

# **TERRESTRIAL FAUNA SENSITIVITY REPORT**

## **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON PORTIONS 66 & 67 OF THE FARM 433, PLETTENBERG BAY.**

**PREPARED FOR ANDREW WEST ENVIRONMENTAL  
CONSULTANCY, GEORGE**



**CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT  
SERVICES – KEN COETZEE  
4 Chestnut Street, Heather Park  
George, 6529 - South Africa  
Cell: +27 76 227 5056  
[www.conservationmanagementservices.co.za](http://www.conservationmanagementservices.co.za)**

# CONTENTS

Executive summary	
1. Introduction, credentials & declaration .....	1
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Credentials of the author .....	2
1.3 Declaration of independence and competency .....	2
2. Description of the study site .....	3
2.1 Topograph.....	3
2.2 Habitat description and evaluation .....	5
2.2.1 Vegetation.....	5
2.2.2 Summary of animal habitat potential .....	7
2.2.3 General description of the study site .....	11
3. Faunal occurrence .....	11
3.1 The basic habitat model .....	11
3.2 Fauna inventory .....	12
3.2.1 Inventory of Amphibians.....	12
3.2.2 Inventory of Reptiles .....	13
3.2.3 Inventory of Mammals.....	13
3.2.4 Inventory of Birds .....	13
3.2.5 Inventory of Invertebrates.....	14
4. Red Data Classification, occurrence and Habitat sensitivity .....	14
4.1 Amphibian and Reptile sensitivity .....	14
4.2 Mammal sensitivity.....	15
4.3 Bird sensitivity .....	17
4.4 Invertebrate sensitivity .....	19
5. Landscape connectivity .....	19
6. Conclusion .....	20
7. References.....	21
Appendix 1: Amphibia checklist.....	22
Appendix 2: Reptile checklist .....	23
Appendix 3: Mammal checklist.....	25
Appendix 4: Bird checklist .....	27
Red List categories .....	28
Curriculum Vitae – Ken Coetzee .....	31
Declaration of independence.....	40

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It can thus be summarized with a high degree of confidence that the study site is of little importance to the fauna predicted to occur on it and that this fauna is already in an advanced state of decline due to habitat transformation.


# 1. INTRODUCTION, CREDENTIALS AND DECLARATION

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Ken Coetzee, of *Conservation Management Services*, was contracted by client representative and EAP working with the EIA application, Andrew West of Andrew West Environmental Consultancy, to do a fauna sensitivity analysis of Portions 66 & 67 of the Farm 443, Plettenberg bay (see Figure 1 for the locality of the study site).

The brief included the following:

- i. Inventory of vertebrate fauna.
- ii. Fauna and fauna habitat sensitivity analysis in terms of Red Data classified species predicted to occur on the study site and evaluate the outcomes of the EIA scoping tool in terms of fauna..
- iii. Evaluate condition and value of habitat and correlate with other specialist studies.
- iv. Determine the critical landscape connectivity corridors present on the study site if any.



**Figure 1:** Locality of the study site in Plettenberg bay.

## 1.2 CREDENTIALS OF THE AUTHOR

The author of this report, Mr Ken Coetzee, is registered with the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (Reg No 400099/08) as a “Professional Natural Scientist”, in the field of Ecological Science.

Mr Coetzee is a Master of Technology graduate of the School of Forestry and Nature Conservation of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (Saasveld Campus) in the field of Ecological Science. His Master of Science thesis was a landscape fragmentation study of an endangered small mammal, the riverine rabbit (*Bunolagus monticularis*). Mr. Coetzee is thus well qualified to carry out a fauna study which has the interests of sensitive fauna species and habitat as its core objective.

Mr Coetzee has over 40 years of relevant experience in the field of nature conservation and management, the most recent 26 years of which were self-employed as a biodiversity specialist consultant, involved in a wide variety of nature conservation, landscape planning, habitat evaluation, commercial game ranch and impact assessment projects as fauna specialist.

## 1.3 DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND COMPETANCY

I hereby declare that I, Ken Coetzee trading as Conservation Management Services, comply with all the conditions of PWC: DEA&DP for a person appointed in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations to compile a specialist report, viz:

- I am independent; (see declaration form on page 40)
- I have the required expertise, including knowledge of the NEMA, the EIA Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity and specialist input or study;
- I have performed the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;
- I fully comply with NEMA, the EIA Regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I have disclosed to the applicant, EAP and the Department all material information in the possession of the person that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing –
  - (i) any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority in terms of these Regulations; or
  - (ii) the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by the person in terms of these Regulations for submission to the competent authority;

- I ensure EIA and EMP best practice and clear communication on the methodologies used, and the assumptions, uncertainties and gaps in knowledge; and
- I adhere to the National Environmental Management principles contained in Section 2 of NEMA and the general objectives of Integrated Environmental management contained in Section 23 of NEMA.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY SITE

### 2.1 TOPOGRAPHY

The topography of the study site can be described as gently sloping to the East (sea shore) and also to the West (towards a low elevation wetland). The entire site is located on a dune ridge, which has high points in the central area (see Plate 1). The two sloping planes (West and East facing) are relatively flat except for the dune peak. (see Figure 2A for the site layout and 2B for surrounding land use).



**Figure 2A:** The layout of the study site.



**Figure 2B:** The locality of the study site showing the wetland to the West and the sea-shore to the East and development on both sides of the proposed development site.



**Plate 1:** One of the sand dune high-points on the study site.

## 2.2 HABITAT DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION

This section thus does not attempt to provide a specialist botanical report, although there will be considerable overlap with the botanical report completed for the study site. Reference can thus be made to the botanical report (Vlok, 2020) for plant species information and details of plant communities.

For the purpose of this report, it is necessary to examine vegetation as wildlife habitat at a different scale than that of biome, veld type or vegetation type. This is done further in this section on faunal habitats. (Refer to Figure 2).

It must be appreciated, however, that these units do not describe botanical communities, but rather broad topographical wildlife habitats, of which the vegetation is an important component.

It must also be appreciated that there are usually no clearly defined edges between these habitat types (vegetation units) and that overlap may be considerable. Similarly, there will be numerous internal variations within each unit.

The habitats identified are thus a broad habitat description based on topography, soil type as well vegetation type and structure, from the point of view of the wild animals, and it disregards minor community variation within each unit. The habitat types identified also represent practical and relatively homogenous units for habitat management purposes. The approximate extent of each of the habitat types is shown in Figure 3.

### 2.2.1 VEGETATION


A study of the vegetation was carried out by Vlok (2020) and is sketchily summarized here for ease of reference.

According to Vlok (2020) the vegetation on the study site is in an ecologically degraded condition with a consequently poor plant diversity. The development of the surrounding area has transformed most of the area. According to Vlok (2020) alien *Acacia cyclops* was cleared away in the past but the plants returned in great density after a recent fire. The plant species recorded on the study site are typical of Goukamma Dune Thicket which consists of a mixture of Thicket patches in a Fynbos matrix. The inclusion of Garden Route Shale Fynbos in the vegetation mapping of Mucina and Rutherford (2018) for the study area is a mapping error due to the coarse scale of the national vegetation types.

None of the species that are present on the study area are typical of Garden Route Shale Fynbos.

Vlok (2020) recorded a total of 52 indigenous plant species as follows:

**Trees:** *Acacia cyclops*, *Acacia saligna*, *Apodytes dimidiata*, *Colpoon compressum*, *Euclea racemosa*, *Gymnosporia buxifolia*, *Searsia crenata*, *Searsia glauca*, *Hippobromus pauciflorus*, *Mystrozylon aethiopicum*, *Syderoxylon inerme* and *Tarchonanthus littoralis*.



**Figure 3:** Approximate delineation of the identified habitat types on the study area. The roadway habitat is not mapped, it lies between the two red units.

- Indigenous thicket invaded by *Acacia cyclops*/
- Fynbos patches invaded by *Acacia cyclops*
- Buildings, garden & driveway
- Disturbed and exposed sandy areas
- Fore-dune thicket/Fynbos

**Shrubs and herbs:** *Carissa bispinosa*, *Putterlickia pyracantha*, *Agathosma apiculata*, *Anthospermum aethiopicum*, *Arctotis pinnatifida*, *Chaenostoma campanulatum*, *Grewia occidentalis*, *Helichrysum cymosum*, *H. teretifolium*, *Limoneum scabrum*, *Metalasia muricata*, *Osteospermum moniliferum*, *Passerina vulgaris*, *Pelargonium capitatum*, *Pharnaceum thunbergii*, *Polygala myrtillifolia*, *Salvia africana-lutea*, *Senecio elegans*, *Tetragonia fruticose*, *Solanum quadrangularis*, *Plantago lanceolata* and *Zaluzianskya capensis*.

**Creepers:** *Asparagus aethiopicus*, *Cissampelos capensis*, *Cynanchum ellipticum*, *C. obtusifolium*, *Rhoicissus tridentata* and *Solanum africanum*.

**Graminoids:** *Sporobolus africanus*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Cyperus ustitatus*, *Ehrharta villosa*, *Ficinia arenicola*, *F. oligantha*, *F. ramosissima*, *Hellmuthia membracacea*, *Imperata cylindrica*, *Melica racemosa*, *Avena fatua*, *Lolium perenne*, *Restio Eleocharis* and *Stipagrostis zeyheri*.

**Geophytes:** *Anemone vesicatoria*, *Chasmanthe aethiopica* and *Cyanella lutea*.

**Succulents:** *Carpabrotus edulis*, *C. acinaciformis*, *Crassula expansa* and *Mesembryanthemum crystallinum*.

No rare or threatened species were found or are suspected to occur on the proposed development site.

## 2.2.2 SUMMARY OF ANIMAL HABITAT POTENTIAL

The following Table (1) illustrates the range of habitats that are available for wildlife on the study site (see Figure 3). These habitat descriptions are based on the physical characteristics, availability of water, the vegetation types and also the degree of disturbance at the site.

**Table 1: Summarized description of habitat for wildlife.  
(Alien plants a shown in bold type).**

HABITAT DESCRIPTION	IMPORTANT PHYSICAL AND HABITAT FEATURES	IMPORTANT VEGETATION COVER SPECIES
1. Indigenous Thicket & <i>Acacia cyclops</i> bush	Consists of a very dense mix of indigenous thicket shrubs and small trees dominated by <b><i>Acacia cyclops</i></b> on a dune sand substrate.  See Plate 2.	<b><i>Acacia cyclops</i></b> , <i>Searsia glauca</i> , <i>Tarchonanthus littoralis</i> , <i>Sideroxylon inerme</i> , <i>Mystroxylon aethiopicum</i> , <i>Grewia occidentalis</i> , <i>Osteospermum moniliferum</i> , <i>Polygala myrtillifolia</i> , <i>Carissa bispinosa</i> , <i>Cussonia thyrsoflora</i> and <b><i>Acacia saligna</i></b> .
2. Fynbos matrix patches variously invaded by <i>Acacia cyclops</i>	Consists of relatively open habitat on dune sand with mostly a sparse fynbos plant cover with light to moderately dense cover of <b><i>Acacia cyclops</i></b> . Physical features include higher sand dunes, mostly vegetated.  See Plate 3.	<i>Anthospermum aethiopicum</i> , <i>Helichrysum teretifolium</i> , <i>Metalasia muricata</i> , <i>Passerina vulgaris</i> , <i>Tetragonia fruticosa</i> and <i>Pelargonium capitatum</i> .
3. Disturbed and exposed sandy habitats	Flatter areas disturbed by previous building activity and consisting of open sand with pathes of crushed stone, tile rubble with a sparse cover of pioneer dune plant species and grasses.  See Plate 4.	<i>Solanum quadrangularis</i> , <i>Carpobrotus acinaciformis</i> , <i>C. edulis</i> , <i>Ehrharta villosa</i> , <b><i>Bromus diandrus</i></b> , <i>Pelargonium capitatum</i> and <i>Crassula expansa</i> .

4. Buildings	Large double story building providing some cover for small animals.	No plant cover, other than <b><i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i></b> on paving and on former lawn areas.
5. Roadway	Variouly stabilized road with sandy verges covered in grasses, sometimes densely.  See Plate 5.	<i>Cynodon dactylon</i> , <i>Imperata cylindrica</i> , <i>Melica racemosa</i> and <i>Sporobolus africanus</i> .
6. Foredune	Densely vegetated and almost intact Thicket/Fynbos mosaic on the primary dune, apparently undisturbed but also invaded by <b><i>Acacia cyclops</i></b> .  See Plate 6.	All the Thicket tree and shrub species listed in 1. above but also with a dense cover of <i>Ehrharta villosa</i> and a thick layer of plant litter.



**Plate 2**: The area of dense Thicket, completely dominated by the alien invasive ***Acacia cyclops***.



**Plate 3:** Small areas of Fynbos within the Thicket/Fynbos matrix, variously Invaded by *Acacia cyclops*. The red plant is *Crassula expansa*.



**Plate 4:** An exposed area of sand that was disturbed by the original building activities on the study site.



**Plate 5: The access roadway to the original house showing a dense cover of grasses on the sandy soil.**



**Plate 6: The relatively undisturbed foredune area.**

### **2.2.3 A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY SITE**

The study site lies in a line of already developed properties (see Figure 2B). Both to the left and right of the study site the properties are residentially developed with most of each property transformed. The study site itself is partly transformed with a residential development and the disturbance created during its construction. On some of these neighbouring properties some of the original natural vegetation has been retained but natural habitat in the entire developed area can best be described as completely fragmented.

The exception is the foredune area on the Eastern sea-side which appears to be undisturbed and the reed filled wetland to the West which is also relatively undisturbed (see Figure 2). The wetland is also bound by a rocky cliff-face on its Western side, which introduces a whole different range of interesting habitat possibilities (for example for crevasse-roosting bats and gecko and lizard habitat).

The natural fauna in these foredune and wetland areas may be intact, but the line of development along the coast has effectively cut-off natural dispersal and foraging movement by animals (with the exception of some birds) between the two habitat types. The study site thus does not represent any kind of “last link” between the foredune area and the wetland.

The last remnants of natural habitat along the line of development (including the proposed development site) is currently being further degraded by a dense infestation of the alien *Acacia cyclops* which results in severely altered habitat conditions.


In terms of the local fauna, the development along the primary dune area should never have been approved and no attempt to rectify the situation at this late stage will make it right. The damage has already been irretrievably done.

## **3. FAUNAL OCCURRENCE**

### **3.1 THE BASIC HABITAT MODEL**

The fauna of the study area is typical of the South Cape Coastal Thicket/Fynbos Mosaic. It is relatively intact, except that most of the original larger mammal species were eradicated by the end of the nineteenth century. Smaller wildlife, however, is also under threat in the Southern Cape area as a result of habitat destruction for expanding development and the effects of over-frequent fires fueled by invasive alien plants.

A habitat model forms the basis for habitat inventory and entails using a set of habitat components or attributes to predict some or other characteristic of a wildlife population (Cooperrider et al, 1986). For this study, the method used to determine the presence or absence of faunal species closely follows the habitat model of Cooperrider et al (1986) and can be simply illustrated as follows:



The single most important predictor of occurrence is probably geographic location. Most wildlife species are quite restricted in geographic distribution, therefore, geographic location, together with knowledge of species distribution, is adequate to predict species potentially present in the area. However, wildlife species are rarely present continuously within their geographic ranges, and complete delineations of all sites used by a species are usually not available. (Cooperrider et al, 1986).

A more accurate prediction of presence and more detailed predictions about population attributes obviously requires much more detailed information on habitat components present (Cooperrider et al, 1986), but this degree of detail is outside of the scope of this study.

## 3.2 FAUNA INVENTORY

The most recently published distribution data for mammal, reptile, amphibian and avian species were used for this study. The presence of animals in the study area was determined on a probability basis assessed in terms of the habitats found on the study site (Table 2) and the known (published) geographic distribution of each likely species. Local knowledge and site observations were also used to refine the predictions. This method has been widely used for inventory and impact assessment purposes as an alternative to the physical location of fauna which is restrictive and impractical in terms of time and cost.

It must be appreciated that these checklists are preliminary. The following description of the fauna is per faunal group:

### 3.2.1 AMPHIBIAN INVENTORY

The study site provides no examples of typical amphibian wetland habitat nor are there any indications that such habitat may temporarily become available during the wet season. Of the 15 amphibian species listed, and that are known to occur in the area, only one species, the plain rain frog *Breviceps fuscus* is considered likely to occur on the study site because it does not require open water in which to breed, as is the case with all the other listed species. (See Appendix 1).

Distributions were determined with reference to Passmore & Carruthers (1995), Carruthers (2001), Wager (1965) and Minter et al (2004).

### 3.2.2 REPTILE INVENTORY

The presence or absence of reptiles is much more difficult to predict than that of the amphibians which have a more predictable habitat. Of the 33 reptile species predicted to occur in the area, 5 are excluded due to unsuitable habitat. Of the 28 reptiles considered to be likely to or possibly occurring on the study site, 3 are *Chelonians* (tortoises), 1 is a chameleon, 18 are snakes, 3 are geckos and 8 are lizards. (See Appendix 2).

8 of the 33 reptile species are endemic to the subregion, most with very small distribution ranges. Although it is highly unlikely that all 33 reptile species actually do occur on the study site, the list merely reflects probability of occurrence based on known distribution and predicted habitat suitability.

Distributions were determined with reference to Fitzimons (1962), Branch (1988) and Bates et al, (2014).

### 3.2.3 MAMMAL INVENTORY

The limited range of habitats (see Table 2) provide for an equally limited variety of mammal types (see Table 3). Of the 28 species predicted to occur in the general study area, the habitat is unsuitable for 3, 16 are considered likely to occur and 9 are considered possibilities. The breakdown of number of species per mammal group is as follows:

Insectivores (shrews, moles)	- 4
Chiroptera (bats)	- 3
Lagomorphs (rabbits and hares)	- 1
Rodents (rats and mice)	-13
Carnivores (genets and mongooses)	- 2
Ungulates (antelopes)	- 1

Distribution was determined with reference to Skinner & Chimimba (2005) Stuart & Stuart (1996), Mills & Hess (1997), Roberts (1951) and Friedman & Daly (2004).

### 3.2.4 BIRD (AVIFAUNA) INVENTORY

Birds are comparatively more mobile than other animals and their predicted and observed presence on the study site does not necessarily indicate permanent residence or occupation of the available habitats. Kelp gulls, for example, observed during the fieldwork may only use the study site buildings as resting refuge and will feed on the nearby seashore. The habitats available to birds on the study site may thus constitute only part of the ecological requirements for certain species. Habitat variability on the study area for birds, however, is minimal, which is reflected in the relatively low diversity of species predicted to occur.

Of the 43 bird species predicted to occur, either permanently or partly on the study area, 14 were by sightings made during the fieldwork (See Appendix 4 for the full checklist).

Distributions were determined with reference to Sinclair et al (1997), Maclean (1985), Harrison et al (1997) and Taylor et al (2015).

### **3.2.5 INVERTEBRATE INVENTORY**

There is no concise inventory for the invertebrates of the general Plettenberg Bay study site nor was it within the scope of this study to produce such an inventory. Both the screening tool and SANBI (2021) identifies two insect species of high sensitivity that may occur at the study site as follows:

A. *Aneuryphymus montanus* – yellow winged agile grasshopper. This grasshopper occurs in fynbos in rocky foothills, particularly on the cooler south-facing slopes. Threatened by farmland expansion and alien plant invasions. It is known to occur in the Southern Cape but details are not available.

B. *Aloeides thyra orientalis* – red copper wing (Brenton subspecies). This butterfly occurs on the Brenton peninsula near Knysna. It occurs in coastal Fynbos on flat sandy ground and the butterfly is dependent on host plants in the *Aspalathus* genus. The butterfly is severely affected by alien plant invasion.

## **4. RED DATA CLASSIFICATION, OCCURRENCE AND HABITAT SENSITIVITY**

Animals have been classified in terms of the ever-increasing threats of overexploitation, illegal trade or habitat transformation. They are rated in terms of their vulnerability to extinction in Red Data lists, one for each animal group. See Appendix 5 for Red Data classifications (ie: degree of vulnerability).

The screening tool identified a number of sensitive species that may occur in the study area or that may be impacted by the proposed development. These species will be discussed separately under each faunal group.

### **4.1 AMPHIBIAN AND REPTILE SENSITIVITY**

With respect to amphibians, Minter et al (2004) state that “habitat loss or modification as a result of agriculture and other forms of human activity remains the most important single threat to the survival of amphibian populations, because of the scale of these changes and their relative permanence. At greatest risk are species that have limited distributions.” It is thus clear that the remaining natural habitats on the study area should also be considered in terms of amphibian conservation and impacted as little as possible, in the interests of herptile persistence in the area.

### Species identified by the screening tool: *Afrivalus knysnae*

Only one of the amphibians predicted to occur in the general area is listed as a Red Data species (endangered). (See Table 2). The endemic Knysna leaf-folding frog occurs in Mountain Fynbos and Afromontane Forest, usually in swampy wetland areas within these habitats. On the study site there is no habitat that meets these requirements so the Knysna leaf folding frog is thus not considered likely, or even a possibility, to occur on the study site.

All of the substrates on the study site consist of deep marine sand and dunes, with no water holding capacity, the habitat is thus too dry for *A. knysnae*. It is possible that this species may occur in the wetland to the West, but definitely not on the study site.

### Species identified by the screening tool: *Tetradactylus Fitzsimonsi*

Fitzsimons long tailed seps is classed as vulnerable and none of the other reptile species predicted to occur in the study area are listed as Red Data species (see Table 2 and Appendix 2). The long tailed seps is only known to occur at three sites, Port Elizabeth, Humansdorp and George. It is thus not known to occur in the Plettenberg Bay area and thus also not on the study site.

**TABLE 2: Red Data classification and occurrence potential for the Amphibians and Reptiles that were predicted by the screening tool to occur on the study site.**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	RED DATA CATEGORY	PREDICTED OCCURRENCE ON THE STUDY SITE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS (Minter et al,2004 & Bates et al, 2014)
Knysna leaf-folding frog	<i>Afrivalus knysnae</i>	Endangered (Minter et al, 2004)	Does not occur Due to habitat unsuitability	Mountain Fynbos / Afromontane Forest Mosaic. Roadside pools in forest clearings, ponds in Fynbos.
Fitzsimons long tailed seps	<i>Tetradactylus fitzsimonsi</i>	Vulnerable (Bates et al, 2014)	Not known to occur in the study site area, only known from Port Elizabeth, Humansdorp and George	Habitat not well known, the other seps species occur mostly in grassland and marshy areas.

## 4.2 MAMMAL SENSITIVITY

Table 3 lists the Red Data listed mammal species which were identified by the screening tool as well as other species which are Red Data listed mammal species but not identified by the screening tool. (See Table 3 and Appendix 3).

**Species identified by the screening tool: *Chlorotalpa duthieae***

Duthies golden mole is classified as *endangered*. This mole occurs in alluvial sands and sandy loam soils within the coastal forests of the fynbos biome. It is not likely to occur on the study site due to habitat unsuitability, there is no forest or similar habitat on the study site.

**Other Red Data listed mammals: *Myosorex longicaudatus***

The long-tailed forest shrew is classified as *endangered*. It is essentially a forest animal but it also occurs in Forest/Fynbos ecotones and fynbos, but always in moist bog-like habitat. It is not likely to occur on the study site due to habitat unsuitability because there are definitely no wetland-like or moist habitats on the study site. It is all dry dune sand. The long-tailed forest shrew is classed as endangered due to the sustained and increasing loss and fragmentation of forest and thicket habitat in its distribution area. Fortunately, this does not apply to the study area.

**Other Red Data listed mammals: *Philantomba monticola***

The blue duiker is classified as *vulnerable*. They occur in forests, thickets and very dense coastal bush along the East coast of South Africa. The rooikrans invaded thicket/Fynbos on the study site does not provide suitable habitat as it does not contain suitable forage or cover habitat. Blue duiker is thus not likely to occur on the study site.

**Other Red Data listed mammal species: *Mystromus albicaudatus***

The white-tailed mouse is classified as *vulnerable*. It is essentially a grassland animal but it also occurs in the Fynbos biome, preferring the more-grassy habitats (De Graaff, 1981). The study site does not provide suitable habitat. The loose sandy soil of the dunes is not the typical substrate habitat of this mouse although the forage appears to be suitable. According to Skinner and Chimimba (2005), the study site lies within a marginal area for this species. According to De Graaff (1981) there are no distribution records for this species in the general study area.

**TABLE 3: Red Data classification and occurrence potential for the Mammals that were predicted by the screening tool to occur on the study site and that were excluded from the mammal checklist (Appendix 3) due to habitat unsuitability.**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	RED DATA CATEGORY (SANBI, 2016)	PREDICTED OCCURRENCE ON THE STUDY SITE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS (Skinner & Chimimba, 2005)
Duthies golden mole	<i>Chlorotalpa duthieae</i>	Endangered	Does not occur on the study site due to habitat unsuitability, there is no forest habitat on the study site.	Occur in alluvial sands and sandy loam soils within the coastal forests of the fynbos biome.

Long-tailed forest shrew	<i>Myosorex longicaudatus</i>	Endangered	Does not occur on the study site due to habitat unsuitability. There are definitely no wetland-like or moist habitats on the study site.	Essentially a forest animal but also occurs in ecotones and fynbos, but always in moist bog-like habitat.
Blue duiker	<i>Philantomba monticola</i>	Vulnerable	Will not occur on the study site. The rooikrans invaded Thicket/Fynbos on the study site does not provide suitable foraging or cover habitat.	Occur in forests, thickets and very dense coastal bush. The rooikrans invaded thicket/Fynbos on the study site does not provide suitable habitat.
White tailed mouse	<i>Mystromys albicaudatus</i>	Vulnerable	The study site does not provide suitable habitat. The loose sandy soil of the dunes is not the typical substrate of this mouse but forage appears to be suitable.	Essentially a grassland animal but also occur in the Fynbos biome, preferring grassy habitats (De Graaff, 1981).

### 4.3 AVIFAUNA SENSITIVITY

The Red Data Classification and probability of occurrence for the birds predicted by the screening tool to occur on the study site is listed in Table 4. Red Data classification is according to Taylor (2015).

**Species identified by the screening tool: *Circus ranivorus*.**

The marsh harrier is classified as *endangered*. It is not considered to be likely or even a possible to occur on the study site because it is dependent on permanent wetland habitat. There are no such wetlands on the study site but the marsh harrier may occur in the wetland to the West of the study site.

**Species identified by the screening tool: *Neotis denhami***

Denhams bustard is classified as *vulnerable*. This bustard does not occur on the study site due to the complete lack of suitable habitat. The rooikrans invaded Thicket/Fynbos is certainly not suitable habitat in terms of food potential or cover, bustards prefer open pasture, cropland, grassy or dwarf shrub habitats. Denhams bustard may occur in the general area on farmlands and pastures but certainly not on the alien tree invaded study site.

Species identified by the screening tool: *Bradypterus sylvaticus*.

The Knysna warbler is classified as *vulnerable*. They occur along edges of Afro-temperate forest and in thick tangled vegetation along drainages in the Forest and Fynbos Biomes. It is thus unlikely that they occur on the study site due to the lack of suitable habitat. The rooikrans invaded Fynbos/Thicket on the study site does not provide the preferred habitat for this species. The sea-shore locality is also not typical Knysna warbler habitat.

Species identified by the screening tool: *Campethera notata*

The Knysna woodpecker is classified as *near threatened*. They occur in occur in dense arboreal (tree rich) habitats, coastal bush and other forest types. It is unlikely that they occur on the study site due to the lack of any kind of dense tree habitat on the site. The Knysna woodpecker is known to nest in stands of alien trees but this applies to large alien trees in which they can excavate their nests into the trunks of the trees and this is not the situation on the study site. The sea-shore locality of the site is also not typical woodpecker habitat.

**TABLE 4: Red Data classification and occurrence potential for the BIRDS that were predicted by the screening tool to occur on the study site.**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	RED DATA CATEGORY (Taylor et al, 2015)	PREDICTED OCCURRENCE ON THE STUDY SITE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS (Taylor et al, 2015)
African marsh harrier	<i>Circus ranivorus</i>	Endangered	Does not occur due to habitat unsuitability	Dependant on permanent wetlands, inland and coastal. May hunt over Fynbos but breeds and feeds in wetlands.
Denhams bustard	<i>Neotis denhami</i>	Vulnerable	Does not occur on the study site due to the lack of suitable habitat. The rooikrans invaded Thicket/Fynbos is certainly not suitable habitat.	Occurs in groups on pastures, croplands and coastal grasslands.
Knysna warbler	<i>Bradypterus sylvaticus</i>	Vulnerable	Does not occur on the study site due to the lack of suitable habitat.	Occurs along edges of Afro-temperate forest and in thick tangled vegetation along drainages in forest and Fynbos
Knysna woodpecker	<i>Campethera notata</i>	Near threatened	Does not occur due to the lack of any kind of dense tree habitat	Occurs in dense arboreal (tree rich) habitats, coastal bush and forest. types.

## 4.4 INVERTEBRATE SENSITIVITY

Species identified by the screening tool: *Aneuryphymus montanus*

The yellow winged agile grasshopper is classified as *vulnerable*. As it is reported to occur in fynbos in rocky foothills, this species is not likely to occur on the study site.

There is no such rocky foothill fynbos on the study site or anywhere near to it. This grasshopper is known to be threatened by the invasions of alien plants and if it did occur in the general study area then residential expansion and repeated generations of alien plant invasions will have eliminated the populations some time ago.

Species identified by the screening tool: *Aloeides thyra orientis*

The red copper wing (Brenton subspecies) is classified as *endangered*. It is reported to occur in coastal Fynbos on flat sandy ground where it is completely dependent on its host plants which are species of the genus *Aspalathus*.

Vlok (2020) did not list any *Aspalathus sp.* in his plant checklist for the study site. In addition to this the butterfly has not been recorded East of the Brenton area, or anywhere near to the Plettenberg Bay general area (Pers. Comm. Dave Edge, 15 Nov. 2021). Alien plant invasions are a particular threat to *Aloeides* and it can be postulated that the dense infestations of *Acacia cyclops* on the study site have made the habitat unsuitable for the red copper wing butterfly.

## 5. LANDSCAPE CONNECTIVITY

The study site lies in a line of already developed properties (see Figure 2). Both to the left and right (North and South) of the study site the properties are residentially developed with most of each property transformed. The study site itself is partly transformed with a residential development and the disturbance created during its construction. On some of these neighbouring properties some of the original natural vegetation has been retained but natural habitat in the entire developed area can best be described as completely fragmented and represent very marginal “stepping stone” connectivity.

The exception is the foredune area on the Eastern sea-side which appears to be undisturbed and the reed filled wetland to the West which is also relatively undisturbed (see Figure 2). The wetland is also bound by a rocky cliff-face on its Western side, which introduces a whole different range of interesting habitat possibilities (for example for crevasse-roosting bats and gecko and lizard habitat).

The natural fauna in these foredune and wetland areas may be intact, but the line of development along the coast has effectively cut-off natural dispersal and foraging movement by animals (with the exception of some birds) between the two habitat types.

*The study site thus does not represent any kind of “last link” between the foredune area and the wetland.*

The ever-increasing problem of *Acacia cyclops* invasion also has a negative effect on most parts of remaining natural vegetation in the general area because it completely transforms the original natural habitat. On the study site *A. cyclops* has invaded approximately half of the site which will eventually result in the loss of half of the original Fynbos/Thicket vegetation. The other half is already transformed by the derelict building and its associated disturbances.

In terms of the local fauna, the development along the primary dune area should never have been approved and no attempt to rectify the situation at this late stage will make it right. The damage has already been irretrievably done.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Inventories for terrestrial fauna of the general study site were drawn up from the literature. Each species identified was then evaluated in terms of the occurrence of its required habitat on the study site and then listed as likely to occur, a possibility to occur or unlikely to occur on the study site.

The Red Data listed species of each group were then also evaluated in terms of their occurrence on the study site in terms of habitat suitability. Animal species that were identified by means of the screening tool were also evaluated in terms of habitat suitability on the study site.

None of the red Data listed or the screening tool identified species were considered to occur on or even use the study site on a permanent basis. The study site habitats do not represent any kind of critical or specialized resource for any of the sensitive animal species.

The habitats available on the study site are all anthropogenically impacted, to a variable degree, but the current situation is set to deteriorate swiftly due to the devastating impact of invasive alien *Acacia cyclops*, which in the last few years has spread over much of the site and which will mature to the further detriment of all indigenous plant and animal species.

The currently disturbed habitats cannot be described as useful or necessary linkage habitat, and with the continued spread and maturity of the alien trees, will become even less likely to provide linkages for animal movement.

*The study site thus does not represent any kind of “last link” between the relatively intact foredune area on the Eastern side of the study site and the relatively undisturbed wetland on the Western side of the study site.*

It can thus be summarized with a high degree of confidence that the study site is of little importance to the fauna predicted to occur on it and that this fauna is already in an advanced state of decline due to habitat transformation.

## 7. REFERENCES

- Branch, W R. 1998. Field guide to snakes and other reptiles of Southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town. 399 pp.
- Carruthers, V. 2001. Frogs and frogging in Southern Africa. Creda Press (Pty) Ltd, Cape Town. 99 pp.
- Cooperrider, A Y; Boyd, R J & Stuart, H R. 1986. Inventory and monitoring of wildlife habitat. U S Dept Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Denver. 858 pp.
- Edge, D. 2021. Personal communication re. butterfly distribution, 15 November, 2021.
- Estes, R D. 1997. Behaviour Guide to African mammals. Russel Friedman Books.
- FitzSimons, V F M. 1962. Snakes of Southern Africa. Purnell & Sons (SA) (PTY) Ltd, Cape Town / Johannesburg.
- Friedman Y & Daly B. 2004. Red Data Book of the Mammals of South Africa: A Conservation Assessment: CBSG Southern Africa, Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (SSC/IUCN), Endangered Wildlife Trust. South Africa.
- Harrison, J A; Allan, L G; Underhill, L G; Herremans, M; Tree, A J; Parker, V & Brown, C J. (Eds). 1997. The atlas of Southern African Birds. Vol 1: Non-Passerines and Vol 2: Passerines. Avian Demography Unit, University of Cape Town. Birdlife South Africa, Johannesburg.
- Maclean, G L. 1985. Robert's Birds of Southern Africa. John Voelcker Bird Book Fund, Cape Town. 848 pp.
- Mills, G & Hess, L. 1997. The complete book of Southern African Mammals. Struik, Cape Town. 356 pp.
- Minter, L R; Burger, M; Harrison, J A; Braack, H H; Bishop, P J & Kloepfer, D., eds. 2004. Atlas and Red Data Book of the Frogs of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SI/MAB Series #9. Smithsonian Institute, Washington DC.
- Passmore, N I & Carruthers, V C. 1995. South African Frogs – A complete guide (Revised Edition). Southern Book Publishers, Halfway House and Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg. 322 pp.
- Roberts, A. 1951. The mammals of South Africa. Cape Times Ltd, Parow. 701 pp.
- Sinclair, I; Hockey, P & Tarboton, W. 1997. Sasol Birds of Southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town. 445 pp.
- Skinner, J D & Chimimba, C T. 2005. The mammals of the Southern African Subregion. Cambridge University Press. 814 pp

## APPENDIX 1: AMPHIBIA CHECKLIST

SPECIES	COMMON NAME	OCCURRENCE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
<i>Bufo pardalis</i>	Eastern leopard toad	Habitat unsuitable	Grassy or open habitats in fynbos, with open water.
<i>Bufo rangeri</i>	Raucus toad	Habitat unsuitable	Vleis, pans, rivers, open pasture areas in fynbos habitats.
<i>Semnodactylus wealii</i>	Rattling frog	Habitat unsuitable	Vleis, ponds, dams in grassland & fynbos.
<i>Hyperolius marmoratus</i>	Marbles reed frog	Habitat unsuitable	Vleis, pans, dams in forest & fynbos habitats.
<i>Hyperolius horstockii</i>	Arum lily frog	Habitat unsuitable	Vegetated shores, reeds, bushes, arums in fynbos habitats.
<i>Afrixalus knysnae</i>	Knysna leaf-folding frog	Habitat unsuitable	Mountain fynbos and Afromontane- forest with open water.
<i>Breviceps fuscus</i>	Plain rain frog	Likely	Live underground in burrows in forest and fynbos.
<i>Xenopus laevis</i>	Common platana	Habitat unsuitable	Permanent water a requirement.
<i>Cacosternum boettgeri</i>	Common caco	Habitat unsuitable	Permanent and/or temporary ponds and puddles.
<i>Cacosternum nanum</i>	Bronze caco	Habitat unsuitable	Marshes, vleis, small streams.
<i>Afrana angolensis</i>	Common river frog	Habitat unsuitable	Permanent water with aquatic vegetation.
<i>Afrana fuscigula</i>	Cape river frog	Habitat unsuitable	Permanent water, still water.
<i>Strongylopus fasciatus</i>	Striped stream frog	Habitat unsuitable	Streams, ponds, dams, seepages with grassy margins.
<i>Strongylopus grayii</i>	Clicking stream frog	Habitat unsuitable	Shallow water with well vegetated borders.
<i>Tomopterna delalandii</i>	Cape sand frog	Habitat unsuitable	Edges of pans, dams, vleis, sandy areas with open water.

### **Amphibians – Probability of each species occurring on the study site (main reference - Minter et al, 2004)**

Confirmed: Species presence actually confirmed by means of sighting, spoor or droppings on the study site.

Likely : Species presence recorded in similar habitats in neighbouring areas and within known distribution.

Possible : Species presence possible on site due to overlap of habitat requirements and nearby known distribution.

## APPENDIX 2: REPTILE CHECKLIST

SPECIES	COMMON NAME	OCCURRENCE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
<i>Rhinotyphlops lalandei</i>	Delalande's beaked blind snake.	Likely	Varied; fossorial. (Endemic).
<i>Boaedon capensis</i>	Brown house snake.	Likely	Varied.
<i>Lamphrophis aurora</i>	Aurora house snake.	Likely	Fynbos habitat.
<i>Lycodonomorphus inornatus</i>	Olive house snake.	Likely	Moist coastal areas. (Endemic).
<i>Duberria lutrix lutrix</i>	Common slug eater.	Likely	Coastal forest and fynbos – moist areas.
<i>Pseudaspis cana</i>	Mole snake.	Likely	Varied, coastal, sandy fynbos, thicket.
<i>Amplorhinus multimaculatus</i>	Many-spotted snake.	Habitat unsuitable	Mountain streams and vleis.
<i>Psammophylax rhombeatus</i>	Rhombic skaapsteker.	Likely	Forest fynbos – moist areas.
<i>Psammophis cruifer</i>	Montaine grass snake.	Habitat unsuitable	Mountain fynbos/grassveld.
<i>Homoroselaps lacteus</i>	Spotted harlequin snake.	Possible	Varied. (Endemic).
<i>Philothamnus hoplogaster</i>	Eastern green snake.	Possible	Varied.
<i>Dasypeltiis scabra</i>	Common or rhombic egg eater.	Likely	Varied.
<i>Crotaphopeltis hotamboeia</i>	Red-lipped snake.	Possible	Open moist areas.
<i>Dispholidus typus</i>	Boomslang.	Likely	Forest, fynbos.
<i>Causus rhombeatus</i>	Common or rhombic night adder.	Possible	Forest, fynbos – moist areas.
<i>Bitis arietans</i>	Puff adder.	Likely	Varied, sandy coastal, fynbos.
<i>Pachydactylus geitjje</i>	Ocellated, thick-toed gecko.	Possible	Fynbos. (Endemic).
<i>Pachydactylus maculatus</i>	Spotted thick-toed gecko	Possible	Fynbos, coastal bush.

**Reptiles.** (Continued overleaf).

SPECIES	COMMON NAME	OCCURRENCE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
<i>Afrogecko porphyreus</i>	Marbled leaf-toed gecko	Likely	Coastal, fynbos & forest. (Endemic).
<i>Acontias meleagris meleagris</i>	Cape legless skink	Habitat unsuitable	Leaf litter in forest & forest edge. (Endemic).
<i>Trachylepis capensis</i>	Cape skink	Likely	Forest, forest edge & fynbos.
<i>Trachylepis homalocephala</i>	Red-sided skink	Likely	Forest, forest edge & seepages. (Endemic).
<i>Nucras lalandii</i>	Delalande's sandveld lizard	Likely	Open fynbos. (Endemic).
<i>Pedioplanis lineoocellata pulchella</i>	Spotted sand lizard	Likely	Varied.
<i>Tetradactylus seps seps</i>	Short-legged seps	Possible	Fynbos, varied.
<i>Chamaesaura anguina</i>	Cape grass lizard	Likely	Grassy/fynbos slopes.
<i>Agama atra</i>	Southern rock agama	Habitat unsuitable	Fynbos rocky areas.
<i>Gerrhosaurus flavigularis</i>	Yellow-throated plated lizard	Possible	Open coastal forest.
<i>Geochelone pardalis</i>	Leopard tortoise	Likely	Varied, fynbos and thicket.
<i>Homopus areolatus</i>	Parrot-beaked tortoise	Likely	Varied, coastal – must have cover.
<i>Chersina angulata</i>	Angulate tortoise	Likely	Forest, coastal fynbos, sandy areas.
<i>Pelomedusa subrufa</i>	Cape terrapin	Habitat unsuitable	Permanent water, burrows in drought.
<i>Bradypodion damaranum</i>	Knysna dwarf chameleon	Likely	Coastal forest, bush, gardens.

**Reptiles – Probability of each species occurring on the study site. (Main reference - Bates et al, 2014)**

Confirmed: Species presence actually confirmed by means of sighting, spoor, droppings on the study site.

Likely : Species presence recorded in similar habitats in neighbouring areas and within known distribution.

Possible : Species presence possible on site due to overlap of habitat requirements and nearby known distribution.

### APPENDIX 3: MAMMAL CHECKLIST

SPECIES	COMMON NAME	OCCURRENCE	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
<i>Myosorex longicaudatus</i>	Long-tailed forest shrew	Habitat unsuitable	Forest ecotone – fern clumps, insectivorous.
<i>Myosorex varius</i>	Forest shrew	Habitat unsuitable	Moist, dense habitat, insectivorous.
<i>Crocidura flavescens</i>	Greater musk shrew	Habitat unsuitable	Moist, dense habitat, insectivorous.
<i>Crocidura cyanea</i>	Reddish-grey musk shrew	Possible	Moist – dry habitats.
<i>Crocidura silacea</i>	Lesser grey-brown musk shrew	Possible	Forest / grassland / woodland
<i>Amblysomus corriae</i>	Fynbos golden mole	Likely	Fynbos and forest
<i>Chlorotalpa duthieae</i>	Duthie's golden mole	Possible	Coastal forests.
<i>Miopterus fraterculus</i>	Lesser long-fingered bat	Likely	Various
<i>Neoromicia capensis</i>	Cape serotine bat	Possible	Forest areas, insectivorous.
<i>Rhinolopus capensis</i>	Cape horseshoe bat	Possible	Caves in varied habitats, insectivorous.
<i>Lepus saxatilis</i>	Scrub hare	Possible	Scrub areas, grass cover, vegetarian.
<i>Bathyergus suillus</i>	Cape dune mole-rat	Possible	Sandy soils, vegetarian.
<i>Cryptomys hottentotus</i>	Common mole-rat	Likely	Moist soils, vegetarian.
<i>Myomyscus verreauxi</i>	Verreaux's mouse	Likely	Fynbos scrub. forest edge
<i>Gerbillurus paeba</i>	Hairy-footed gerbil	Likely	Sandy substrates, disturbed sites
<i>Georchus capensis</i>	Cape mole-rat	Possible	Sandy soils, vegetarian.
<i>Hystrix africaeutralis</i>	Porcupine	Likely	Varied habitat, vegetarian.
<i>Otomys irroratus</i>	Vlei rat	Likely	Wetland & swampy areas, eats grass/sedges.
<i>Mus musculus</i>	House mouse	Likely	Varied habitat, eats grass seeds, insects & vegetable matter.
<i>Rhabdomys pumilio</i>	Striped mouse	Likely	Fynbos, shrubveld, wetland.
<i>Mus minutoides</i>	Pygmy mouse	Likely	Fynbos, wetland, disturbed areas.
<i>Mastomys coucha</i>	Multimammate mouse	Likely	Varied habitat, omnivorous.
<i>Saccostomys campestris</i>	Pouched mouse	Likely	Varied habitat.
<i>Mystromys albicaudatus</i>	White-tailed mouse	Possible	Macchia, grassland.
<i>Genetta genetta</i>	Small-spotted genet	Likely	Wooded & wetland areas
<i>Ictonyx striatus</i>	Striped polecat	Likely	Varied habitat, insectivorous & carnivorous.

(Continued overleaf)

<b>SPECIES</b>	<b>COMMON NAME</b>	<b>OCCURRENCE</b>	<b>HABITAT REQUIREMENTS</b>
<i>Galerella pulverulenta</i>	Small grey mongoose	Possible	Forest, scrub & grassland.
<i>Raphiceros melanotis</i>	Grysbok	Possible	Thick bush, hilly areas, fynbos.
<i>Philantomba monticola</i>	Blue duiker	Habitat unsuitable	Forest and dense shrub habitats.

**Mammals – Probability of each species occurring on the study site (Friedman & Daly, 2004).**

- Confirmed: Species presence actually confirmed by means of sighting, spoor, droppings on the study area.  
Likely : Species presence recorded in similar habitats in neighbouring areas and within known distribution.  
Possible : Species presence possible on site due to overlap of habitat requirements and nearby known distribution.

## APPENDIX 4: BIRD CHECKLIST

SPECIES	THICKET/FYNBOS	
	LIKELY	C'FIRMED
Bar-throated apalis	X	
Black-shouldered kite	X	
African goshawk	X	X
Bokmakierie	X	X
Cape batis	X	
Cape bulbul	X	X
Cape bunting	X	
Cape canary	X	
Cape francolin	X	
Cape robin	X	
Cape sparrow	X	
Cape wagtail	X	
Cape white-eye	X	X
Common quail	X	
Common waxbill	X	
Crowned plover	X	
European starling	X	
European swallow	X	X
Familiar chat	X	
Fiscal flycatcher	X	
Fiscal shrike	X	X
Fork tailed drongo	x	
Grassbird	X	
Grassveld pipit	X	
Greater double-collared sunbird	X	
Greater striped swallow	X	
Guinea fowl	X	
Hadeda	X	X
Kelp gull	X	X
Laughing dove	X	X
Lesser double-collared sunbird	X	
Malachite sunbird	X	
Olive thrush	X	X
Orange-breasted sunbird	X	
Red-eyed dove	X	X
Red-necked francolin	X	
Redwing starling	X	
Rock pigeon	X	
Sombre bulbul	X	X
Southern boubou	X	X
Speckled mousebird	X	
Spotted prinia	X	
Turtle dove	X	X

**Birds – Probability of each species occurring on the study site (Harrison et al, 1997).**

Confirmed: Species presence confirmed by means of sightings and birdsong.

Likely : Species presence recorded in similar habitats in neighbouring areas and within known distribution for each species.

## **APPENDIX 5**

### **RED DATA BOOK CATEGORIES FOR MAMMALS**

**(SOURCE: Friedman Y and Daly, B (editors) 2004. Red Data Book of the Mammals of South Africa: A conservation Assessment: CBSG Southern Africa, Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (SSC/IUCN), Endangered Wildlife Trust, South Africa).**

#### **EXTINCT (EX)**

A taxon is extinct when there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual has died. A taxon is presumed Extinct when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times (diurnal, seasonal, annual), throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

#### **EXTINCT IN THE WILD (EW)**

A taxon is Extinct in the Wild when it is known only to survive in cultivation, in captivity or as a naturalized population (or populations) well outside the past range. A taxon is presumed Extinct in the Wild when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times (diurnal, seasonal, annual), throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time frame appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

#### **CRITICALLY ENDANGERED (CR)**

A taxon is Critically Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing an extremely high risk extinction in the wild.

#### **ENDANGERED (EN)**

A taxon is Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing a very high risk extinction in the wild.

#### **VULNERABLE (VU)**

A taxon is Vulnerable when the best available evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing a high risk extinction in the wild.

#### **NEAR THREATENED (NT)**

A taxon is Near Threatened when it does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable now, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future.

#### **LEAST CONCERN (LC)**

A taxon is Least Concern when it has been evaluated and does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened. Widespread and abundant taxa are included in this category.

#### **DATA DEFICIENT (DD)**

A taxon is Data Deficient when there is inadequate information to make a direct, or indirect, assessment on its risk of extinction based on its distribution and/or population status. A taxon in this category may be well studied, and its biology well known, but appropriate data on abundance and/or distribution are lacking. Data Deficient is therefore not a category of threat. Listing of taxa in this category indicates that more information is required and acknowledges the possibility that future research will show that threatened classification is appropriate.

## **RED DATA BOOK CATEGORIES FOR AMPHIBIANS & REPTILES**

(SOURCE: Minter, L R; Burger, M; Harrison, J A; Braak, H H; Bishop, P J & Kloepfer, D (Eds) 2004. Atlas and Red Data Book of the Frogs of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SI/MAB Series 9. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

Bates, M.F., Branch, W.R., Bauer, A.M., Burger, M, ,Marais, J, Alexander,G.J & De Villiers. 2014. Atlas and Red List of the Reptiles of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Suricata 1, SANBI, Pretoria).

### **EXTINCT (EX)**

A taxon is extinct when there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual has died. A taxon is presumed Extinct when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times (diurnal, seasonal, annual), throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

### **EXTINCT IN THE WILD (EW)**

A taxon is Extinct in the Wild when it is known only to survive in cultivation, in captivity or as a naturalized population (or populations) well outside the past range. A taxon is presumed Extinct in the Wild when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times (diurnal, seasonal, annual), throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time frame appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

### **CRITICALLY ENDANGERED (CR)**

A taxon is Critically Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild.

### **ENDANGERED (EN)**

A taxon is Endangered when the best available evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing a very high risk extinction in the wild.

### **VULNERABLE (VU)**

A taxon is Vulnerable when the best available evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing a high risk extinction in the wild.

### **NEAR THREATENED (NT)**

A taxon is Near Threatened when it does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable now, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to qualify for a threatened category in the near future.

### **LEAST CONCERN (LC)**

A taxon is Least Concern when it has been evaluated and does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened. Widespread and abundant taxa are included in this category.

### **DATA DEFICIENT (DD)**

A taxon is Data Deficient when there is inadequate information to make a direct, or indirect, assessment on its risk of extinction based on its distribution and/or population status. A taxon in this category may be well studied, and its biology well known, but appropriate data on abundance and/or distribution are lacking. Data Deficient is therefore not a category of threat. Listing of taxa in this category indicates that more information is required and acknowledges the possibility that future research will show that threatened classification is appropriate.

## **RED DATA BOOK CATEGORIES FOR BIRDS**

**(SOURCE: Taylor, M.R Peacock, F. & Wanless, R.M. 2015. The 2015 Eskom Red Data Book of Birds of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Birdlife South Africa, Johannesburg.**

### **EXTINCT (EX)**

A taxon is extinct when there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual has died.

### **EXTINCT IN THE WILD (EW)**

A taxon is Extinct in the Wild when it is known only to survive in cultivation, in captivity or as a naturalized population (or populations) well outside the past range. A taxon is presumed Extinct in the Wild when exhaustive surveys in known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate times throughout its historic range have failed to record an individual. Surveys should be over a time frame appropriate to the taxon's life cycle and life form.

### **REGIONALLY EXTINCT (RE)**

A taxon is regionally extinct when there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual potentially capable of reproduction within the region has died or disappeared from the region or, if a former visiting taxon, the last individual has died or disappeared from the region.

### **CRITICALLY ENDANGERED (CR)**

A taxon is Critically Endangered when available scientific evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild.

### **ENDANGERED (EN)**

A taxon is Endangered when available scientific evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing a very high risk extinction in the wild.

### **VULNERABLE (VU)**

A taxon is Vulnerable when the best available scientific evidence indicates that it is considered to be facing a high risk extinction in the wild.

### **NEAR THREATENED (NT)**

A taxon which has been assessed but does not currently qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable, but is close to qualifying for or is likely to become Vulnerable in the near future. Also included here are taxa that are the focus of a continuing taxon-specific or habitat-specific conservation programme targeted towards the taxon in question, the cessation of which would result in the taxon qualifying for one of the threatened categories above within a period of five years.

### **LEAST CONCERN (LC)**

A taxon which has been assessed but does not qualify for Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable and does not qualify for Near Threatened.

### **DATA DEFICIENT (DD)**

A taxon is Data Deficient when there is inadequate information to make a direct, or indirect, assessment on its risk of extinction based on its distribution and/or population status. A taxon in this category may be well studied, and its biology well known, but appropriate data on abundance and/or distribution are lacking. Data Deficient is therefore not a category of threat. Listing of taxa in this category indicates that more information is required and acknowledges the possibility that future research will show that threatened classification is appropriate.



**CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT  
SERVICES – Ken Coetzee**  
4 Chestnut Street, Heather Park, George,  
South Africa, 6529  
Cell no: 0762275056  
e-mail: [consken@mweb.co.za](mailto:consken@mweb.co.za)  
[www.conservationmanagementservices.co.za](http://www.conservationmanagementservices.co.za)

## **CURRICULUM VITAE - KEN COETZEE**

### **PERSONAL DETAILS:**

Full names: Kenneth Coetzee  
Date of birth: 23 December 1952  
ID no: 521223 5058 084  
Nationality: South African  
Marital status: Married  
Profession: Habitat and Wildlife Management Consultant (Present)  
Nature Conservation Manager (Previous)  
Years with firm: Cape Nature Conservation: 25 years  
Own consultancy: 27 years.

### **1. RECORD OF WORK EXPERIENCE:**

#### **1.1 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT SERVICES**

Since 30 July 1996 to present date I have been self-employed as a landscape and wildlife management consultant. My business, *Conservation Management Services*, is now 26 years old and has successfully established and retained a considerable client base, with well over 1200 contracts successfully completed. Conservation Management Services provides evaluation and practical advice to a wide range of landowners, including developers, farmers, nature conservation authorities, private nature reserve, game farm owners and the tourism industry.

Our service provides innovative evaluation, advice, design, planning, assessment and current information in the field of wildlife and habitat management, natural resources inventories, habitat rehabilitation and training (with SETA accreditation), natural resource utilization and sensitive development.

To date, more than 1200 contracts have been successfully completed, mostly in the environmental impact assessment and nature reserve / game ranch management planning fields and rehabilitation training for Sanparks. We have satellite offices in Plettenberg Bay and Knysna which includes a rehabilitation work team and extensive experience in rare game breeding.

## **1.2 SERVICE WITH CAPE NATURE CONSERVATION (CAPE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT CONSERVATION AUTHORITY):**

**1.2.1 1993 – 1996: Divisional Manager (Assistant Director Management)** for the Central Cape Division (South Cape area – Karoo and Coastal), based in George. Responsible for all aspects of conservation management, training and administration. Divisional representative in the Cape Town head Office component. During this period, I was particularly concerned with the development of natural resource inventory on nature reserves, the training of field staff and rural area conservation outside formal nature reserves.

The following list reflects further activities of this period:

- ❖ Established Game Guard Training Committee (first in Province).
- ❖ Researched the endangered riverine rabbit (MSc thesis).
- ❖ Co-established Mountain Zebra Working Group (first in country).
- ❖ Established conservancies on private land.
- ❖ Represented South Africa at International Ranger Symposium in Poland.
- ❖ Produced various handbooks on game guard training, conservancy establishment, picnic site construction, bush camp design and monitoring.
- ❖ Delivery of numerous presentations at scientific workshops/symposia.

In July 1996, after an unbroken service of 25 years in formal nature conservation, I applied for a voluntary severance package to be free to start my own business as a range ecologist and wildlife management consultant.

**1.2.2 1991 – 1993: District Manager (Chief Nature Conservator)** – South Cape Regional and based in Oudtshoorn. Responsible for all aspects of nature reserve management on 12 nature reserves in the Little Karoo and Outeniqua Coastal area. During this period, the development of formal management plans for nature reserves, eco-tourism development and training of field staff was particularly important. The development of formal biological inventory for each conservation area was also important. Performance appraisal of field staff and training were major activities as well.

**1.2.3 1986 – 1991: Principal Nature Reserve Manager** – Karoo Nature Reserve at Graaff-Reinet (now the Camdeboo National Park). Responsible for all aspects of reserve management with an emphasis on habitat rehabilitation, game introductions and developing eco-tourism facilities. During this period, I developed 6 picnic sites for tourists, an education centre for visiting school groups, self-guided trails for visitors and hikers, a game viewing area with observation hides and a system of mountain trail huts. The establishment and maintenance of an ongoing natural resource inventory was also important.

**1.2.4 1975 – 1986: Nature Reserve Manager** – Rolfontein Nature Reserve on the south shore of the Vanderkloof Dam on the Orange River. Eventually controlled 30 000 ha under conservation management. Responsible for all veld, game, infrastructural, tourist and administrative management. During this period, I was particularly involved in the following:

- ❖ Veld monitoring system (developed and implemented techniques).
- ❖ Game census (developed and implemented techniques).
- ❖ Established game guards (of the first in the organisation).
- ❖ Field observation recording (developed and implemented techniques).
- ❖ Habitat preference study of large herbivores. (3-year study).
- ❖ Biological inventory and collection. (Registered with Smithsonian Institute).
- ❖ Designed and constructed game holding bomas (design published).
- ❖ Reintroduction of wildlife (including rare species).
- ❖ Game capture (developed and implemented techniques).
- ❖ Soil erosion control (developed and implemented techniques).
- ❖ Developed game viewing systems for tourists.
- ❖ Developed trail network and accommodation.
- ❖ Assisted with phytosociological study. (3-year study).

**1.2.5 1972 – 1975: Research Technician** – based at the Oviston Nature Reserve on the Gariep Dam – worked largely on fish distribution and production surveys in the Orange River system. During this period, I was also particularly involved in exploratory fish distribution work, seasonal bird inventory along the 100 km lake and vegetation surveys for the reserve.

## 2. PUBLICATIONS

As further example of work experience, the following list of publications illustrates general proficiency in the field of ecological evaluation and management:

- 2.1 Coetzee, K. 1985. A permanent facility (boma) for the temporary housing of medium to large wild ungulates. *Bontebok* 4: 17 – 24.
- 2.2 Fabricius, C & Coetzee, K. 1992. Geographic information system and artificial intelligence to predict the presence or absence of mountain reedbuck. *S Afr J Wild Res* 22: 80 – 86.
- 2.3 Coetzee, K. 1994. The riverine rabbit (*Bunolagus monticularis*) and its habitat: Conservation implications of an unnaturally fragmented distribution. Master's Degree Thesis (MTech). Saasveld School of Forestry, Port Elizabeth Technikon. ( Unpublished dissertation )
- 2.4 Coetzee, K: The fynbos and renosterveld in: Bothma, J du P (2016) Ed: *Game Ranch management-6<sup>th</sup> edition* Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- 2.5 Coetzee, K: The Succulent Karoo in: Bothma, J du P (2016) Ed: *Game Ranch management, 6<sup>th</sup> edition*. Van Schaik, Pretoria.

- 2.6 Coetzee, K : Veld rehabilitation in: Bothma, J du P (2016) Ed: Game Ranch management – sixth edition. Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- 2.7 Coetzee, K : Game management in: Esler, KJ; Milton, SJ and Dean, WRJ. (2006). (Eds): Karoo veld - ecology and management. Briza, Pretoria.
- 2.8 Coetzee, K (2005). Caring for natural rangelands. University of Kwazulu-Natal Press, Scottsville.
- 2.9 Coetzee, K : Game Management in: Esler, KJ: Pierce, SM: De Villiers, C (2010). (Eds.): Fynbos Ecology and Management. Briza publication, Pretoria.
- 2.10 Coetzee, K. 2013. Game Guard Management. New Voices Publishing Services, Cape Town.
- 2.11 Coetzee, K. 2016. Practical Techniques for Habitat and Wildlife Management. New Voices Publishing Services, Cape Town (In Print).

### **3. EDUCATION:**

#### **3.1 Master’s Degree in Technology (M Tech).**

Obtained between 1992 and 1994 at the Saasveld School of Forestry, (now George Campus), Nelson Mandela University.

Dissertation title: The riverine rabbit (*Bunolagus monticularis*) and its habitat: Conservation implications of an unnaturally fragmented distribution. 1994.

#### **3.2 National Higher Diploma (B Tech) Forestry Conservation.**

Obtained between 1989 and 1990 at the Saasveld School of Forestry, Port Elizabeth Technikon. Recipient of an award for ‘The Best Higher Diploma Student for 1990.’

#### **3.3 National Diploma in Nature Conservation and Wildlife Management (N Dip).**

3-Year course. Obtained between 1974 and 1976 at the Pretoria Technikon.

Other than my education qualifications, I have gathered over 40 years of uninterrupted experience in the field of scientific and practical nature conservation management. This experience was gained in my capacity as scientific research technician, nature reserve manager, regional conservation manager, researcher and veld and wildlife management consultant and lecturer.

**I am registered as a Professional Natural Scientist, in the field of *Ecological Science*, with the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions. Reg. No. 400099/08.**

#### **4. MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES, NATURE CONSERVATION INITIATIVES AND LECTURING:**

- 4.1 Member of the Game Rangers' Association of Africa for 25 years. Member of the Executive Committee for 10 years. Editor of the Association Journal for 5 years. Now Honorary member.
- 4.2 Member of the Wildlife Management Association. (15+ years).
- 4.3 Board member (Director) of the Gouritz Cluster Biosphere Reserve (GCBR). I have also undertaken a contract with the GCBR to identify best options for corridor routes through private land in the Little Karoo and also a landscape scale training needs analysis for environmental training.
- 4.4 Subcontracted to the Cedarberg Biodiversity Corridor Initiative, to prepare guidelines for the introduction and maintenance of wildlife in the corridor area.
- 4.5 Part time lecturing for the Game Ranch Management and Nature Conservation Resource Management courses at the George Campus of the Nelson Mandela University, George. 2011 to date.

#### **5. RANGE OF WORK UNDERTAKEN BY CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT SERVICES:**

To date we have successfully completed a more than 1 000 individual consultation projects. The following lists the typical range of some of the projects undertaken:

- ❖ Murtala Tukur: Development of a 100,000ha wildlife reserve in Eastern Nigeria.
- ❖ Jacob Mwanzia: Meletse Game Reserve, Limpopo, management plan.
- ❖ Crown Prince Abu Dhabi: Management plan for Al Maha Farm, Morocco.
- ❖ Johann Venter: Touwsberg Nature Reserve, Little Karoo, management plan.
- ❖ Nicolaas Marais: Develop a management plan for the Aardvark Nature Reserve near Vanwyksdorp.
- ❖ Louis de Swart: Brulberg: Complete game farm management plan including natural resources inventory. Middelburg.
- ❖ Mark Barnard: Development of a Management Plan for the Kleeberg Game Ranch in Namibia.
- ❖ Mark MacAdam: Development of a Management Plan for the Desert Star game Ranch near Colesberg.
- ❖ Ron Begby: Kuzuko Game Reserve (Greater Addo Park Complex): Veld and wildlife management plan: Somerset East.
- ❖ Dr Fred Roux: Quaggasfontein: Feasibility study and guidelines for hippopotamus, buffalo and cheetah introduction: Colesberg.

- ❖ Sabine Plattner (Racing Stables): Rondeberg Nature Reserve: Veld and game management guidelines: Yzerfontein.
- ❖ Botha Schabort: Rietfontein Private Nature Reserve: Veld and wildlife management guidelines: Beaufort West.
- ❖ Chris Mulder Ass Inc: Hanglip Private Nature Reserve: Veld and wildlife management guidelines: Plettenberg Bay.
- ❖ Sanbona Game Reserve: Assessment of the impact of introduction of extralimital giraffe and white rhinoceros.
- ❖ Chris Mulder Ass Inc: Gansevallei Development: Veld and wildlife management guidelines: Plettenberg Bay.
- ❖ Bill McAdam: Bushmans Kloof Game Reserve: Habitat and game management plan including natural resources inventory: Clanwilliam.
- ❖ Cape Technikon: B Tech (Nature Conservation) Part Time Lecturer for five years: Cape Town.
- ❖ Southern African Wildlife College (WWF): Develop modules and lecture guidelines for courses: Ecology; Vegetation Management; Animal Management; Management Planning and Interpretation.
- ❖ Mike Cawood: Witdraai Game Reserve: Game count: Beaufort West.
- ❖ Squire, Smith & Laurie: Game reserve and tourism management assessment: Expert witness for the State: Eastern Cape.
- ❖ Martin Flavell: Shamwari Game Reserve: Buffalo investment investigation: Patterson.
- ❖ Irene van Lippe: Bergplaas, New Bethesda: Veld and game management guidelines including natural resources inventory.
- ❖ Bill McAdam: Hunter's Moon Game Ranch management plan including natural resources inventory: Colesberg.
- ❖ Cape Nature Conservation, Oudtshoorn: Fish ladder design, Olifant's River.
- ❖ Pieter Coetzee: Assegaay Bosch Game Ranch game management plan including natural resources inventory: Van Wyksdorp
- ❖ Paarl Municipality, Paarl: Assessment of development of potential of Paarl Mountain Reserve for tourism.
- ❖ SRK Consulting: Namibia: Fauna impact study at Otjiwarongo Cement Factory.
- ❖ Jannie Mouton: Koktyls Private Nature Reserve Management Plan: Barrydale

- ❖ Niel Warmenhoven: Westbrook Nature Reserve. Veld and wildlife management guidelines: Graaff-Reinet.
- ❖ John Vye: Agtersneeuberg Game Ranch. Veld and wildlife management plan. Graaff-Reinet.
- ❖ Mark & Sarah Tompkins: King Karoo Ranch: Development of reserve management plan: Graaff-Reinet.
- ❖ Anglo American Mines: Management plan for the Black Mountain Mine area, Aggeneys.
- ❖ SRK Consulting: Game impact assessment: Port Elizabeth
- ❖ Ostrich Industry Business Chamber Biodiversity Unit: Ostrich veld damage rehabilitation guidelines and implementation: Oudtshoorn.
- ❖ East Cape Parks Board: Oviston Nature Reserve Management Plan: Oviston.
- ❖ South African Parks Board: Agulhas National Park game introduction and veld management guidelines: Agulhas.
- ❖ Endangered Wildlife Trust: Rehabilitation of Riverine rabbit habitat on the Sak River of the Great Karoo

## **SAMPLE OF ADDITIONAL CONSULTING CONTRACTS**

1	Oubaai Golf Development, Mossel Bay.	Fauna impact assessment.
2	Koktyls Private Game Reserve, Barrydale.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
3	Hunter's Moon Game Ranch, Colesberg.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plan and annual follow-up audits.
4	Quaggasfontein Private Game Ranch, Colesberg.	Feasibility study & guidelines for hippopotamus and brown hyaena introduction.
5	Buffelsdrift Private game Reserve, Oudtshoorn.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
6	Pezula Country Estate, Knysna.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
7	Cape Technikon, Cape Town.	Preparation and presentation of B Tech Degree lectures in Nature Conservation Management (10 years).
8	Rietfontein Private Game Ranch, Beaufort West.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
9	African Farm Nature Reserve, Montagu.	Management plan for cheetah breeding project.
10	Hartenbos Lifestyle Reserve, Mossel Bay.	Vegetation sensitivity analysis for development proposal.
11	Western Cape Nature Conservation Board, George.	Assist with provincial nature reserve management audits.
12	King Karoo Game Ranch, Graaff-Reinet.	Feasibility study and introduction plan for white rhinoceros.
13	Groenkloof Private Game Reserve, Graaff-Reinet.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
14	Retreat Private Game Reserve, Kuruman.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
15	Bosluisvloof Private Game Lodge, Ladismith.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
16	Gamka Private Wilderness Reserve, Calitzdorp.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.

17	Vaale Valley Estate, Mossel Bay.	Vegetation impact assessment.
18	Boschenbach Private Nature Reserve, Lambert's Bay.	Introduction plan for captive lions.
19	San Bona Wildlife Reserve, Barrydale.	Habitat evaluation for giraffe and white rhinoceros.
20	Gouritz Initiative (Gouritz Cluster Biosphere Reserve).	Evaluation and potential for landscape corridor.
21	Sharples' Environmental Services (Hartenbos 1).	Operational phase management plan.
22	Koktyls Private Game Reserve, Barrydale.	Feasibility study for buffalo introduction.
23	Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor, Porterville.	Wildlife introduction and management guidelines.
24	Berg en Dal Private Game Reserve, Mossel Bay.	Impact assessment for giraffe introduction.
25	Fancourt Country Estate, George.	Alien vegetation control management plan.
26	Karoo Heritage Estate and Golf Course, Oudtshoorn.	Biodiversity impact assessment.
27	Hartenbos Private Game Farm, Mossel Bay.	Preparation of fire management plan.
28	Camdeboo Stud Game Farm, Graaff-Reinet.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.
29	Oviston Nature Reserve, East Cape Parks.	Preparation of fauna, infrastructure and fire sections of management plan.
30	Cape Town City Council, Cape Town.	Preparation of management plans for Helderberg, Rietvlei and Tygerberg Nature Reserves.
31	Indalu Wildlife Projects, Mossel Bay.	Feasibility study & preparation of plans for introduction of elephant, white rhinoceros, buffalo & captive carnivores.
32	Wind Farm Project, Municipality of Beaufort West.	Biodiversity impact assessment.
33	Solar Power Generation Project, UCT, Cape Town	Biodiversity impact assessment.
34	Bland's Drift Private Game Farm, Mossel Bay.	Management plan for intensive buffalo and sable farming.
35	South African Ostrich Industry Chamber, Oudtshoorn.	Preparation of soil erosion control guidelines.
36	Inverdoorn Private Game Reserve, Touws River.	Impact assessment for elephant introduction.
37	Conservation South Africa, Kammieskroon.	Rehabilitation training for local farmers.
38	Koesanie White Rhino Project, Swellendam.	White rhinoceros intensive breeding management plan.
39	Rietfontein Private Game Reserve, Beaufort West.	Habitat monitoring plan and implementation.
40	Welgevonden Private Game Ranch, De Rust.	Evaluation and preparation of corridor management plan.
41	Nyaru Private Game Reserve, Mossel Bay.	Preparation of game introduction & reserve management plans.

*Note:* Most of the management plans and guideline documents contain substantial sections on veld rehabilitation, ecological monitoring, resource inventory, wildlife management infrastructure and road maintenance guidelines. The EIA contracts relate to biodiversity impact assessments as well as Environmental Management Plans.

## 6. CERTIFICATION:

I, the undersigned, certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, these data correctly describe my qualifications, my experience and myself.



**Kenneth Coetzee**

**DATE: 20 June 2022**

**THE SPECIALIST**

**Note:** Duplicate this section where there is more than one specialist.

I ...Kenneth Coetzee....., as the appointed Specialist hereby declare/affirm the correctness of the information provided or to be provided as part of the application, and that I :

- in terms of the general requirement to be independent:
  - other than fair remuneration for work performed in terms of this application, have no business, financial, personal or other interest in the development proposal or application and that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity; or
  - am not independent, but another specialist (the "Review Specialist") that meets the general requirements set out in Regulation 13 has been appointed to review my work (Note: a declaration by the review specialist must be submitted);
- in terms of the remainder of the general requirements for a specialist, have throughout this EIA process met all of the requirements;
- have disclosed to the applicant, the EAP, the Review EAP (if applicable), the Department and I&APs all material information that has or may have the potential to influence the decision of the Department or the objectivity of any report, plan or document prepared or to be prepared as part of the application; and
- am aware that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 48 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

Signature of the Specialist:



Name of Company:

Conservation Management Services

Date:

20 June 2022