

SAMREC Committee Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting	26 August 2021	Time	09:45
Chaired by:	Ken Lomborg	Location	Zoom
Minutes prepared by:	Gugu Charlie		
Present: Ken Lomborg Chair Lisa Chanderman Tarryn Flitton Linda Iaccheri Rob Ingram Tania Marshall Santoshnie Mathuray Jacques Nel Adri Opperman Steven Rupprecht John Sullivan Karin van Deventer Jeremy Witley			
<u>SAIMM Secretariat:</u> Gugu Charlie Camielah Jardine			
<u>Apologies:</u>			
Topic	Discussion		
1. Welcome	Mr Lomborg welcomed everybody to the meeting and no apologies were noted.		
2. Minutes of previous meeting	The minutes of 27 May 2021 as previously circulated were accepted as a correct record, although it was noted that Mr Jacques Nel had been omitted from the list of attendees.		
3. Action items from previous meeting	27 May 2021 Page 2, Agenda Item 4 – SAMCODES APP: Mr Lomborg advised that Ms Flitton would give feedback later in the meeting. Page 2, Agenda Item 4 – SAMCODES APP: With regard to Ms Letlhaku checking on sponsorships, Ms Jardine advised that the list of sponsors had been sent to Ms Flitton. An updated list would be shared during the meeting. Mr Lomborg believed that SAMREC did need more sponsors, as there were some aspects of the App that would require funding. Page 2, Agenda Item 4 – SAMCODES APP: Ms Flitton would confirm whether she had distributed the App presentation to members later in the meeting. Page 2, Agenda Item 6 – SAMCODES Conference: Mr Lomborg urged all members to register. This would be the week of 25-29 October and there would be four sessions in the morning. It was hoped that everyone would attend.		

	Page 5, Agenda Item 10 – TRAINING: The ESG inquisition questionnaire had been distributed and there had been quite a few responses. There were a number of issues that came out of the inquisition and she thanked all those who provided input for the panels, as well as those who attended. She believed it was particularly useful. There was a lot of information that came out and a write-up had been done which would be distributed in due course, as well as the results of the questionnaire. Some of the important things that came out of the results was that ESG was here to say and would have to be included in the public reporting, in more detail than was being done at present. Having said that, an ESG inclusion in the Code was certainly not a sustainability. It was about the important things being included and that it was not just data dumping to make the reports lengthy and unwieldy. There needed to be more correlation across the different codes, as well as input from CRIRSCO, various other codes and also the JSE, particularly when it came to annual reporting requirements. One of the things that came out was that there was a request for a working committee to be put together, with representation from SAMREC, SAMVAL, SAMOG and SAMESEG and perhaps the JSE as well, in order to produce something that would be usable for everyone concerned. Under direction of the SSC, there would be a working group set up which would have representatives from all the committees, to make it something that everyone was happy with that everyone could use. Dr Marshall excused herself from the meeting.
4. SAMCODES App	Ms Flitton advised that there had not been much movement or development. They were keeping up to date with the news articles and events, but she still wanted to get a training group together in the next month or two with the other admin users. There was currently one person from SAIMM and one from SAMVAL. She wanted to get other users active so that they could also populate information and keep it going. Goldfields had been added as a sponsor and she believed there were currently four sponsors. The SAMCODES Conference had been advertised on the App, but she would just make sure that the dates were correct on the SAMCODES App. She had added a contact details box which was for the SAMCODES App but no-one had really contacted her. The idea was to get people to register their contact details on the App so that they could be kept up to date. That was something that had been lacking from the SAMREC side and this could be improved with more admin users keeping it current. For the next month or two, the aim would be to revamp and revitalise the App and get more users. She could not remember whether she had sent the presentation that she gave at the last committee meeting and asked everyone to let her now if they required a copy. The iPhone application was working on a PWA (Progressive Web Application), so it was not in the Store as the Appstore would not accept it. She advised that it would be good to know, if there were any other

	committee members using Apple phones who could also tests this from their side, because as far as she could see, it was working. She tested the App on both Android and Apple phones for the PWA. There was a user manual which needed to be updated and this could then be put on the SAMCODES sites and probably also on the GSSA site. If the App was ever being advertised, she believed the user manual might need to go with it. The current user guide was also on the App and there was a link. The biggest aim was to get two or three admin users to share the load in keeping the App current. Mr Nel volunteered his services. A request would also be made to GSSA in this regard. Ms Jardine agreed to see if there was someone else to assist from the SAIMM side. Action: Camielah Jardine
5. CRIRSCO	Mr Lomborg advised that CRIRSCO was about to have its annual meeting, which was scheduled for October; two weeks prior to the SAMCODES Conference. It would be a virtual meeting due to all the travel restrictions. Regarding the countries that were coming in, the Philippines was very close to becoming a member, they just had to get the stock exchange to approve the code and attachments, which was very encouraging. He did not believe there were any other countries that were any closer. The other thing was that a strong relationship was being developed with the ICMM. They had a new CEO who was a South African, so it was hoped that the relationship with them could be improved. Also of interest was that JORC were currently updating their code. One of the aspects they were looking at that would be of interest was the CP and ASIC, the regulator. The regulator wanted some guarantee that the Competent Person was competent. It might well be that there would be quite lengthy discussions on how the professional organisations manage competent persons.
6. SAMCODES Conference	This conference was planned for 25-29 October 2021 and would be a virtual event. The agenda was on the SAIMM website. There were 20 short papers that would be presented over that time. Mr Lomborg asked members to register and advertise this conference, to ensure that it was worthwhile. Ms Jardine advised that there were currently 13 registrations. Action: All members
7. Technical Discussion: Effective date of CPR and date of resource or reserve	Mr Lomborg believed that this meeting should not be purely an administrative one; but should also serve as an opportunity to discuss technical issues. This would be put as a standing item on the agenda, so that any technical issue that came up could be aired and discussed. A recent one that had come up was the effective date of a CPR and the date of a resource or reserve. The situation was that someone had submitted a document to the JSE for a number of mines which had their end of year at the end of the previous calendar of 2020 as the date of their resource and reserve but, because of the time taken to put the CPR together, it was now August, so they were out of the six-month rule which is currently in place for the JSE. The question was now important it was, and under which circumstances could the effective date of the document and the date of the resource

and reserve be longer than six months? He opened the question to the floor.

Prof Rupprecht commented that the report in question was an exception to the rule, in that it was not the type of report one saw every day, and he believed common-sense should prevail. There was a difference when one was reporting eight months later, when you had one mine vs a number of mines and had a huge task ahead, running to over 1 000 pages.

Mr Witley added that when looking at a mining company, they had a planning session that happened through the year and, typically, the mineral resource models were updated first. Then, based on the data at the time, this went to the mining engineer to do his plan and schedule the production reserve. This happened over a one-year cycle, but typically, what happened was that the mine would then do a depletion on that model, i.e. they would fix the data way back when, but they will do a depletion on the model and then redeclare the effective date of that nominal resource as per the last mining phases. He wondered, in this particular case, why people did not do the same thing.

Mr Lomberg believed it was more an administration issue in this situation, but it still begged the question.

Ms van Deventer suggested that one needed to look at why it was and what the reasoning was to be transparent, so that any significant changes in the past reporting period was actually reported on. It would probably suffice if one could get a statement to say that there were no significant changes from when they did the resource and reserving up to the publication of the CPR; unless there were significant changes, were a statement could be made in that essence. Mr Lomberg added that that significant change could either be that they mined a significant amount or there was a significant amount of additional data. In fact, any one of the modifying factors.

Mr Ingram advised that he would take this back to the JSE for their response.

Mr Lomberg commented that if there was a very large resource and reserve and six months' production was insignificant, it should not make any difference.

Mr Ingram believed it had to be a substantial material change that would invalidate the original statements, but he did not believe that was the case in this instance.

Mr Lomberg asked if there were particular questions that should be put on the list for discussion. Ms Flitton knew that there was a paper being presented on exclusive mineral resources at the SAMCODES Conference, but she did think that mineral resources needed to be looked at again. She asked whether SAMREC needed to provide further guidance to the CPs on how to calculate/estimate that exclusive mineral resource. Mr Lomberg believed that was a good topic to put on the list

Mr Lomberg asked that, if there were technical issues that members would like to raise, these should be forwarded to Ms Jardine so that a list could be put together. It would be good that the meeting should not just be an administration meeting. At some stage, it would be necessary to issue an update to the Code, as the Code was now five

	years old. It was quite a big undertaking and he believed most people were a bit wary of starting that, as it would be pretty heavy going. Action: All Members
8. Training	The SAMCODES Conference was the big training event of the year. Next year it would be normal training. Typically, there had been advanced training and basic training in two separate years and the committee may well decide to do both next year. These would be done virtually. The last training done was the basic training.
9. General	Ms Linda Iaccheri introduced herself. She was new to the meeting and thanked the committee for including her. She was a lecturer in mining geology at Wits and she taught honours students and mining engineers. She was at the ESG Inquisition and had been invited by Dr Marshall to join the SAMREC committee, as she actually taught the SAMREC Code. Mr Lomborg welcomed her and filled her in about the training courses available. Ms Lisa Chanderman raised a general comment. A lot of time was spent discussing the wording of things and what people should be doing; but one still came across a lot of CPRs that should not even be called that. She did not believe there were any repercussions for putting that kind of information out. She understood that it was a small community and one did not want to ruffle any feathers, but she wanted to know what the team thought about that. Prof Rupprecht advised that he had done a couple of complaints. It was a mixed bag. The aim was not to disbar a CP or CV; it was just a question of trying to correct poor reporting. He was also concerned that there had not been a complaint over the past two or three years, even though there were some reports out that were questionable. He believed there was work to be done on both sides and, if the shortcomings were not addressed, there would one day be a rule that would put it into a third party's hands and SAMCODES would lose control. He supported the call to do something about it. Mr Lomborg reiterated what Prof Rupprecht said. He believed there should be more policing of the Code, but nobody wanted to be seen as the hatchet man doing the complaints. The sanction should be training or mentorship long before there were any serious possible consequences and somehow the balance had to be right. Ms Chanderman advised that it was the first time she had heard of the process to lodge a complaint if one came across a CPR that was clearly not ever meant to be one. Mr Lomborg noted that the one thing common to all CRIRSCO Codes was that they had to have a Code of Ethics and a Disciplinary Code. The CoE and DC were more difficult to get right for new entrants into the Code itself. When he spoke to the people at JORC a few weeks back, they had had about ten complaints in the last year or so. He suggested talking to them to find out their process. Ms Chanderman did not agree with naming and shaming, but she believed people should value the work they put out there. Regarding the CPRs, Ms Flitton reported that the JSE did give feedback on annual reporting, so that if there were any shortcomings, etc. they let the company know and a response had to be given and added to the annual report. She was not sure whether CPRs were treated differently within the JSE. Mr Lomborg advised that the feedback was all in the public company space.

	Ms Iaccheri asked whether anybody was attending the workshop which AusIMM was holding on ESG. Mr Lomborg responded that, through CRIRSCO, there was a very good connection with the AusIMM. Ms Iaccheri asked whether anyone attending could please bring back some notes. Regarding training, Ms Flitton noted that a lot of training was recorded and this was something that could be followed up with Dr Marshall. For example, there was a SAMCODES training session done at the beginning of the year (or maybe last year). This was recorded and she believed that people could still pay for those courses and go and watch the recording, while also getting CPD points. She suggested that this might be an avenue if Ms Iaccheri did want to do courses.
Next meeting	The next meeting was scheduled for 25 November 2021.
Meeting closure	Mr Lomborg thanked everyone for their attendance and contribution. The meeting ended at 11:30.

Matters arising/Action Items

Meeting Date	Action	Responsible	Due	Status	Comments
26/08/21	Update list of App sponsors	Tshepi Letlhaku	November 2021		
26/08/21	Identify admin user from SAIMM	Camielah Jardine	November 2021		
26/08/21	Register for SAMCODES Conference	All members	September 2021		
26/08/21	Put forward questions for discussion under 'Technical Discussions'	All members	November 2021		