



# FORMAL MEETING MINUTES

## Public Stakeholder Engagement – Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

**Project:** Algae Farming and Refinery for Production of Biofuel & Crude Algae Oil (CAO)  
**Location:** Portion X, Henties Bay State Land (within Dorob National Park), Erongo Region, Namibia  
**Venue:** NYS Boardroom, Henties Bay  
**Date:** Thursday, 23 April 2026  
**Time:** 10:30 – 14:00  
**Facilitator / EAP:** Erongo Consulting Group  
**Minute Taker:** Erongo Consulting Group

### 1. Meeting Context and Purpose

| Item                      | Detail   |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Purpose of Meeting</b> | To present the proposed algae farming and biorefinery project, explain the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, and formally solicit stakeholder inputs, concerns, and recommendations for integration into the Scoping Report and EIA |
| <b>Regulatory Context</b> | Conducted as part of the <b>mandatory public participation process</b> in terms of the Environmental Management Act (No. 7 of 2007)  |
| <b>EIA Phase</b>          | Scoping Phase  |
| <b>Expected Outcome</b>   | Identification of key environmental, social, and economic issues requiring further assessment, mitigation, and incorporation into the EIA process  |

### 2. Summary of Project Presentation

| Component             | Expanded Description  |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Project Nature</b> | Large-scale, integrated algae cultivation and biorefinery system designed to produce renewable biofuel and Crude Algae Oil (CAO), contributing to Namibia's energy diversification and industrial development |
| <b>Water Source</b>   | Seawater abstraction via pipeline from the Atlantic Ocean; no reliance on freshwater systems, thereby minimising pressure on scarce inland water resources  |

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Cultivation System</b>     | Controlled algae growth in inland tanks/ponds using evaporation-based concentration systems, optimised for coastal desert conditions  |
| <b>Processing System</b>      | Downstream extraction and refining of algae biomass into biofuel and CAO through an integrated biorefinery process  |
| <b>Environmental Approach</b> | No discharge of process water into the ocean; exclusive use of indigenous algae species; full compliance through an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and regulatory monitoring |

### 3. Attendance

Stakeholders from a range of sectors participated in the meeting, including:

- Government representatives (regional and local authorities)
- Community members and local residents
- Representatives of the fishing sector
- Environmental and conservation stakeholders
- Private sector and institutional stakeholders
- Project Proponent and technical team
- Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)

A **detailed attendance register**, including names, affiliations, and contact details of participants, is **attached as Annexure X** to this report.

*The attendance registers forms part of the formal Public Participation documentation and serves as evidence of stakeholder engagement in compliance with regulatory requirements.*

# Stakeholder Issues & Response Register (Public Participation – EIA)

**Project:** Algae Farming and Refinery for Biofuel & Crude Algae Oil (CAO)

**Location:** Portion X, Henties Bay State Land (Dorob National Park), Erongo Region

## 1. Community Development, Water and Social Responsibility

| Issue ID | Stakeholder Concern / Question   | Response  | Action Required  | Responsible Party |
|----------|--|---|--|-------------------|
| SD1      | What tangible, long-term socio-economic benefits will the project deliver to local communities beyond temporary construction jobs? | The Proponent confirmed that community development is a core component of the project and will be addressed through structured Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programmes, including local employment, social investment, and community upliftment initiatives. | Develop a <b>comprehensive Community Development &amp; CSR Framework</b> with clear deliverables, timelines, and monitoring indicators | Proponent         |
| SD2      | Will the project address potable water challenges affecting nearby communities (including areas impacted by the Somaru River)?     | The Proponent acknowledged existing water challenges and committed to supporting potable water initiatives in collaboration with local authorities and institutions.  | Design and implement a <b>Community Water Support Programme</b> aligned with local needs and municipal systems                         | Proponent + EAP   |
| SD3      | How will local communities be included in project benefits and decision-making processes?  | The Proponent confirmed that communities will be integrated through employment, skills development, and ongoing stakeholder engagement mechanisms.  | Define <b>community inclusion and benefit-sharing mechanisms</b> within the EIA and EMP  | EAP               |

## 2. Training, Capacity Building and Education

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>   | <b>Response</b>  | <b>Action Required</b>  | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| TC1             | Will the project provide structured training programmes for local skills development? | The Proponent confirmed that training will be continuous, structured, and aligned with project technical requirements (e.g., microbiology, engineering, environmental sciences). | Develop a <b>Training and Capacity Development Strategy</b> linked to project phases                    | Proponent                |
| TC2             | Will internship opportunities be provided for students?                               | The Proponent confirmed that internship programmes will allow students to gain practical experience through structured on-site exposure combined with academic learning.         | Establish a <b>formal internship programme</b> including selection criteria, duration, and disciplines  | Proponent                |
| TC3             | Will scholarships be offered, including postgraduate support?                         | The Proponent committed to establishing a scholarship scheme to support studies relevant to the project, including postgraduate research.  | Develop a <b>Scholarship Programme Framework</b> with funding mechanisms and institutional partnerships | Proponent                |
| TC4             | Will local institutions be involved in capacity development?                          | The Proponent indicated that partnerships with Namibian and international universities will be pursued to build local expertise and institutional capacity.                      | Formalise <b>collaboration agreements with universities and training institutions</b>                   | Proponent                |

### 3. Fishing, Marine Life and Coastal Access

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>   | <b>Response</b>  | <b>Action Required</b>   | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| FM1             | Will seawater abstraction impact fish stocks, breeding patterns, or marine ecosystems?          | The Proponent indicated that abstraction volumes are relatively small compared to the ocean system and that the majority of operations are land-based, reducing direct marine impacts. | Conduct a <b>Marine Impact Assessment</b> to quantify potential impacts and define mitigation measures | EAP                      |
| FM2             | Will pumping operations generate noise that could affect fish behaviour and fishing activities? | The Proponent confirmed that noise impacts will be addressed through engineering design and are not expected to significantly affect broader fishing areas.                            | Include <b>noise modelling and mitigation measures</b> in the EIA                                      | EAP                      |
| FM3             | Will the project restrict access to traditional fishing areas along the coastline?              | The Proponent confirmed that public access to the shoreline will not be restricted and that infrastructure will not block fishing routes.  | Map and formally designate <b>fishing access corridors</b> within the project area                     | Proponent + EAP          |

|            |   |  |  |           |
|------------|---|--|--|-----------|
| <b>FM4</b> | Will fishermen be compensated if their livelihoods are negatively affected? | The Proponent indicated that potential impacts on livelihoods will be assessed during the EIA, and mitigation or compensation measures will be considered where necessary. | Develop a <b>Fisheries Livelihood Mitigation and Compensation Plan</b> if impacts are identified | Proponent |
| <b>FM5</b> | Why was land secured up to the coastline?                                   | The Proponent clarified that securing land to the coastline is intended to prevent future conflicts with third-party developments, not to restrict community access.       | Document and justify <b>land allocation rationale</b> in the EIA                                 | EAP       |

## 4. Water Use, Waste Management and Environmental Compliance

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>   | <b>Response</b>   | <b>Action Required</b>   | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| <b>WM1</b>      | Will wastewater or contaminated process water be discharged back into the ocean?                | The Proponent confirmed that the system is evaporation-based and that no process water will be discharged back into the ocean.        | Clearly document <b>no-discharge system design</b> in the EMP          | EAP                      |
| <b>WM2</b>      | What measures will be in place to prevent leaks, spills, or contamination from tanks and ponds? | The Proponent confirmed that all systems will be monitored and managed under strict Environmental Management Plan (EMP) requirements. | Develop <b>monitoring, containment, and emergency response systems</b> | Proponent                |
| <b>WM3</b>      | What are the consequences of non-compliance with environmental regulations?                     | Non-compliance may result in regulatory penalties, enforcement actions, or suspension of operations.                                  | Include <b>compliance and enforcement framework</b> in EMP             | EAP                      |

## 5. Algae Species, Biosecurity and Ecological Risk

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b> | <b>Response</b> | <b>Action Required</b> | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|

|            |  |   |   |           |
|------------|--|---|---|-----------|
| <b>BS1</b> | Will foreign or genetically modified algae species be introduced?          | The Proponent confirmed that only indigenous algae species will be used.                                      | Include <b>species selection and justification</b> in EIA | EAP       |
| <b>BS2</b> | What measures will prevent accidental release or ecological contamination? | The Proponent indicated that cultivation will occur in controlled systems with biosecurity measures in place. | Develop a <b>Biosecurity and Species Management Plan</b>  | Proponent |

## 6. Land Use, Infrastructure and Mapping

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>                                   | <b>Response</b>   | <b>Action Required</b>  | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| <b>LU1</b>      | Is the project linked to mining activities or mining rights?            | The Proponent clarified that the project is not a mining operation but an algae-based renewable energy development. | Clearly state <b>project nature and land use</b> in EIA                         | EAP                      |
| <b>LU2</b>      | Will infrastructure be located on the beach or sensitive coastal areas? | The Proponent confirmed that infrastructure will be located inland, not directly on the beach.                      | Provide <b>accurate infrastructure layout maps</b>                              | EAP                      |
| <b>LU3</b>      | Are current maps and diagrams accurate?                                 | The Proponent acknowledged that maps require refinement and will be updated.  | Revise and include <b>detailed, accurate maps</b> in the Scoping Report and EIA | EAP                      |

## 7. Environmental Sensitivity (Lichens and Protected Areas)

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>                          | <b>Response</b>  | <b>Action Required</b>   | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| <b>ES1</b>      | Will sensitive lichen species and protected areas be affected? | The Proponent confirmed that a specialist botanical study is underway to identify sensitive areas and guide site planning. | Complete and integrate <b>Botanical (Lichen) Specialist Study</b> into EIA | Specialists              |

|            |   |  |  |     |
|------------|---|--|--|-----|
| <b>ES2</b> | Will necessary permits and environmental approvals be obtained? | The Proponent confirmed that all required permits and approvals will be secured and incorporated into the EIA and EMP. | Include <b>permit and compliance requirements</b> in EIA | EAP |
|------------|---|--|--|-----|

## 8. Water Quality and Operational Risks

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>   | <b>Response</b>  | <b>Action Required</b>   | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| <b>WR1</b>      | How will sulfur outbreaks and poor seawater quality affect operations?          | The Proponent indicated that this will be addressed through engineering design, system adaptability, and specialist input. | Include <b>water quality risk assessment and mitigation measures</b> | Proponent + Specialists  |
| <b>WR2</b>      | Is the system resilient to environmental variability (temperature, conditions)? | The Proponent confirmed that systems will incorporate temperature control and robust materials (e.g., concrete tanks).     | Detail <b>engineering design specifications</b> in EIA               | Proponent                |

## 9. Stakeholder Engagement and Governance

| <b>Issue ID</b> | <b>Stakeholder Concern / Question</b>                                  | <b>Response</b>  | <b>Action Required</b>                                       | <b>Responsible Party</b> |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| <b>SG1</b>      | Have all relevant stakeholders and authorities been consulted?         | The Proponent confirmed that consultations are ongoing and that relevant authorities are aware of the project. | Maintain and update <b>Stakeholder Register</b>              | EAP                      |
| <b>SG2</b>      | Will stakeholder engagement be documented and included in submissions? | The EAP confirmed that all engagement activities, comments, and responses will be documented in the EIA.       | Compile <b>Public Participation Report and evidence pack</b> | EAP                      |