

**RÖSSING URANIUM LIMITED
SWAKOPMUND PUBLIC MEETING**

| | |
|-------------|--|
| DATE | Wednesday, 24 October 2012 |
| VENUE: | Swakopmund, Rossmund Conference Centre |
| PROJECT: | Rössing Uranium: Mining of the Z20 Uranium Deposit – SEIA process |
| PURPOSE: | <p>The purpose of the meeting was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide information on the proposed project • discuss the proposed SEIA process to be followed • provide information on the public participation process • obtain initial comments on the project and the proposed SEIA process |
| ATTENDANCE: | See attendance register |

1. OPEN

Bea Whittaker (BW) welcomed the group and introduced the project team.

2. PRESENTATION

Carlo Van Heerden (CvH) presented the proposed project to the audience by referring to the prepared powerpoint presentation:

- Technical aspects of the project, including details on the infrastructure corridor (i.e. access road, water and fuel pipelines, power line and reference to the overland conveyor), pit and waste rock design, plant changes and tailing facilities
- A detailed presentation was delivered by Hermann Frühstück (HF) from Doppelmayr, the suppliers of the RopeCon conveyor technology:
- Provided details on the technical aspects of the overland conveyor system, which is to be used in the proposed project. (RopeCon system)

Werner Petrick (WP) from SLR Consulting Namibia (SLR) delivered a presentation on the steps that will be conducted for the proposed project SEIA and the social and environmental aspects.

- The SEIA process for the infrastructure corridor will be completed after the Scoping phase.
- The rest of the project components will be further assessed during the next phase (assessment phase).
- MET should therefore be in a position to make a decision on the infrastructure corridor as part of the scoping phase.

WP explained that during the screening phase the SEIA Team studied existing information in quite some detail. (i.e. previous SEIAs in the area, Rössing monitoring results, information provided by supplier of the conveyor, etc.). The SEIA Team in liaison with Rössing Uranium agreed that the infrastructure corridor can be subject to a Scoping phase only, taking the following into consideration:

- The potential social and environmental impacts relating to this type of activity (linear infrastructure) is fairly well understood;

- the receiving socio-economic and biophysical environment have been studied and contextualised in detail; and
- Additional input/assessment requirements from environmental specialists have been identified and will be included in the Scoping Report. These will be supplemented (where required) by input from I&APs during the PPP.
- A stand-alone SEMP will be developed for the infrastructure corridor.

3. DISCUSSION

The following issues/comments were made during the meeting:

| Issue Raised | Raised by | Response |
|---|-----------------|---|
| Heritage | | |
| Is the old railway going to be impacted through this project? | Joachim Lenssen | Rainer Schneeweiss (RS): No, it won't be impacted. It falls outside of the mining licence and accessory works area. |
| Will there be any impact on the Khan Mine valley area? | Joachim Lenssen | RS: No, also falls outside of the ML area. |
| EIA Process | | |
| Why is the infrastructure not included within the EIA phase, only in the scoping phase? | Marcia Stanton | <p>WP: During the initiation/screening phase exiting information was studied by the SEIA team in quite some detail. (i.e. previous SEIAs in the area, Rössing monitoring results, information provided by supplier of the conveyor, etc.). The SEIA Team in liaison with Rössing Uranium agreed that the infrastructure corridor can be subject to a Scoping phase only, taking the following into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential social and environmental impacts relating to this type of activity (linear infrastructure) is fairly well understood; • the receiving socio-economic and biophysical environment have been studied and contextualised in detail; and • Additional input/assessment requirements from environmental specialists have been identified and will be included in the Scoping Report. These will be supplemented (where required) by input from I&APs |

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| | | during the PPP. |
| There are some concerns regarding this, as the public will only have the opportunity to comment on the infrastructure during the scoping. According to law, a full EIA process must be conducted with regards to accessory works | Marcia Stanton | WP: If the SEIA team finds during the process that the infrastructure has not been covered sufficiently within the scoping report, it will extend into the full EIA phase. Also, the final decision rests with MET (DEA) - the Environmental Commissioner. |
| Infrastructure | | |
| Will the access road be decommissioned after closure/mining? | Joachim Lenssen | RS: No definite answer at this stage. Stakeholders will be consulted 2/3yrs before closure to decide whether there is a desire to keep the facility for further use. However, provision is made in the closure plan to decommission the road. |
| Will the project commence even if certain agreements are not in place with regards to water? | Marcia Stanton | CvH: No, desalinated water is a must, This expansion will not be considered without it. |
| What will be transported on the access road? | Marcia Stanton | CvH: No ore or waste material will be transported via road. Only personnel, equipment and parts. |
| Will a roof be included with the conveyor? Also, has there been work done on bird collisions and fatalities regarding the conveyor? | Mark Stanton | HF & WP: These issues will be investigated within the air quality and biodiversity studies. |
| Will there be support structures in the river bed for the conveyor? | Mark Stanton | HF: There will be no towers within the riverbed. RS: There will be no visible infrastructure within the riverbed part from the overland conveyor. |
| Will the conveyor system be removed after mining? | Marcia Stanton | RS: No decision yet, again it depends on what stakeholders want and the financial costs associated with potential future maintenance if kept in operation. But removal will be included in the closure plan and funds. |
| General | | |
| What is the expected pit depth and will backfilling be considered? | Marcia Stanton | RS: Approximately 300m deep. Backfilling is not a financially viable option, given the granite based nature of the ore and the open pit mining method applied. |
| Why is there only a half-circle pit shown in the images? | Marcia Stanton | RS: The pit is taken to the edge of the lease area, so that the maximum impact can be calculated and this means extending the pit beyond the image shown. |
| Will the study disclose the information regarding the pit boundary? | Marcia Stanton | RS: Yes, that information will be available |
| Will the option of dumping the waste rock on the neighbour's | Werner Ewald | RS: Several alternatives are being considered, including this |

| | | |
|---|--|------|
| ML (away from the river) be considered? | | one. |
|---|--|------|

4. CLOSE

BW closed the meeting and thanked the public for their interest in the proposed project.