the competent authority for decision-making. In this regard, please be advised that in terms of Regulation 14(1) of the section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016 that only a person registered as an EAP may perform tasks in connection with an application for an environmental authorisation. It is acknowledged that Regulation 14(6) of said 24H Regulations states that when acting under supervision of a registered EAP, a registered Candidate EAP may assist with the performance of tasks in connection with an application for an environmental authorisation contemplated in Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 ("NEMA"), read with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 ("EIA Regulations, 2014"). This Directorate notes from the Application Form, that the person appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) is Donovan Henning (EAPASA Registration No. 2020/1217) from Gibb International (Pty) Ltd. While it is acknowledged that Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA Reg. 2020/1217) has signed an EAP declaration, it appears that Mr. Henning has acted as a "review EAP" and not as the person who holds the primary responsibility for the performance of the tasks for which the EAP is held responsible. Whereas a "Review EAP" has a specific meaning in the context of the EIA Regulations, 2014, care must be taken when such statement is used in respect of the section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016. This Directorate notes from the Application Form, that the person appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) is Donovan Henning (EAPASA Registration No. 2020/1217) from Gibb International (Pty) Ltd. While it is acknowledged that Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA Reg. 2020/1217) has signed an EAP declaration, it appears that Mr. Henning has acted as a "review EAP" and not as the person who holds the primary responsibility for the performance of the tasks for which the EAP is held responsible. Whereas a "Review EAP" has a specific meaning in the context of the EIA Regulations, 2014, care must be taken when such statement is used in respect of the section 24H Registration Authority Regulations, 2016.				2. On page 2 of the Notice, it is indicated that the Draft Scoping Report "...does not specify the 30-day commenting period to which it must be subjected." This is incorrect, as the review period is stated in Section 4.3 of the Draft Scoping Report submitted on 6 March 2026. 3. On page 3 of the Notice, reference is made to a "review EAP". On page viii of the Draft Scoping Report submitted on 6 March 2026 it is indicated that the author is Donovan Henning (the registered EAP). 4. The Site Sensitivity Verification Report indicates that the author is Donovan Henning (the registered EAP), as the EAP. 5. On page 5 of the Notice it is incorrectly stated that "...the EAP/Candidate EAP is omitting this reference number and incorrectly referencing the previous DE&ADP reference numbers in correspondence and reports". The reference number utilised on the cover page and throughout the Draft Scoping Report submitted 6 March 2026 is 16/3/3/2/D6/29/001/26. We respectfully request that the Department reconsider the above comments, including the manner in which these comments contributed to the suspension of the application, in light of the Draft Scoping Report that was submitted on 6 March 2026. C. Regulated Timeframes The following key dates relevant to the formal EIA process are noted: • The Application Form was submitted to the Department on 27 February 2026. • The Draft Scoping Report was submitted to the Department on 6 March 2026. • The public review period commenced on 9 March 2026.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	- All documents and correspondence have been submitted by Dr. Marilie Pretorius (Candidate EAP). It is not apparent that the EAP is responsible for the execution of the tasks. - The Site Sensitivity Verification Report has been prepared (authored) by the Candidate EAP, Marilie Pretorius. This is contrary to the requirements of the relevant Protocols. - It appears that the Candidate EAP will be managing the entire public participation process, whereas Regulation 7 is clear that the consultation with Organs of State and State Department, is a task which falls within the ambit of the tasks for which the EAP is responsible. It is noted from the EAPASA register that a Dr. Marilie Pretorius is registered as a Candidate EAP (EAPASA Reg. 2024/8345); however, neither the Application Form or Draft Scoping Report (and supporting documents) confirm this and describe the role of the Candidate EAP in relation to the appointed EAP. Notwithstanding the fact that this aspect was brought to your attention prior to the submission of the Application Form, this aspect has not been corrected, and each document/report has not clearly demonstrated that the EAP has indeed fulfilled the primary responsibility for the performance of the identified tasks and how the Candidate EAP may have assisted the EAP. As such, it is not apparent that you have indeed complied with Regulation 12. 4. In accordance with Regulation 14(1)(a) you are notified that the Competent Authority believes or has reason to believe that the EAP has not complied with the requirements of sub-regulations 13(1)(b); 13(1)(c); 13(1)(d) and/or 13(1)(e) in respect of the application, other than the requirement of independence in Regulation 13(1)(a). In light hereof the application for environmental authorisation (DEA&DP Ref. No. 16/3/3/2/D6/29/0001/26) for the proposed extension of Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway on the Remainder of Portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley No. 225, Mossel Bay, Western Cape Province, is suspended. Further to the above— 4.1 In accordance with sub-regulation 14(1)(a), the application is suspended until 20 April 2026 to enable your EAP to utilise the period to resolve the matter in respect of the application for environmental authorisation. Note: Should the matter be resolved sooner; the Competent Authority may lift the suspension prior to 20 April 2025; however, if not the suspension period may be extended.				- The Notice was received on 12 March 2026. We are cognisant of the regulated 44 days in terms of Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations of 2014, as amended, calculated from the date of submission of the Application Form to the date by which the Final Scoping Report must be submitted. At the time of receipt of the Notice on 12 March 2026, a period of 13 days had elapsed since submission of the Application Form. Accordingly, 31 days remain within the regulated timeframe for submission of the Final Scoping Report. Based on this calculation, the Final Scoping Report would be due for submission to the Department by 15 April 2026, subject to confirmation by the Department. Furthermore, at the time of receipt of the Notice, 27 days remained of the public review period for the Draft Scoping Report. The implications arising from the above are addressed in the section below. D. Way Forward In order to address the matters raised in the Notice and to enable the EIA process to proceed in a procedurally compliant manner, the following actions are proposed: - Donavan Henning (the registered EAP) will notify all Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) of the suspension within 7 calendar days from the date of issue of the Notice. This notification will state that the current public review period has been placed on hold and will resume once the suspension is lifted. Proof of such notification will be submitted to the Department. - Donavan Henning (the registered EAP) will assume direct responsibility for managing the

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	4.2 As contemplated in sub-regulation 14(1)(b), the appointed EAP is afforded an opportunity to make written representations to the competent authority regarding the suspected non-compliance with the aforementioned requirements of Regulation 13. Such written representation must include a reasoned opinion and must be submitted to the competent authority on or before 02 April 2026. 4.3 The Applicant / EAP is invited to submit representations on the issues that have been raised and any recommendations how to resolve the matter. Such representations must be submitted to this Department by no later than 02 April 2026. 5. On receipt of the representations, the Competent Authority will follow the procedures detailed in sub-regulation 14(5) and decide the matter. 6. You are required to notify all registered Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) of the suspension of the application within 7 calendar days from the date of issue of this letter. The EAP must, within said 7-day period, provide proof to the competent authority of complying with this requirement. 7. Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number (viz. DEA&DP Ref.: 16/3/3/2/D6/29/0001/26) in any future correspondence in respect of this application. It is noted that the EAP/Candidate EAP is omitting this reference number and incorrectly referencing the previous DE&ADP reference numbers in correspondence and reports. 8. Please note that the activity may not commence prior to an environmental authorisation being granted by the Department. It is an offence in terms of Section 49A(1)(a) of the NEMA for a person to commence with a listed activity unless the Competent Authority has granted an environmental authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. A person may be liable to prosecution for failing to comply with the requirements of Section 24F of the NEMA. 9. This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw initial comments or request further information from you based on any information received.				public participation process. Any support by the Candidate EAP will be expressly identified as such. In this regard, all future emails to be sent by the Candidate EAP as part of the public participation process will include the following statement: "This email is sent by a Candidate Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) (registration no. 2024/8345), whose work is undertaken under the supervision and oversight of the registered EAP, Donavan Henning (registration no. 2020/1217)." 3. If the suspension is lifted and we are notified thereof by the Department, we will inform the I&APs of the revised end date for the public review period. Should it become apparent that the regulated 44-day timeframe for submission of the Final Scoping Report cannot be met, a motivation for an extension of time in terms of Regulation 3(7) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, will be submitted to the Department at least 7 days prior to the expiry of the applicable timeframe. 4. As indicated in Section 4.3 of the Draft Scoping Report, notice boards were placed at the site on 6 March 2026 in accordance with Regulation 41(2)(a)(i) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended. New site notices will be placed at the same locations to inform I&APs of the extension of the public review period should the suspension be lifted. 5. Section 4.3 of the Draft Scoping Report further records that notices were published in English, Afrikaans, and isiXhosa in the Mossel Bay Advertiser on 6 March 2026, in accordance with Regulation 41(2)(c)(i) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended. In light of this, it is not proposed to place additional newspaper notices should the suspension be lifted. We respectfully submit that the responses provided in this letter address the matters that

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
					resulted in the suspension. The undersigned remains available should the Department require any further clarification.
20.	Email: Kindly can you send me a OneDrive link with all the documentation for our review.	Megan Simons Land Use Scientist – Landscape East, Cape Nature	Email (18/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Please see the below WeTransfer link: https://we.tl/t-uBZc7Tp7OcDT6tbT Alternatively, the Report is also available at: https://nemai.co.za/downloads/
21.	Email: Can you please assist with the GPS coordinates.	Chantell Bruintjies, Transnet Freight Rail Port Elizabeth	Email (20/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Please see attached Appendix A of the Draft Scoping Report with Location maps and coordinates.
22.	Email: LIFTING OF SUSPENSION: APPLICATION FOR A SCOPING AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTING PROCESS IN TERMS OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT, 1998 (ACT NO. 107 OF 1998) AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS, 2014: PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MOSSDUSTRIA AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RACEWAY ON THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 8 OF THE FARM RIETVALLEY 225, MOSSEL BAY, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Please find attached the comment from this Department regarding the aforementioned subject. Letter: 1. The Following refer: 1.1. The application submitted on your behalf by your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donovan Henning (EAPASA Registration Number: 2020/1217) of from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd. and received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3), hereinafter referred to as "this Directorate" and on 27 February 2026, 1.2. The draft Scoping Report received by this Directorate on 9 March 2026, 1.3. This Directorate's Notice of Suspension dated 12 March 2026 and 1.4. The representations received by your appointed EAP on 16 March 2026.	Mr. Francois Naude, Ms. Shireen Pullen and Mr. Gavin Benjamin, DEADP	Email (22/03/2026) Letter (22/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	We acknowledge receipt of the Department's correspondence in respect of the lifting of the suspension. We will proceed accordingly.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	2. This letter serves as acknowledgment of receipt of the representations received from your appointed EAP on 16 March 2026. 3. Comment on Representation This Directorate has reviewed the representations provided. The EAP must ensure that Dr. Marilie Pretorius' role is always clearly defined/ described in all reports/documents that are submitted to the competent authority for consideration. It is noted on page viii of the draft Scoping Report and numerous other sections of the draft Scoping Report that Mr. Donavan Henning (among other registered EAPs) is referenced as the Registered EAP who prepared the draft Scoping Report and accepts all responsibility as the EAP and Dr. Marilie Pretorius as the environmental consultant (registered as a Candidate EAP) who assisted with the compilation of the document; however, page viii of the Draft SR still lists Dr. Marilie Pretorius as one of the people who prepared the draft Scoping Report. Please be advised that the statement in section D.2 of the letter received from the EAP, referring to e-mail correspondence which the Candidate EAP issues pertaining to the public participation process, should rather read: "This email is sent by a Candidate Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) (registration no. 2024/8345), who is assisting the registered EAP, Donavan Henning (registration no. 2020/1217)." 4. Decision on the suspension of the application: 4.1 The Competent Authority has considered all the information mentioned above and is of the opinion that sufficient information has been provided to make an informed decision on the suspension of the application and it regards the matter as being resolved. 4.2 You are hereby informed that the suspension of the application is lifted from the start of Wednesday, 25 March 2026. Note: The reckoning of days must include said day. 4.3 The Department will acknowledge receipt and consider the draft SR in accordance with the prescribed timeframes (considering the suspension period) and advise you accordingly. The remaining period of the 30-day comment period (i.e 26-days) is reckoned to extend to the end of Tuesday, 21 April 2026. 4.4 The Competent Authority stipulates that the Scoping Report must be submitted to this Department for decision within 44-days from the date of receipt of the application by the Department. The remaining period is reckoned to extend to the end of Tuesday, 28 April 2026, by which date the Scoping Report in terms of Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations of 2014, must be submitted to this Department. 5. In light of the above your EAP is required to notify all registered Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) within 7 calendar days from the date of this				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	letter being issued, that the suspension of the application has been lifted and the actions pertaining to the public participation process. NOTE: The EAP must provide proof of complying with this requirement to the competent authority within said period. To comply with the regulatory requirements, it is advised that the notice should not be issued later than 24 March 2026. 6. Please note that the activity may not commence prior to an environmental authorisation being granted by the Department. It is an offence in terms of Section 49A(1)(a) of the NEMA for a person to commence with a listed activity unless the Competent Authority has granted an environmental authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. Furthermore, it is an offence in terms of Regulation 48(1)(a) of the EIA Regulations, 2014 if a person provides incorrect or misleading information in any form, including any document submitted in terms of these Regulations to a competent authority or omits information that may have an influence on the outcome of a decision of a competent authority. Offences in terms of the NEMA or the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014, will render the offender liable for criminal prosecution. A person convicted of an offence in terms of the above is liable to a fine not exceeding R10 million or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 10 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment. 7. Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of this matter. 8. This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw initial comments or request further information from you based on any information received.				
23.	Email: I am making contact on behalf of DFR Engineers, to enquire whether you will need Electrical and/ or Mechanical Engineering Services for the abovementioned project. We do a significant amount of work in the Western Cape and have been involved in a number of similar developments. Our portfolio includes: • Electrical distribution, transmission, and reticulation, • Electrical and Mechanical designs and infrastructure for private sector, industrial, agricultural, public sector, mining etc. • Renewable energy and energy optimisation, • Specialised designs such as lifts, escalators, energy farms, fire designs,	Shameemah Khan	Email (24/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Email: Thank you very much for your interest in the proposed Project. Your comments will be included in the comments and response report

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	- Wet services and rational fire designs, - Statutory compliance and heritage projects. If these services have not yet been finalised, we would appreciate the opportunity to be considered or to discuss how we could potentially get involved. I have attached our company profile for your reference. Please feel free to let me know whether I can schedule a quick call to introduce ourselves				
24.	Email: Find attached my public Comment as requested on the proposed raceway in Mosdustria. I also addressed the email with Comments to my respective Ward Councillor's for Ward 7, Stephan Botha and Ward 11 Nicky Le Roux. Ward 7 being Mosdustria and Ward 11 being Dana Bay, which are the affected neighbours of the proposed development. It deems to be noted that George and Oudshoorn respectively 50 and 90 km from Mossel Bay has Oval tracks. Oval tracks and spinning areas do not set different track layouts like for instance Grandprix circuit and rally tracks. Therefore, an oval track is an oval track no different to the other. Why an additional track within an 50km radius joined to Mossel Bay by a double highway. I have detailed my comments in the attached documents. Letter: Introduction: As indicated above I have 1 property in Mosdustria and 3 properties in Dana Bay that could be impacted by the assessment. It is a substantial investment which could be negatively impacted by incorrect assessment. Past approvals of the Municipality has proved to be incorrectly approved such as a Fishmeal plant that was approved with conditions as a red meat rendering plant. The Conditions of approval were never met and a longer than ten year period of illegal activities at this plant took place before myself and Dana Bay residents and Mosdustria Property owners could get legal intervention to prove the plant activities did not comply with regulations and zoning. This cost us a lot of time and private monies to resolve. The Municipality being the owner of the property has proved in the past during the above situation not to be trusted when approvals under conditions were set out. Conditions were not met and very sparse Environmental impact studies were done without considering and answering the concerns of the Public participation.	Marius van Wyk	Email (27/03/2026) Letter (27/03/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Email: Thank you very much for your comments. It will be included and addressed in the Comments and Response Report. Nemai Consulting takes note of the sensitive environmental features in your letter. The following specialist studies will be undertaken during the EIR phase of the process. These studies will assist with the development of an understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed development, on both the social and biophysical environments: - Wetland Assessment; - Terrestrial Ecological Assessment; - Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment; - Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment; - Palaeontology Impact Assessment; - Aquatic Biodiversity Impact Assessment; - Noise Scoping Assessment; - Risk Assessment; - Socio-Economic Impact Assessment; and - Avifauna impact assessment (solar PV facility).

28

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	I refer to the Draft Scoping Report currently under your review and specifically to the area identified north of Border Street between the railway line and Border Street. While the palaeontological study has flagged sensitivity in this area, it is evident that a comprehensive environmental assessment of this zone has not yet been undertaken at the scoping stage. As it is marked I presume future development is planned here and the scoping document will be to include this area which historically could be related to the wetlands in the area earmarked for development of the raceway. As a property owner in Border Street since 2010, I submit the following site-specific, long-term observations, which constitute material environmental information: • The presence of a seasonal to semi-permanent wetland system • A persistently high groundwater table, evidenced by: • Permanently waterlogged areas on private property • Sewer manholes consistently inundated with groundwater • Sustained surface water flow after rainfall events, continuing for several days • The presence of seasonal indigenous flora ("veldblomme"), indicating intact ecological functioning 1.1 In addition to the above: • The area supports consistent amphibian (frog) activity, particularly after rainfall • Regular breeding calls are audible, indicating reproductive use of the habitat It is well established in ecological practice that amphibians function as sensitive bio-indicators of wetland ecosystem integrity, due to their dependence on: • Clean, unpolluted water • Stable hydrological regimes • Undisturbed habitat conditions 1.2 Based on the combined hydrological, botanical, and faunal indicators described above, this area must be regarded, at minimum, as a potential wetland or wetland-associated system of ecological				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	significance. In terms of the principles of National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the EIA Regulations, the following applies: • All potentially sensitive environmental features must be identified and assessed at the earliest stage • The precautionary principle requires that uncertainty may not be used as a basis to defer or downplay risk • Site-specific observations such as these trigger a duty for specialist verification • Assessments would have to be seasonably spaced and related 1.3 Formal Request to Nema Consulting Accordingly, I formally request that Nema Consulting ensure that: • All potentially sensitive environmental features must be identified and assessed at the earliest stage • The precautionary principle requires that uncertainty may not be used as a basis to defer or downplay risk • Site-specific observations such as these trigger a duty for specialist verification • Assessments would have to be seasonably spaced and related Critical clarification: Any conclusion that this area is of “low sensitivity” or “not a wetland” must be supported by field-based, seasonal specialist studies. A desktop assessment or limited site inspection would not meet acceptable EIA standards and would constitute a material gap in the scoping process. 2. NOISE IMPACT – DANA BAY AS A SENSITIVE RECEPTOR The Draft Scoping Report indicates that noise impacts will be assessed in later phases. However, the current scoping appears to materially underestimate the nature and extent of potential noise impacts. The residential area of Dana Bay, 4 km in a straight line from the proposed development, must be treated as a highly sensitive receptor. Currently noise from the Gouriqua Power turbines is heard at night times. It is constant jet engine like sound without variance in speed. This tends to be tolerated as it is a steady noise without variance.				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	However a oval track raceway, cars without silencers and a area where Spinning/driftting activity at rev limiting and cutout notes are varied would prove to be a challenge, especially seeing that these activities take place on Saturday Nights. It deems to be noted that George and Oudshoorn respectively 50 and 90 km from Mossel Bay has Oval tracks. Oval tracks and spinning areas do not set different track layouts like for instance Grandprix circuit and rally tracks. Therefore an oval track is an oval track no different to the other. Why an additional track within an 50km radius joined to Mossel Bay by a double highway. 2.1 Nature of the Proposed Noise Sources The proposed raceway includes: • An oval racing circuit, where vehicles will operate: • At sustained high revolutions • In lower gears under continuous load • A spinning/driftting track, where vehicles: • Operate at maximum revolutions in first gear • Repeatedly reach the rev limiter, generating impulsive and cyclic noise peaks These characteristics are known to produce: • Continuous high-decibel noise, and • Intermittent peak noise events, which are more intrusive and disturbing than steady-state noise 2.2 Environmental Factors Affecting Noise Propagation The following must be explicitly included in the assessment: • Temperature inversion, particularly during evening and night events, which can significantly increase noise propagation • Coastal atmospheric conditions that may enhance sound travel • The Doppler effect, contributing to fluctuating and intrusive noise perception 2.3 Required Assessment Standard I request that Nema Consulting ensure that the noise impact assessment: Is conducted by an independent acoustic specialist				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	- Is based on worst-case operational scenarios, not average conditions - Explicitly includes: - Spinning/drift activities - Night-time operations - Peak and cumulative noise levels Reference should be made to applicable standards, including SANS 10103. Critical clarification: Any limitation of the assessment scope (e.g. excluding certain activities or modelling only daytime conditions) would result in a systematic underestimation of impact and would not align with accepted professional or regulatory standards. 3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT The anticipated noise impacts are expected to: - Negatively affect residential amenity - Result in reduced property values - Undermine long-term investment confidence in the Mossel Bay municipal area These impacts must be quantified and properly assessed, not treated as secondary considerations. 4. FUEL STORAGE AND GROUNDWATER RISK The proposed 15 m x 15 m fuel storage area raises significant concerns, particularly in light of the documented high groundwater conditions. Motorsport activities typically involve: - Transport and storage of high-octane fuels - On-site fuel decanting, mechanical work, and vehicle washing This introduces a clear risk of soil and groundwater contamination. 4.1 I request that Nema Consulting ensure that: - Detailed spill containment systems are specified - Stormwater management measures are clearly defined - Oil-water separation systems are included				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	- Design measures demonstrate suitability for high groundwater conditions 5. CONCLUSION The issues raised above are based on long-term, site-specific observations and constitute material environmental information relevant to the assessment process. - I respectfully request that Nema Consulting: - Incorporate these concerns into the scoping phase - Ensure that all identified risks are subject to specialist, evidence-based investigation - Apply the precautionary principle in line with National Environmental Management Act Final statement: These concerns cannot reasonably be dismissed without documented, field-based specialist assessment. Failure to address them adequately at this stage may result in material omissions in the Environmental Impact Assessment process. I also address the above public comment to the Mossel Bay Ward Councillor Ward 11 Nicky le Roux and Ward 7 Councillor Stephan Botha.				
25.	Email: Kindly receive the attached comments for your attention. Letter: The Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency (BOCMA) has evaluated the submitted documents and has the following comments: Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency (BOCMA) hereby acknowledges receipt of your application dated 10 March 2026 for the aforementioned activity, which was received by this office on 10 March 2026. Based on an evaluation of the intended activity and the information provided, it has been determined that the proposed extension of Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway on the remainder of portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley 225, Mossel Bay. This office therefore supports the proposed extension of Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway activities on the aforementioned property.	Ngobeni Tshembhani, and Jan van Staden, Breede-Olifants CMA	Email A (07/04/2026) LetterA (07/04/2026)	Nema Consulting	Email: Thank you very much for your comments. Please note that it will be included in the comments and response report and addressed. An Aquatic Specialist will compile a Aquatic Biodiversity Impact Report during the EIA phase where BOCMA's comments will be taken into consideration and investigated further.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	2. BOCMA does not object to the proposed development subject to compliance with the following condition: a. The proposed extension of Mossdustria and the establishment of a raceway on the remainder of portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley 225, located within the jurisdiction of the Mossel Bay Local Municipality, Western Cape. will trigger Section 21 (c) & (i) water uses of National Water Act ,1998 (Act No 36 of 1998) As amended 3. Please note no abstraction of surface or groundwater may take place or storage of water be created without prior authorisation from this office, unless it is a Schedule 1 or Existing Lawful Use as described in Section 32 of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) as amended. 4. Please ensure that no waste or water containing waste is disposed in a manner which may detrimentally impact on a water resource without authorisation from the National Water Act, 1998 (Act 36 of 1998) and other related legislations. 5. The applicant should be aware that according to Section 19 (1) of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No.36 of 1998), “an owner of land, a person in control of land or a person who occupies or uses the land on which (a) any activity or process is or was performed or undertaken; or (b) any other situation exists, which causes, has caused or is likely to cause pollution of a water resource, must take all reasonable measures to prevent any such pollution from occurring, continuing or recurring”. Any pollution incident(s) resulting from the discharge of treated effluent or any activity from the plant must be reported within 24 hours to the relevant authority. 6. No stormwater runoff from the application premises containing waste, or water containing waste emanating from any activity may be discharged into a water resource without prior treatment. 7. All requirements as stipulated in the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) regarding water use must be adhered to. 8. These comments do not exempt you from complying with other relevant legislations and requirements of other governmental Departments.				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	BOCMA reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information received.				
26.	Email: ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MOSSDUSTRIA AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RACEWAY ON THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 8 OF THE FARM RIETVALLEY 225, MOSSEL BAY, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Please find attached the comment from this Department regarding the aforementioned subject. Letter: 1. The above-mentioned document submitted by your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donavan Henning (EAPASA Registration Number: 2020/1217) of from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd and assisted by Candidate EAP, Dr. Marilie Pretorius (EAPASA Registration Number: 2024/8345) from NEMAI Consulting is hereby acknowledged by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3 (hereinafter referred to as “this Directorate”). 2.The information is currently under review and comment on the draft Scoping report will be provided by 21 April 2026 as indicated in the EAP’s e-mail notice of 24 March 2026. 3.Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of this matter. 4.This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw initial comments or request further information from you based on any information received.	Mr. Francois Naude, Ms. Shireen Pullen and Mr. Gavin Benjamin, DEADP	Email B (07/04/2026) Letter B (07/04/2026)	Nemai Consulting	We await the Department’s comments.
27.	Email: COMMENT ON THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MOSSDUSTRIA AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RACEWAY ON ERF 6 MOSSDUSTRIA AND THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 8 OF THE FARM RIETVALLEY 225, MOSSEL BAY, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Please find attached the comment from this Department regarding the aforementioned subject. Letter: 1.The above-mentioned document submitted on your behalf by your appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), Mr. Donavan	Mr. Francois Naude, Ms. Shireen Pullen and Mr. Gavin Benjamin, DEADP	Email (21/04/2026) Letter (21/04/2026)	Nemai Consulting	Thank you for your comments 2. The EIR will clearly describe engineering services (i.e., reticulation of water, sewage and stormwater) to support the proposed development. 3. 1 The Scoping Report (“SR”) contains all the information outlined in Appendix 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (GN No. R. 982 of 4 December 2014, as amended) (“EIA

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	Henning (EAPASA Registration Number: 2020/1217) of from GIBB Environmental (Pty) Ltd and assisted by Candidate EAP, Dr. Marilie Pretorius (EAPASA Registration Number: 2024/8345) from Nemai Consulting to the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3 (hereinafter referred to as “this Directorate”) refers. 2. Proposal and affected environment The proposal entails the extension of the existing Mossdustria Industrial Development and the establishment of a racetrack on Erf 6, Mossdustria (SG code C05100140000000600000) and a portion of Portion 8 of the Farm Rietvalley 225 (SG code C05100000000022500008), (“the property”) which, according to relevant GIS datasets contains sections of Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA), sections of Aquatic Ecological Support Areas (ESA) and contains a mix of North Langeberg Sandstone Fynbos (Least Concern) and Hartenbos Dune Thicket (Endangered) vegetation. The proposal also includes an industrial expansion area of approximately 12-hectares, an alternative Energy Production Area of approximately 22-hectares, a Motorsport arena of approximately 38-hectares, Open Space of approximately 15-hectares, construction and laydown areas and internal roads. It is assumed that the proposal also will include the installation of engineering services (i.e., reticulation of water, sewage and stormwater) to support the proposed development, this must be clearly described in the forthcoming reports. 3. This Directorate has reviewed the document and comments as follows: 3.1. The Scoping Report (“SR”) must contain all the information outlined in Appendix 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (GN No. R. 982 of 4 December 2014, as amended) (“EIA Regulations, 2014”) and must also include the information requested in the letter dated 4 March 2026. 3.2. Project Description It is noted from the Application Form that this is a strategic infrastructure project (“SIP”) as contemplated the Strategic Infrastructure Development Act, 2014 (Act No. 23 of 2014). You are required to demonstrate how this project has been identified and included as a SIP in terms of said Act and provide supporting proof hereof. The Plan of Study for EIA (“POS:EIA”) must clearly demonstrate how this aspect has been incorporated and influences any processes.				Regulations, 2014”) and the information requested in the letter dated 4 March 2026. 3.2 Please note on page 5 of the Application form that it is NOT a SIP project. 3.3 Please see Section 7 of the FSR. 3.4 Please refer to page 115 of the FSR where a noise assessment is included in the Plan of Study. 3.5 Clear description of the civil engineering services will be provided in the EIR. In addition, Mossel Bay Municipality's Directorate: Technical Services will provide written confirmation of the availability of all the services for the proposed development, as well as the unallocated available capacity of the respective engineering services. This will be submitted with the EIR. 3.6 Chief Town and Regional Planner, Mr. Riaan Thompson has been added to the I&AP database and will be notified of the draft EIR review. 3.7 Please refer to section 1.7 where a detailed Table is provided based on the Guideline on Need and Desirability (DEA, 2017). Feedback will be supplemented by findings of the specialists in the EIR. 3.8 All reasonable and feasible alternatives, including the no-go alternative, will be comparatively assessed further in the EIA phase. 3.9 The DRS does not make reference to the project requiring Biodiversity Offsets. In addition, the Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecologist did not find reason for offsets during his

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	3.3.The guidance on the Screening Tool Report (STR) and Site Sensitivity Verification Report (SSVR) provided in this Directorate's letter dated 4 March 2026 is still relevant and should therefore be taken into account. Further to this, the final SR must clearly demonstrate how the tasks outlined in the POS:EIA is aligned with the findings of the SSVR and guidance provided in the afore-mentioned letter. 3.4.The Directorate notes that the undertaking of a separate noise impact assessment is not one of the tasks included in the POS:EIA despite this Directorate previously highlighting this requirement. Please be advised that this is a matter which will prejudice the success of the application if not assessed. Kindly ensure that the POS:EIA is amended in this regard. 3.5.At this stage it is unclear which civil engineering services will be required for the proposed development and what the alignment of link services will be. Kindly ensure that a civil engineering services report also forms part of the specialist input that must be undertaken in the EIA Phase, and that the other specialists consider the layout of such services. Please be advised that the entire development footprint (i.e., preferred site) must be described and assessed. Should any development take place outside of the property, this must be clearly described and where applicable, the Application Form shall need to be updated. In addition, the Mossel Bay Municipality's Directorate: Technical Services must provide written confirmation of the availability of all the services for the proposed development, as well as the unallocated available capacity of the respective engineering services. must be obtained from the Mossel Bay Municipality's and submitted to this Directorate at least with the Environmental Impact Assessment Report. However, should water, sewage and stormwater services be proposed solely by the 3.6.The Public Participation tasks highlighted in the draft SR is noted. Kindly ensure that the following organs of state are consulted and afforded an opportunity to provide comment on the proposed development: • The Department responsible for Strategic Infrastructure Projects (unless this is not a SIP); • Chief Town and Regional Planner, Mr. Riaan Thompson from this Directorate. Notwithstanding the above guidance, the EAP must consult with every organ of state that administers a law relating to a matter affecting the environment relevant to that application for an environmental authorisation.				preliminary study and engagement with Cape Nature. 4. The synchronising applications in terms of other applicable legislation with the EIA process. Please note that Nemai Consulting is undertaking the WULA process. Points 5 to 7 are noted. 8.The reference number assigned (16/3/3/2/D6/29/0001/26) will be utilised. 9.No activity will commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation being granted by the Department. 10.Refer to point 8 above

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	3.7. Need and Desirability Your motivation in terms of Need and Desirability for the proposed development is noted in section 1.7 of the draft SR. Please note that the need and desirability should also be informed by and aligned with the requirements as set out in the Need and Desirability Guideline which was published by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in 2017. Although the motivation in terms of the need and the desirability is noted, your attention is drawn to the key questions of the aforementioned guideline. It is of outmost importance that the proponent/Environmental Assessment Practitioner specifically and explicitly demonstrate how the need and desirability considerations in the said guideline have been taken into account by comprehensively addressing these key questions in the final SR that will be submitted. 3.8 Alternatives No site or location alternatives will be considered during the EIA Process It is also noted that a few lay-out alternatives are identified in the draft Scoping Report. All reasonable and feasible alternatives, including the no-go alternative, must be comparatively assessed (including the cumulative impacts) during the EIA regulations. 3.9. Clarity regarding the Biodiversity Offset The proposal as described in the Draft SR does not include a clear description of how “The National Biodiversity Offset Guideline” will be considered and the applicability of a biodiversity offset, nor does the POS:EIA include a clear description of how a biodiversity offset will be considered, as required in the published in Government Notice No. 3569 of 23 June 2023. It is unclear how a Biodiversity Offset Assessment would be undertaken in the EIA Phase of the application. Please clarify how this aspect will be addressed and whether a biodiversity offset will not form part of the proposal. 4. Synchronising applications in terms of other applicable legislation with the EIA process This Directorate is aware that a Water Use License Application (“WULA”) for the relevant water use activities in terms of Section 21 of the National Water Act, Act 36 of 1998, has been commissioned by the applicant and will be managed by Upstream Consulting. Please be reminded that it is now a legal requirement to synchronise the two applications. As such, you are required to include the information, reports and / or any formal correspondence from the Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency (“BOCMA”) in respect of the WULA in the EIAR. Please be advised that the omission of any reports/information may prejudice the success of the application for environmental authorisation.				

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE BY	RESPONSE
	5.Content of the Final SR 5.1.The final Scoping Report must contain all the information outlined in Appendix 2 of GN No. R. 982 of 4 December 2014 and must also include the information requested in this letter. 5.2.Failure to submit any information prescribed in Appendix 2 of GN No. R. 982 may result in Environmental Authorisation being refused. 6.Should the final Scoping Report not be submitted within the prescribed timeframe, the application will lapse in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 and your application file will be closed. Should you then wish to pursue the application again, a new application process would have to be initiated. A new Application Form would have to be submitted and the prescribed application fee would have to be paid. 7.The Scoping and EIA phases of the EIA process are two distinctly separate phases, each having its own requirements and reports to be submitted. The Department will not accept Scoping and EIA Reports where the processes or information of the two phases were combined into a single process or report. 8.Kindly quote the abovementioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. 9.Please note that the activity may not commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation being granted by the Department. It is an offence in terms of Section 49A of the NEMA for a person to commence with a listed activity unless the Department has granted an Environmental Authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. Failure to comply with the requirements of Section 24F and 49A of the NEMA will result in the matter being referred to the Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Directorate of this Department for prosecution. A person convicted of an offence in terms of the above is liable to a fine not exceeding R10 million or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 10 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment. 10.Kindly quote the abovementioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. 11.The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information from you based on any new or revised information received.				

