

Comments and Responses

IAP Details	Comment / Concern	Response
Kevin Liddle Notification meeting 15/12/2023 as well as Email 21/11/2023	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My understanding is that the 120mw of solar can not be accommodated by the current Nampower infrastructure. If this is indeed the case then to what extent do you, in this study, consider upgrades to substations, transmission lines, etc. 2. Will the installation have any impact on the existing Nampower users. As Nampower is the sole provider of utility electricity in the valley I think it is fair to consider if there are any negative effects for all stakeholders in the valley. This may include things such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a)The ability to obtain netmetering licences b)The ability for other land owners to supply the network c) Risk of more power cuts due to maintenance, installation, etc. d)Technical effects (e.g. harmonics) 	<p><i>Response:</i> Cumulative considerations have taken note of two additional sola plants planned for the area. These plants have not been approved by the ECB or Nampower, unlike this application for the 20MW plaant. NamPower have indicated that the Aussenkehr Substation will be able to accommodate the additional capacity. Construction of the line and connection to the Aussenkehr Substation should not result in any power delays for the agriculture sector or cause any restriction in other producers supplying electricity to the grid. However, the existing solar plant will be affected during the upgrading of the line, this is addressed in Section 10 of the report.</p>
Kobus Botma Notification meeting 15/12/2023	During the construction of the existing solar plant, dust created during earthworks and general construction activities resulted in a problem for our operations (table grape production). During that time, the developers erected shade netting and employed dust mitigation measures. We would kindly request that consideration to dust management be included in the assessment.	<p><i>Response:</i> Dust mitigation measures have been included in Section 10 of the report.</p>
Ann and Mike Scott Email 22/11/2023	Thanks for the feedback on this interesting project. All the best!	Noted
Lipinge Ndelimona Email 22/11/2023	Thank you The Information is well-received	Noted
Ann & Mike Scott Email 25/05/2024 (Bird Specialist)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P6 – perhaps specify here the capacity (kV) and structure of the existing power line that is proposed for upgrading: is it a wooden monopole, distribution line? 	Information included

IAP Details	Comment / Concern	Response
	<p>2. P13 – would the structure of the 66 kV wooden option be a five-pole (“Kamerad”)?</p>	<p>The line referred to is in fact a 132kV line of which 66kV capacity is used. The structure of the line is visible below photo.</p> 
	<p>3. P13 – a disadvantage of the steel monopole structure and the need for additional earth wiring, is that this wire running on top of the structure would increase the collision risk for birds.</p>	<p>Note – included in report</p>
	<p>4. P59 – the proposed wildlife corridor could also include the northern side of the servitude of the existing 66 kV power line; if so, this would make it slightly wider?</p>	<p>The corridor already includes the servitude of the existing 132kV line</p>
	<p>5. Attached is the latest version of the BirdLife SA guidelines for solar power (2017), which is more detailed than the 2012 version. These guidelines are mandatory in SA (but not in Namibia).</p>	<p>Thank you kindly, where applicable additional measures have been included in the EMP section of the report.</p>