Archaeological monuments in KwaZulu-Natal: a procedure for the identification of value

by

Gavin Whitelaw

(Natal Museum, P. Bag 9070, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa)

ABSTRACT

Over 200 sites of colonial heritage in KwaZulu-Natal are national monuments, mostly reflecting the culture and history of white South Africans. In 1994 only one precolonial site had this status. This imbalance in colonial and precolonial national monuments is due partly to the late development of archaeological research in the province, and partly to the policy of the national heritage agency since the 1950's. In the early 1990's, the National and KwaZulu monuments councils each funded a project to identify archaeological sites in the province worthy of national monument status. This paper presents the results of the projects. These include criteria to evaluate archaeological sites for possible monument status, and a list of 35 of the most important sites in the province. The criteria take cognisance of both the scientific value of a site and of its value as may be perceived by the public. Four of the identified sites have since been declared national monuments. The disparity between colonial and precolonial monuments remains, however, and needs to be addressed with some urgency if heritage managers hope to receive popular support for their work. Hopefully Amafa aKwaZulu-Natali, the proposed new provincial heritage agency, will take up this issue.

INTRODUCTION

I present in this paper a procedure for evaluating precolonial archaeological sites for declaration as national monuments. The procedure was developed in two related projects carried out in 1993 and 1994, funded respectively by the National Monuments Council (NMC) and the KwaZulu Monuments Council (KMC). The aim of the projects was to identify archaeological sites in KwaZulu-Natal worthy of national monument status. At that time, the rock art site Mpongweni Rock Shelter was the only precolonial national monument in the province. By contrast, over 200 colonial[1] sites are national monuments and a great many more have some lesser form of recognition. Most are associated with the historical and cultural heritage of white people. The KMC has had a greater focus on indigenous heritage than the NMC, but its work of the recent past has been biased towards the history and origin of the Zulu Kingdom.

This uneven acknowledgement of KwaZulu-Natal's cultural heritage seems curious given that the country's first heritage legislation, the Bushman-Relics Protection Act (No 22 of 1911), was concerned with archaeological heritage. However, the first fulltime professional archaeologist in the province was appointed only in 1972. With the exception of O. Davies' work on beach and river gravels therefore, the province lacked a systematic site recording and excavation programme that would have

---

[1] For the purpose of this paper I regard the colonial period as starting in 1824 with the establishment of the first permanent white settlement at Port Natal.

identified important archaeological sites. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, it became policy of the Historical Monuments Commission in the early 1950's not to proclaim archaeological sites as national monuments, except in unusual circumstances. The Commission believed that archaeological sites were afforded satisfactory protection through the general provisions of the Preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act (No 4 of 1934)[2] (Deacon 1993 1996). This policy focused the Commission's efforts more directly on colonial heritage sites. Consequently, the Commission's professional staff, and that of its successor, the NMC, was dominated by historians, cultural historians and architects. Since the type of sites declared as national monuments was linked to the interests of heritage personnel, the proportion of national monuments of precolonial heritage dropped from 14 % in 1948 to 2 % in 1992 (Deacon 1993). The higher proportion of the 1940's reflects the influence of both archaeologist C. van Riet Lowe, who was secretary of the Commission at this time, and conservation bodies such as the South African National Society (Deacon 1993; Deacon & Pistorius 1996).

Whatever the reasons for this discriminating policy change, it has had the unfortunate effect of promoting the erroneous impression, among tourists and South Africans alike, that the country's history began with the arrival of Dutch settlers at the Cape in 1652. In a sense, the near-absence of precolonial national monuments played a collaborating role with ideologically-inspired lacunae in school syllabi and museum displays (cf. Mazel & Stewart 1987; Wright & Mazel 1991). We need to note here that the general protection provided by the legislation for archaeological sites was extended in 1986 to *all* historical sites[3] older than 50 years. This has not prevented the largescale declaration of colonial sites as national monuments during the last ten years. Clearly this limited acknowledgement of the culture and history of native South Africans must be reversed, particularly if students and custodians of South Africa's heritage hope to receive popular support for their work. The NMC and KMC therefore contracted the Natal Museum Institute for Cultural Resource Management to:

1. Establish criteria to evaluate archaeological sites for national monument status.
2. Study the archaeological site reports at the Natal Museum[4] to identify those sites that merit declaration as national monuments.

ASSESSMENT OF VALUE

I use the term 'value' rather than 'significance', because the significance of a site is established within the context of particular research projects and questions (Green 1980). 'Value' is a broader term that better reflects the overall worth of a site which is important in determining those archaeological sites that merit national monument status.

The most important part of the NMC and KMC projects was to establish a set of criteria by which the value of archaeological sites could be determined. In this I was

[2]This was the first legislation that enabled the proclamation of monuments, giving them formal legal protection (Hall & Lillie 1993). It superceded earlier heritage legislation and was itself replaced by the National Monuments Act (No 28 of 1969).

[3]Historical site is defined in the National Monuments Act as 'any identifiable building or part thereof, marker, milestone, grave-stone, landmark or tell'

[4]The Natal Museum is the regional recording centre for archaeological site data in KwaZulu-Natal.

guided principally by the relevant heritage legislation, existing NMC policy for the declaration of archaeological sites as national monuments, the Australian ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance 1988 (the Burra Charter), Fowler (1982) and Davis (1989). The criteria developed for this project are the result of discussions between T. Maggs, A. Mazel and myself, while L. van Schalkwyk and J. Deacon made valuable suggestions.

Two pieces of legislation were relevant, the National Monuments Act (No 28 of 1969) which governed heritage matters in what was Natal, and the KwaZulu Monuments Act (No 19 of 1980) for the self-governing territory of KwaZulu. 'National monument' is a term defined in the National Monuments Act (NM Act), which gives the NMC legal control of all developments at the site. Monuments declared in terms of the KwaZulu Monuments Act (KM Act), however, could have been monuments only of the self-governing territory of KwaZulu. For convenience, I use 'national monument' in this paper, except in specific reference to the KM Act.

Section 10(1) of the KM Act states that 'any immovable or moveable property of aesthetic, historical, archaeological, palaeontological or scientific value or interest or places where things of aesthetic, historical, archaeological, palaeontological or scientific value or interest are found' may be declared a monument. The NM Act, Section 10(1), adopts a more general tone, but covers the same ground. Both acts also allow for the protection of an area rather than single sites. These are termed conservation areas (NM Act) and historical preservation areas (KM Act). Protection offered by the two acts is similar, although the NM Act makes provision for the registration of immovable conservation-worthy property on the National Register, in consultation with local authorities. This brings the NMC into planning decisions that may affect the property.

The purpose of declaring a site of any description a national monument, is to ensure its protection, preservation and maintenance. National monuments should also serve to educate the public and commemorate particular people and events (NMC policy). Proper fulfilment of these aims requires considerable expenditure, both initially in developing the site as a resource for visitors, and on an on-going basis to ensure the site's continued preservation. The funds for development and management conventionally come from public monies, accumulated through taxation. If the expense is to be justified, then there is a need to consider carefully what attributes make an archaeological site worthy of national monument status. We need to ask, therefore, what we wish our national monuments to be.

According to current national legislation, sites declared as national monuments should serve as tokens of the past and inspiration for the future (NM Act, Section 2A). National monuments should be something more than this, however. Ideally, they should have contributed or be able to contribute to our understanding of the past. For example, an important guiding principle for placing archaeological sites on the National Register in the United States, is that they should have yielded, or have the potential to yield, important information about the past. National monuments should also have the capacity to enrich the present through interpretation and be of value – however that may be defined – to future generations (cf. Burra Charter Guidelines 1984; Davis 1989; Deacon 1993; Fowler 1982).

TABLE 1

Attributes and value points to assess archaeological sites
for which there is no oral or written history.

1. degree of organic preservation
- none/poor (only non-organic remains)   0
- fair (fragmentary faunal remains, some charcoal)   1
- good (good preservation of faunal and/or floral remains)   2
- excellent (abundant floral remains or floral and faunal remains of great age)   3

2. long sequences
- stratigraphic separation of two different layers/episodes of occupation   1
- moderately complex sequence (3-5 separate layers/episodes)   2
- long sequences (6 or more layers/episodes)   3

3. presence of exceptional elements
- of some interest   1
- of considerable interest   2
- outstanding   3

4. potential for future archaeological investigation
Is the site's potential
- lacking   0

or is the site a

- poor   1
- moderate   2
- good   3

example of its kind, such that a future researcher might consider it for further work?

5. degree of archaeological investigation
- recorded   1
- tested and/or mentioned in publication   2
- researched and adequately reported   3

6. potential for public display
- are there visible artefacts or features?   1
- are they intrinsically interesting?   2
- is the site accessible?   1
- is the site likely to appeal to public imagination?   2

7. aesthetic appeal
Are the environs of the site appealing?
- no   0
- yes   1

Aesthetic appeal of cultural content of site?

- none   0
- low   1
- medium   2
- high   3

Maximum points obtainable: 25

8. bonus point
Is there potential for the implementation of a long-term management plan?
- no   0
- yes   1

How do we assess these aspects of an archaeological site? I chose, in discussion with colleagues, to develop an assessment procedure in which a site would score points for various critical attributes. This allows the relative value of archaeological sites to be assessed in as objective a manner as possible. The choice of attributes must clearly reflect our vision of an ideal national monument.

I focused first on attributes that currently tend to determine scientific importance. These include the degree of organic preservation, length of occupation, the presence of elements or features of particular interest, and the future research potential of a site (Table 1: points 1 to 4). Other criteria may be equally significant and it is possible, even likely, that important sites not characterised by these attributes exist. Indeed, because significance varies according to research design, a great many sites are potentially of value to archaeologists. Nevertheless, I believe that most important archaeological sites in KwaZulu-Natal would score highly in all or most of the attributes listed above.

The narrow interests of archaeologists cannot be the sole consideration in determining value if national monuments are properly to enrich the present and be of value to future generations. Davis (1989: 97) notes that the general public may not share archaeologists' enthusiasm for archaeological sites: 'the information from all significant sites should be of interest to the public, but not necessarily the sites themselves'. She goes on to argue that the use of public funds to preserve and interpret archaeological sites for future generations can best be justified for sites that have 'both important information and features which can be seen and therefore more easily interpreted to the visiting public' (1989: 97). I adopted her position, believing that the link between public funds and public interest should be an important part of the assessment of a site's value. Because of the nature of many South African archaeological sites, however, public interest needs to be defined more broadly than in terms of visible archaeological features. I tried to do this by including the attributes of accessibility, aesthetics and the more elusive 'public imagination'. Furthermore, because protection of national monuments, and most archaeological research, is supported by public funds, I included an attribute which gives priority to sites that have been researched and reported in adequate detail (Table 1: points 5 to 7).

Archaeological investigation of sites dating to the eighteenth century, and possibly a little earlier, has frequently yielded a body of associated oral or written historical evidence. Any assessment of the value of such sites must take cognisance of this additional resource. Oral or written history directly associated with an archaeological national monument will probably appeal to most visitors' interests more easily than a purely archaeological history, greatly increasing the attraction of the site. This is particularly so in South Africa where, for political reasons, there has been little development of any sensitivity towards the more distant past. The two categories of archaeological sites, those with and those without associated oral or written history, could not be assessed with the same attributes. A common scoring system would prejudice one or other category through low scores in one or more attributes. I therefore developed a second set of attributes which includes scores for oral and written historical resources (Table 2). Clearly, some sites could be assessed in terms of both sets of attributes and here the site assessor must decide on the most appropriate action.

TABLE 2

Attributes and value points to assess archaeological sites
for which there is oral or written history.

1a. historical and/or cultural significance
Is the site associated with a person or group who was or were of
*   little/no   0
*   some   1
*   great   2
historical or cultural significance?

1b. historical and/or cultural significance
Is or was the site the scene of an event of
*   no   0
*   some   1
*   great   2
historical or cultural significance?

    Alternatively:

Is or was the site the scene of a material or social practice that is or was of
*   no   0
*   some   1
*   great   2
historical or cultural value?

2.   volume of oral or written history
*   brief mention   1
*   some detail   2
*   plenty of detail   3

3.   degree of preservation
*   poor (only non-organic remains)   0
*   fair (faunal remains, some charcoal)   1
*   good (features preserved)   2

4.   degree of research
*   mentioned in publication   1
*   researched in some detail   2

5.   potential for public display
*   are there visible artefacts or features?   1
*   are they intrinsically interesting?   2
*   is the site accessible?   1
*   is the site likely to appeal to public imagination?   2

6.   aesthetic appeal
Are the environs of the site appealing?
*   no   0
*   yes   1
Does the cultural content of the site have
*   no   0
*   low   1
*   medium   2
*   high   3
aesthetic appeal?

Maximum points obtainable: 21

7.   bonus point
Is there potential for the implementation of a long-term management plan?
*   no   0
*   yes   1

The second set of attributes includes reference to the archaeological content of sites (points 3, 5 & 6) and could not be used for heritage sites known only through oral or written references. Indeed, it would be unwise to do this given that oral historical research about precolonial heritage sites is a grossly under-researched field.

I chose not to consider the possibility of destruction in assessing a site for national monument status, even though one of the principal purposes of the heritage legislation is to protect cultural treasures from destruction. This is a separate issue that should not impact upon the assessment of a site's value. Similarly, I did not address the key issue of site management. Recent examination of specific case histories has illustrated the importance of appropriate management of archaeological monuments (Deacon 1993 1996). Without the correct management, sites may be destroyed through insensitive development or enter a 'decaying cycle' of neglect (Deacon 1993: 130) and become natural targets for visitor abuse. I suggest though, that sites should score an additional bonus point in the assessment procedure if there is potential for the meaningful implementation of an appropriate long-term management plan. This would increase the likelihood of these sites receiving national monument status.

IDENTIFICATION OF VALUABLE SITES

I assessed the reports of all archaeological sites that fell within the boundaries of the former KwaZulu and a large percentage of the reports of sites in the rest of the province (see Appendix). Interestingly, the distribution of recorded sites is heavily skewed towards former white areas (Natal) and little professional archaeological research has taken place in what was KwaZulu. This may be a consequence of apartheid law: until 1985 whites required a permit to enter KwaZulu, which possibly hindered more extensive archaeological surveys (no black archaeologists were employed in the province at this time). I anticipate that coverage will gradually become more even as archaeologists focus on under-researched areas.

The assessment excluded the Drakensberg area where the archaeological record is dominated by some 600 rock art sites. Instead, I selected nine rock art sites in the Drakensberg, based on the survey data compiled by Mazel (1981). I evaluated these and all other sites that merited more detailed examination according to the attributes in Tables 1 and 2. Scores ranged from 29 % to 88 %. Nine of the 11 sites that scored 20 (80 %) or more points were hunter-gatherer sites. The two others were agriculturist sites dating to the first millennium AD. This distribution is not surprising, given the emphasis the scoring procedure places on aesthetics and long sequences. Fifteen sites scored 18 or 19 (over 72 %), including agriculturist sites of the first and second millennium and hunter-gatherer sites. One hunter-gatherer and six agriculturist sites scored 17 (68 %). Those with lower scores ranged from Middle Stone Age open sites to rock art sites, but excluded Early Stone Age sites, none of which merited detailed evaluation.

Two agriculturist sites with associated oral or written history, kwaBulawayo and the Qa-Qa-Lensimbi mine, scored 15 (71 %) with the attributes in Table 2. Two points of interest emerged from the assessment of sites of this category. First, several sites, important from an oral historical point of view, yielded low scores because they

lacked visible well-preserved features and had not been the subject of archaeological research. Secondly, the Ntabayensimbi iron mine in northern KwaZulu-Natal received a score of only 56 %, in contrast to the high score of the similar Qa-Qa-Lensimbi mine on the upper Mhlathuze river. The difference lies in the body of available oral history associated with Qa-Qa-Lensimbi, which gives the site an interest beyond that of its strictly archaeological features. Without oral history, mines such as these would probably be of limited public interest, being simply small quarry pits along outcrops of iron ore.

TABLE 3

Archaeological sites in KwaZulu-Natal that merit monument status.

Site Name	Score %	National Site Number
Border Cave	88	2731BB 1
Nkupe Shelter	84	2829BB 4
Mgoduyanuka Late Iron Age site	76	2829CB 6
Junction Shelter	76	2829CD 50
Mhlwazini Cave	80	2829CD 57
Hattingsvlakte Iron Age engravings	76	2829DD 19 & 22
Nqabeni	72	2830BD 42
Ntshekane Early Iron Age site	72	2830CD 4
Shakan Game Pits	76	2831BD 6
Qa-Qa-Lensimbi Iron Mines	71	2831CA 9
Ndondondwane Early Iron Age site	80	2831CC 2
Wosi Early Iron Age site	72	2831CC 18
Mamba Early Iron Age site	80	2831CC 20
kwaBulawayo	71	2831DC 4
Battle Cave	72	2929AB 2
Eland Cave	76	2929AB 22
eSibayeni Cave	76	2929AB 23
Clarke's Shelter	76	2929AB 33
Poacher's Rock	76	2929AB 61
Moor Park Late Iron Age site	72	2929BB 14
Main Caves	88	2929BC 1 & 2
Game Pass 1	72	2929BC 24
Collingham Shelter	84	2929BD 13
Good Hope Shelter	84	2929CB 20
iKanti 1	76	2929CB 36
Shongweni North and South Caves	88	2930DC 16 & 22
Umhlatuzana Rock Shelter	80	2930DD 98
Sibhudu Shelter	84	2931CA 15

I suggest that all sites with scores of 70 % or greater are worthy of national monument status (Table 3). In addition, sites that score between 65 % and 69 % could receive special protection through inclusion on the NMC's National Register (Table 4).

At least one archaeological conservation area should be declared in the province. This is the Natal Drakensberg Park, managed by the Natal Parks Board (NPB). The Natal Drakensberg arguably contains the world's richest and finest hunter-gatherer rock art and is widely known for its natural resources. Declaration of the Natal Drakensberg Park as an archaeological conservation area would provide an appropriate environment for the proper management and protection of these priceless resources. Natal Museum archaeologists A. Mazel and B. Wahl, together with NPB

TABLE 4

Possible candidate sites for the National Register.

Site Name	Score %	National Site Number
Ntshondwe refugee caverns	68	2731CB 17
Mgede Shelter	68	2829BA 1
Kopleegte Iron Age engravings	68	2829DC 16
Mabhekazi	68	2830AC 8
Mabhija	68	2830CA 3
Emseni Early Iron Age site	68	2830CC 22
Magogo Early Iron Age site	68	2830CD 34

officials and other interested and affected parties, are currently developing a cultural resource management plan for the Park (Wahl *et al.* 1997). This plan should ensure the long-term conservation of archaeological resources in the Natal Drakensberg if implemented in a meaningful way by professional cultural resource managers.

CONCLUSION

Unlike many colonial national monuments, archaeological sites are abandoned and rarely used by the public, if at all (Deacon 1993). If they are to be successfully developed as national monuments they will need innovative interpretation that will allow members of the public to interact with the site on an intellectual and, in some cases, physical level. For this reason it is important that sites selected for declaration as national monuments should appeal to the general public. The sites should also be important from a scientific point of view: if archaeologists do not value them, non-archaeologists are unlikely to do so. The procedure presented here addresses both aspects, scientific value and value as it may be perceived by the public.

Five of the sites have been declared national monuments since the completion of the projects, while another three await completion of the declaration technicalities. The declared sites are Mgoduyanuka, Hattingsvlakte, Mhlwazini Cave, Umhlatuzana Rock Shelter and Collingham Shelter.

The NPB opposed the NMC proposal to declare as national monuments the rock art sites in Table 3, that are located within the Natal Drakensberg Park. The NPB requested that, instead of declaring sites piecemeal, 'a formula be found to protect the rock art collectively, wherever it occurs, in the Natal Drakensberg Park' (letter from the NPB to the NMC, dated 25 July 1996). Although the NMC may declare national monuments without the permission or agreement of the land owner (in this case the land manager), in practice it does not do so. The NPB position is unfortunate and appears to confuse the two issues of management and protection. All archaeological sites, not just national monuments, are protected. What the NPB requires is a formula for the proper management of the rock art sites, which the new cultural resource management plan (CURE) will provide. Ironically, several of the sites that are targeted in CURE for development as visitor resources are of national monument status (eg. Battle Cave, Main Caves, Game Pass 1 and iKanti 1). The declaration of national monuments, and the legal implications this carries, is in part a mark of respect for past cultures. Acknowledgement of this respect by declaration will clearly contribute to the value of these sites as visitor resources.

The management of South Africa's heritage will change considerably in the near future. Under the proposed new heritage legislation, heritage resources will be managed at the lowest competent level of government and provinces will decide whether to accept responsibility for heritage matters or leave it with the proposed new national body, the South African Heritage Resources Agency. In KwaZulu-Natal, the KMC will merge with the regional branch of the NMC to form a new organisation, Amafa aKwaZulu-Natali (Heritage KwaZulu-Natal). We should expect that a more balanced acknowledgement of the past will be a consequence of this organisation's work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

AUSTRALIA ICOMOS. 1988. *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance (The Burra Charter)*. Sydney: Australia ICOMOS.

DAVIS, H. 1989. Is an archaeological site important to science or the public, and is there a difference? *In*: Uzzel, D. L., ed., *Heritage interpretation: the natural and built environment*. London: Belhaven Press pp. 96–100.

DEACON, J. 1993. Archaeological sites as national monuments in South Africa: a review of sites declared since 1936. *South African Historical Journal* **29**: 118–131.

—— 1996. Case studies of Conservation Practice at archaeological and palaeontological sites. *In*: Deacon, J., ed., *Monuments and sites: South Africa*. Colombo: ICOMOS pp. 53–70.

DEACON, J. & PISTORIUS, P. 1996. Introduction and historical background to the conservation of monuments and sites in South Africa. *In*: Deacon, J., ed., *Monuments and sites: South Africa*. Colombo: ICOMOS pp. 1–8.

FOWLER, D. D. 1982. Cultural resources management. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* **5**: 1–50.

GREEN, D. F. 1980. Brief analysis and advice on the Central Arizona Project to Water and Power Resources Service. Ms on file, Central Arizona Project, Phoenix, Arizona.

HALL, A. & LILLIE, A. 1993. The National Monuments Council and a policy for providing protection for the cultural and environmental heritage. *South African Historical Journal* **29**: 102–117.

MAZEL. A. D. 1981. Up and down the little Berg: archaeological resource management in the Natal Drakensberg. Unpublished final project report to the Department of Water Affairs, Forestry & Environmental Conservation.

MAZEL, A. D. & STEWART, P. M. 1987. Meddling with the mind: the treatment of the San hunter-gatherers and the origins of South Africa's Black population in South African school history textbooks since 1972. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **42**: 166–170.

WAHL, E. J., MAZEL, A. D. & ROBERTS, S. E. 1997. Cultural resource management plan for the Natal Drakensberg Park (CURE). Draft discussion document for public workshop on 4 & 5 August 1997, Natal Parks Board, Pietermaritzburg.

WRIGHT, J. & MAZEL, A. D. 1991. Controlling the past in the museums of Natal and KwaZulu. *Critical Arts* **5** (3): 59–78.

APPENDIX

National Site Numbers of the archaeological sites assessed.

2632CC 1 to 11	2632CD 1 to 12	2632DD 1 to 8
2729DB 1	2729DD 1 & 2	2730AC 2
2730BC 1 & 2	2730BD 1	2730CB 1 to 9
2730CD 1 & 2	2730DA 1 to 3	2730DB 2 to 6
2730DC 1 to 5	2730DD 1 to 7	2731AB & AD 1
2731AC 1 to 10	2731BB 1 to 29	2731BC 1 to 6
2731BD 1 to 15	2731CA 1 to 31	2731CB 1 to 19
2731CC 1 to 3	2731DA 1 to 6	2731DC 1 to 3
2732AC 1 to 21	2732AD 1	2732BA 1
2732BB 1 & 2	2732BC 1 to 5	2732CA 1 to 34
2732CB 1 to 11	2732CC 1	2732CD 1 to 23
2732DA 2 & 3	2828DB 75, 76	2828DD 1
2829AD 5 to 7	2829BA 1 to 3	2829BB 1 to 7
2829BC 1 to 4	2829BD 1	2829CA 1 to 68
2829CB 4 to 38	2829CC 76 to 90	2829CD 34, 50, 57, 59
2829DA 1 to 12	2829DB 1 to 14	2829DC 1 to 21
2829DD 1 to 59	2830AA 2 to 10	2830AB 3 to 23
2830AC 1 to 10	2830AD 1 to 12	2830BA 1 to 50
2830BB 1 to 161	2830BC 1 to 92	2830BD 2 to 484
2830CA 1 to 5	2830CB 1 to 19	2830CC 1 to 28
2830CD 2 to 63	2830DA 1 to 10	2830DB 1 to 33
2830DC 1 to 23	2830DD 1 to 15	2831AA 2 to 29
2831AC 1 to 88	2831AD 1 to 11	2831BA 1
2831BB 1 to 17	2831BC 1 to 46	2831BD 1 to 114
2831CA 1 to 12	2831CB 1 to 3	2831CC 1 to 20, 26
2831CD 1	2831DA 1 to 8	2831DB 1 to 7
2831DC 1 to 6	2831DD 1 to 33	2832AA 1 to 43
2832AB 1 to 26; 30 to 33; 48 to 60	2832AC 1 to 22	2832AD 1 to 83
2832BA 1 to 83	2832CA 1 to 19	2832CB 1 to 5
2832CC 1 to 4	2929AB 2, 22, 23, 33, 61	2929BA 1 to 18
2929BB 1 to 36	2929BC 1 & 2, 24	2929BD 13
2929CB 20, 36	2929DB 1 to 20	2929DC 1 to 15
2929DD 1 to 6	2930AB 5	2930BB 2
2930BD 1 to 3	2930CA 1 to 16	2930CB 1 to 61
2930CC 1 to 6	2930CD 1 to 17	2930DA 1 to 90
2930DB 1 to 60	2930DC 1 to 37	2930DD 1 to 126
2931AA 1 to 9	2931AC 2 to 6	2931CA 11, 15
3029DA 1	3030AA 1 to 10	3030AB 1
3030AC 1 to 3	3030AD 1 to 4	3030BA 1 to 3
3030BB 2 to 89	3030BC 1 to 72	3030CA 1 to 3
3030CB 1 to 25	3030CC 1 to 11	3030CD 1 to 30