

**NOTES OF THE SAMREC COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON 29 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 09:45**  
**MIDSHAFT BOARDROOM, MINING PRECINCT, CARLOW ROAD**

**Present:**           **T Marshall (Acting Chairperson)**  
                          **N Lock**  
                          **L Jeffrey**  
                          **M Austin**  
                          **K Ramaamo**  
                          **L Koorsse**  
                          **T Flitton**  
                          **M Stewardson**

**Apologies:**       **K Lomborg   C Dohm**

---

**1.     WELCOME**

Ms Marshall chaired the meeting and welcomed the committee.

**2.     ACCEPTANCE OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Correction – Mr Stewardson to give feedback on the SANS Document and not Mr Austin. The summary of the action items should also be corrected.

Correction – page 2 - 4.2 SAMCODES app – the paragraph reads world news, but it should be corrected and changed to news only, not world news.

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 August 2018 were accepted as being a true reflection of proceedings.

**3.     MATTERS ARISING**

**3.1 Chinese Delegation for the Mineral and Resource Visit**

Ms Marshall confirmed that many of the members present were involved with the Chinese visit and they would like to extend their gratitude to the efforts everybody put in. Also to Mr Mullins for his own effort, and Jeff to arrange the three weeks visit by the Chinese, from a technical standpoint it was a very successful meeting. There is still communication with attendees, questions they only thought about two weeks later. There has been great communication and they want us to extend their gratitude to everybody that participated.

Dr Lock had interaction with Chinese Diamond people, and one of the features of their working life before this visit at least was more of an alignment with the Russian codes and the command the convict, for example the 701 mine, they have a battery of mills to make sure they recovered every single tiny diamond. So that is the sort of conflict between their working life and our working life. How did that come up and all sort of discussions that were held during this visit.

Ms Flitton's contribution were that there were so many things that they did not completely understand, for example, SAMREC is a principle's based set of guidelines. And competent persons are to use their experience and their ability and they could not comprehend that. In China you have rules for everything and the idea of you using your intelligence to make a decision - that is not something that they ever had in their careers. One of the other things that was very difficult for them to come to terms with, is the fact that everything is not run by the state. That SAMREC, SAMVAL, BSSC, they are all NGO's, they are independent. They don't have someone from the state sitting and telling them what they will do and how to do it. Those are some of the issues that they had lots and lots of discussions about. Ms Flitton is not sure that there were any resolutions at the end of the day. There was no political commissar but the head of the delegation was the Deputy of the Ministry of Resource and Reserve Estimation Committee of the Minerals Division of the People's Republic of China. China is making a huge effort but there are some of the fundamental issues that still has to be grasped.

It is a cultural issue really. And the fact that only two of them spoke good English was a complicating factor. Coal issues, they tell you how to do it. Questions were asked, what phase of the study are you in, the answer is simply, whatever phase you want to be in, the Chinese couldn't cope with that.

### **3.2 SANS Document**

Mr Stewardson not present therefore no feedback available.

**ACTION: Mark Stewardson/Matt Mullins**

### **3.3 SAMCODES APP**

As per Ms Marshall, the SAMCODES demo app was taken to CRIRSCO, but not enough feedback was provided to elaborate on this item. It was agreed that Mr Lomborg will give the feedback on this item in the next meeting.

**ACTION: Tarryn Flitton/Ken Lomborg/Matt Mullins**

### **3.4 Formation of the Sub-Committee acquire sponsorships for the SAMCODES app**

Mr Mullins to discuss this with Mr Lomborg and provide feedback once this meeting has taken place.

**ACTION: Matt Mullins/Ken Lomborg**

### **3.5 Concern regarding the definition of competent person to be raised at CRIRSCO**

Mr Lomborg will discuss this with Dr Lock and feedback will be provided once this meeting between Mr Lomborg and Dr Lock has taken place.

**ACTION: Ken Lomborg/Matt Mullins**

### **3.6 Fundamentals of the SAMREC Committee**

Ms Marshall announced that Mr Mark Austin will be taking over as Deputy Chair of SAMREC from the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2019. This was confirmed by Mr Austin himself.

#### **4. MINOR ALTERATIONS: DRILLHOLE**

As per Ms Marshall the next item that needs to be looked at is within the SAMREC Code, the term drillhole and borehole is used interchangeably. So the proposal is that for consistency sake, the term drillhole should be used. The issue was raised that you get drillhole one word and drillhole two words. Why this discussion took place is to make sure that SANS aligns to SAMREC, so the decision needs to be made which version of drillhole will be used so that the SANS document can be edited. The suggestion was to go to CRIRSCO and find out what they say. Dr Lock volunteered to do the research and go to CRIRSCO to do this.

The question was raised as to what the timeline of the decision making about the version of the word drillhole will be used, it was decided that it will be during the February meeting. This is needed again to update the SANS document that was scheduled to be sent out for public comment early next year.

Dr Lock undertook to send his feedback to Mr Lomberg for feedback in the February meeting.

**ACTION: Dr Lock/Mr Lomberg**

#### **5. SAMCODES APP**

As per Mr Austin, they have been very close to a final product for quite some time now. The last week of the term that Mr Austin had with them was around the text search functionality. So when you access the app, you can either do online or it actually brings down the documentation to your cell phone as a pdf. When you're online, text search is no problem at all, but when you're offline, they are unable to do that text search. And in their wisdom and their good-heartedness, they thought they would go away and try and sort this out. They approached other application developers who all said, yes, we can do that and then later came back and admitted that they can't do that. So it delayed things quite a lot. So Mr Austin had a chat to them this morning and said to them that they need to get the app out, get this version out, it needs to be marketed so the community can actually see it work and then come back to us with their comments. So that's what we're going to do. We're going to say that they've got the functionality of the text search when you're online, and most people will be online anyway, get the product out there and let's get going. Ms Marshall raised the question of when are they hoping to have it ready. Mr Costin's response was after a brief conversation this morning, they are hoping to get it up within the next day or two. It really is very close, probably earlier than previously anticipated. If they are happy with the results, they will probably release it.

They had a couple of things where there was question marks. Mr Austin thought about minutes ago adding sponsors versus advertisers. Mr Austin think the terms were interchangeable. Sponsors are people who give you money to achieve an end as opposed to advertisers, who are paying you a fee to advertise their product. Mr Austin think they've gotten away from getting revenue collection via sponsors. We'd rather go fully onto advertisers.

We still need to land how we're going to manage that particulars. And who are going to manage it. It's actually going to take very little money to run this app and we were hoping SAIMM could do that on our behalf. With some training, very little training, and some stuff to be done, probably half an hour per month, it is that small. There are a few things, load on the news, that sort of things and just to control the advertisers. One of current members could manage the loading of the news, the events, etc. Someone from the committee could probably manage. It is really the advertising and the collecting of that revenue. We did say we are not going to start it on a monthly basis, we are going to start it on a six monthly to a year basis, and this will reduce the admin part of the collection

because again the app is for free. The end user will not be paying for the app. And the committee believe that they could probably cover it with advertising. More than likely and any excess revenue can then be put back into the app for further advancement.

From a SANS point of view, you just got the SAMREC code in and you haven't got any link to SANS. SANS has no website, in the event that they do want a link to SANS, they will have to go through the SABS website. The app has links to SAMREC, SAMVAL, STEMARK, JSC, and those four for now.

The question was raised if it will have a SAMIAS guideline link as well. The answer was to rather just do a link to download the guidelines. The app will link with the SAMCODES news wall. And there will be a link icon that people can click on their phones and their tablets, and then it will take them to all the links on the app.

The SANS codes has not been linked to the app as yet but could be included at any time. Anything that can be used to get the SANS Codes out there will be great. It was suggested that even if it is not on the app itself, the link could be mentioned under the news functionality for marketing purposes. Another question was raised as to how much control there will be over personal information? The committee don't want to be bombarded by advertisers. Unless you physically click on an icon, it will not open up a pop up. They have been quite careful, there is a place where users can add their details, they can but it doesn't force a user but will allow for this committee to have a target audience and know whom has downloaded their app, so they can communicate things on there. It was suggested to be very careful with the privacy of personal information, you will have to have various levels of security to prevent hacks and things like that for personal information. This was noted and will be discussed in more detail. It was re-iterated that security was built into the app. If the collection of the information is an issue, they can change the settings on the app to not collect any information.

The suggestion was made to give the committee time till February to get their ducks in a row and decide if they want to collect the information or if they don't. This was agreed upon by some of the other committee members.

**ACTION: Steven Rupprecht/Tania Marshall/Matt Mullins**

## **6. CRIRSCO NEWS**

In September Mr Lomberg and Mr Dixon went to London for the CRIRSCO meeting. Mr Lomberg is currently the Deputy Chairperson for CRIRSCO and he will remain so for the next year, they have a two year change over period. And Mr Lomberg will be promoted to the Chairman of CRIRSCO, which is a fairly big achievement.

The updated CRIRSCO template has been finalised and will be available soon on the CRIRSCO website. That is based very much on the latest SAMREC Code. Roger Dixon has been doing a huge amount of work in compiling the CRIRSCO template. What the CRIRSCO template means is, every county that develop their code based on CRIRSCO, takes the thirteen definitions in the template verbatim. That is the basis of any new code. CRIRSCO has agreed to base most of the definition on what SAMREC has been doing during their last rewrite.

Ms Marshall stated that as far as she is aware, none of the SAMREC codes needs to be changed or updated, the latest version was finalised at the last CRIRSCO meeting so there should be a draft going out very soon but as far as Ms Marshall is aware, there is nothing SAMREC need to update.

The next CRIRSCO meeting is in Washington in September 2019.

## **7. SEC NEWS**

Ms Marshall reminded the committee that back in 2016 they were all asked to make comments on the SEC regulations. The Americans had a dual system of notification. The SME had a code that was similar but different to everybody else's. Ms Flitton raised the question if SME is not a CRIRSCO code? Ms Marshall responded positive but also added that there were certain things that was slightly different. It wasn't accepted by the SEC, Securities and Exchange Commissions, they had their own set of regulations. In 2016 the SEC sent around communication asking all bodies to comment on them developing, taking the SME Code, updating and modernizing it bringing it in line with CRIRSCO. All parties involved put in their comments and the updated SEC Guidelines were distributed last month. Ms Flitton raised the question if it is a guideline. Ms Marshall responded that it is a guideline as long as you do it exactly the way that it is. It becomes requirement in 2021 and it is downloadable from the website. All the committee members were sent a PDF copy of the new version.

Ms Marshall continued, Mr Tim Rowland's was going to provide feedback on this, as he was asked to read it in depth because Goldfields is dual listed. The press release, nobody has time to read 438 pages of SEC guidelines, but there is a two page summary in the press release on the SEC website, which is actually very useful. They have to a large extent harmonised with CRIRSCO, they don't use the term competent person. However they've decided to go with the Canadian qualified person. Some of the really nice things on it is that inferred resources are allowed, you can even talk about exploration targets in the same way CRIRSCO allows description of exploration targets. It is a very useful tool to download and stick on your hard drive somewhere. The summary is much less than the full document. Once Mr Rowland has had a look at it he will provide feedback and also more about the application. The understanding of all the committee members were that Mr Rowland were going to make a formal proposal about the SEC guidelines in the current meeting, to put a working group together. Ms Marshall said this should just be held over till the next meeting. It was suggested to put this item on the agenda for the next meeting and also to enquire whom would like to be part of this group. Ms Flitton raised the issue of maybe involving SASOL to form part of this group. Ms Marshall made the assumption that part of what Mr Rowland will do is to send that communication out, as broad as possible, to get anybody whom might be interested, comments on it. The sub-committee will be more about how do companies that are dual-listed go about reporting so all companies dually listed can report in similar ways. It can't affect the SEC guidelines at all, but it can be discussed on how to apply it, what the best uses are and so forth. These SEC guidelines will come into effect on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2021. Ms Flitton said it would be good if Mr Rowland start to communicate as soon as possible, sending out whom wants to be involved, he will chair, and how often they plan to meet, and the context of the sub-committee is about.

## **8. TRAINING**

Ms Marshall on training issues going forward. Mr Lomborg is going to be presenting at the MIASA Conference, which is directly after the Mining Indaba, organised by the Minerals Council and he has a twenty minute slot there, to introduce the whole of SAMCODES.

They are doing the basic SAMREC, JSE, reporting course done every year, GSSA organised course, and the date is set for the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> of May 2019.

Then there is the advance SAMREC SAMVAL, that's the SAIMM Conference, which is later in the year, date is set for 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of August 2019.

The SAMVAL and SAMREC introduction for non-technical professionals needs to be re-invigorated, this is held at the JSE. That is for non-geologists, it is for accountants and lawyers and such individuals.

Early in October, the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the 3<sup>rd</sup> of October, SAMREC have the next Companion Volume Conference. Two years ago, in 2016, they had the Companion Volume Conference Launch with the launch of the SAMCODES, this is now the follow up, and some of the objectives behind this conference is that the codes have been out for two years. What has been learnt? What are the issues? How have they been able to deal with? What are the good things they have done with it? What are some of the perhaps not so good things that has come out of it? So really at this stage, SAMREC is asking people to think about what they would like to present, give some thought to writing a paper, doing a presentation, there are no details about what the Conference is going to be about. The first organising committee meeting will only be held in January 2019. This was only mentioned during this meeting to give the committee a heads up that this conference is going to take place and for the members to give some thought to some ideas. Ms Marshall requested that any feedback or information to be sent to Camilla so that this can be discussed at the organising committee meeting and see where SAMREC can go with this. The Conference will be held in Johannesburg, easy access for everybody to get to.

Dr Lock wants to make a contribution straight away. GORK were the first to have a companion body in 2001. The nature of that conference in publication is pretty much by way of case studies. They had a second version which looked at the detail, which is not quite as good. The other domain is Canada where they have gone in a difference direction and there is a fifty odd page document which is a guideline to estimation methodology for that from Grassroots through to production. Clearly that is a much more prescriptive type of document although it is not selling itself as prescriptive but it is not case studies. That is why Dr Lock is drawing the contrast. In 2016, SAMREC had a bit of a mixture between the two, and Dr Lock wants to encourage identifying opportunities, identifying gaps in the prescriptive side of it and then adding the case studies side to it. Dr Lock asked the committee if his suggestion resonate with anybody else. Ms Marshall agreed that they didn't want to narrow it down to either one or the other, they want as much as possible from all aspects. Dr Lock concurred, fill gaps on the one side and on the other side, and both sides continue to be presented by SAMREC, in contrast to Canada and Australia, this is how SAMREC distinguishes itself.

Ms Marshall continued that one of the topics Mr Lomberg suggested was on how to deal with historical data. This has always been an issue in everybody's reporting. Where you have written reports, read reports, seen issues, you don't think has been handled properly, you think could be handled a different way or you have no idea how it should be handled, just not the way it is handled now. Ms Marshall suggested that all these issues could be brought up for presentation at this Conference, and according to procedure, it will be peer-reviewed and published in the Proceedings Volume.

## **9. SANS 10230 AND COAL GUIDELINES**

Ms Flitton stipulated that the document reference number on the meeting agenda should be SANS 10320, not 10230. The committee consist of about 5 or 6 people that are regulars. They are finished for the year. They have one more meeting in January and then they hope to be able to get the code part of the document out for the second round of public comments. The code part refers to all the public reporting issues that has been listed and put them up front. They used a mixture of following the Diamond guideline, following the SAMREC code and obeying the SABS's various Editorial Protocols that can't be ignored. So everything that is public reporting is on the first pages, it is about ten clauses long. Everything after this is about the 'how to', the appendices. And they are considering, but again this they have to run through SANS, moving the 'how to' items into an appendix. And possibly even having two parts to the document. Part A is all code items, Part B is the current appendices plus the 'how to' items. So it is still published as one document but with two very distinct parts to it. What they have left to do on the code side is review two diagrams, make sure that they fit in with SAMREC and convey SAMREC's intentions. There is one more thing that they needed to do. The following is a summary

email of the progress sent by Karen this morning. *After session with the editors at the SABS it was agreed that all definitions as quoted from SAMREC will only appear in Clause 3, which is all our definitions, where it will be fully referenced. SABS protocol is not to capitalise or bold print but appear statement in how the wording should be interpreted is included. The following wording is included in the introduction to the SANS Document for clarification to the reader and I am quoting now. 'Definitions reference from the 2016 addition that the South African committee reporting of exploration results in Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves (SAMREC Code, SAMREC 2016) by identifying meaning and application, although these are not capitalised in this document, according to SABS Editorial Protocol. As an example, competent persons approach in this document and it is all lower case, is the same as competent person in quotes with capital C and capital P, in the SAMREC code. The SAMREC code Editorial Codes apply to all public reporting. So that's how we try to accommodate both sides. The word shall is used where provision is mandatory. Should is used where provision is preferred and may is used where alternatives are equally acceptable. Any variance from the SAMREC code and this standard shall be motivated in a clear and transparent manner on and 'if not why not' basis. Then Karen goes on to say:- after a few iterations, we have now written the coal guideline in such a way that we specifically address specific aspects around public reporting and non-public reporting, following the principles of the Diamond Guideline. Public and non-public reporting is clearly separated and they should not be confused with the use of the guideline. Generic principles are highlighted in the different reporting categories discussed separately. We believe it is nearly there. The working group still needs to edit the associated figures. These are scheduled towards the end of January. Once this is complete the draft document of the first chapters will be circulated to the original interested parties that responded during the DSS Phase. The next phase of editing will then be to add the old chapters six onwards in, that is the 'how to' items, and consideration would be given to appropriateness and inclusion is either further technical 'how to' chapters or appendices. This editing will continue while the first ten clauses, are out for comment and input. Karen also included the content, there are ten clauses which are the following: - scope; normative references; terms and definitions, the first three being SABS protocol, then it is public reporting general; public reporting of coal expiration results; public reporting of coal expiration targets; public reporting of coal resources; public reporting of coal reserves; public reporting of coal and pillars remnants and stock piles and clause ten non-public (internal) reporting of inventory toll.*

A comment was made by Ms Marshall that there has been a huge amount of work done on this document since last year that they started with it. Ms Flitton stated that from a personal point of view, she thinks this has been an incredibly valuable exercise because it makes you look at your area with a different set of eyes and you try to make sure that people outside of coal know what you are talking about. Coal people read it and it is obvious to them, but outsiders can read it and understand. Ms Marshall said that they are looking forward to the draft of Part A.

The following question was posed to Mr Koorse. Once the committee hand the SANS document over to SABS, they have no control over it, the Editorial Staff of SABS will get hold of it. They will have to go through the whole document before it goes out for second comment, won't it? Mr Koorse agreed. Previously the SABS had staff issues which is why it took so long, but the staff issues has been resolved. Ms Flitton expressed the hope that it will result in things happening quicker, but agreed that they are at the SABS's mercy with this.

## **10. GENERAL**

Mr Austin asked the question how SAMREC approach the changes to the code. Does SAMREC just incrementally change the code or are they going to wait and do what Step changes say they can do? Ms Marshall commented that when you have a look at things

like drillholes and non-material issues, they first do research and then put out an updated version of SAMVAL. The version that is on the website is take de-facto as being the most up to date ones. What normally happens is you change the one on the website, you don't need to change the version number or anything like that. You just add it to the website and you can put out a notification, probably under news on the website, that the version has been updated with the following changes and that is all you need to do. If it is material change, then it has to go through the JSE, and the FSB and Public Participation and the whole process. So material changes are kept aside, until there are enough material changes to actually make a new updated version of it. But these spelling mistakes and all of that, there were a couple of changes made already on the website.

It is important to have virtual control. Virtual control is held by the SAIMM with Sam, we have a Dropbox, where any new control or any new versions go into that Dropbox, the old one is removed and the new one is added. It is all dated so they know exactly which is which.

Mr Ramaamo raised the question as to how should they go about to update the document and do changes? Ms Marshall answered by saying that SAMREC does not make any allowance for updates. That is specifically through the JSE. Any document go into the JSE and it cannot be updated by SAMREC. The concern SAMREC has with updates, is what if the person has no access to the original document? Then they can't see what the material changes might be. Ms Marshall said she doesn't think there would be too much of an issue with non-material updates but anything material does trigger a new agenda.

It was suggested to put the change to a material item's update on the agenda for discussion on the next meeting. Ms Marshall agreed, and also suggested that Mr Ramaamo attended the Companion Volume Conference, it is a major concern, a topic of discussion, a presentation. On this Conference they don't want to stand up there and pat themselves on the back and commend themselves on the good they have done. They have a world class standard in SAMVAL, they don't want to stop there. The industry changes, things change, people find ways of getting around things, new circumstances arrive, how will SAMREC address those changes going forward. It is not a static document, it's got to improve and issues like this need to be highlighted, so Ms Marshall agreed to put it on the agenda for discussion in the next meeting and also keep it in mind for a presentation.

Dr Lock raised that the CIM has a section where they have taken some short discussions papers on specific issues and if that was sort of in the form of a blog, in the app, it allows for a conversation between interested parties, and helps guide the things that needs to be looked at in the next revision. Ms Marshall confirmed that this is the point of these discussions so that when they need to update, they have a list of the things that needs to be updated, nothing forgotten or dropped through the cracks going forward. Dr Lock continued that having something outside of the committee might be helpful, like a public discussion forum. Ms Marshall reminded the committee that SAMREC has a website where they encourage people to write controversial papers. In the last three years they have not received one paper. Ms Flitton is of the opinion that a paper might be too long and giving someone the opportunity to write a paragraph or half a page might spark some interest. Dr Lock raised the question what does effective dates, what does this mean? It would be good to put these discussions out on the website so that SAMREC is aware of what is going on out there. Ms Flitton suggested that when you receive a CPR and you do your work based on the CPR, in theory, if it is a publicly listed company, it should have gone through the readers panel, but there is nothing on that document to show you that it has gone through the readers panel. It would be nice if a publicly reported document that has passed by the readers panel has some sort of a stamp or something so that future readers could be happy with it. Ms Marshall cautioned that the fact that it has passed the readers panel doesn't make the document gospel, the readers panel checks compliance. If there are major issues the readers panel can bring it to the attention of the author but they cannot force the author to change the document. Ms Flitton said just the fact that



the panel confirmed that it is compliant with the code, gives you a certain level of comfort. Ms Marshall stated that if it is a public company, then if it was their listing document or the annual report, it would be reviewed, other documents are not reviewed. Ms Flitton agreed and would like to see the panel has reviewed this and it is compliant.

Dr Lock suggested that they should take action when something is wrong and compliance through the proper channels. According to Ms Flitton this is a generic issue, specific to a particular company at a particular time with a particular author and the ramifications of causing trouble with that could be a mine closing factor. As per Ms Marshall this was discussed earlier this morning in another meeting, and Mr Duke was very passionate about a particular issue. They are trying to find ways of not hurting the industry. At the moment there are not specific answers but they are thinking the more they can raise awareness that these issues does exist, and these are the correct ways of doing it, might help to resolve these issues, but Ms Marshall did agree that they don't have any answers.

As per Ms Glitse they are going to maybe possibly in the Companion Volume Converse, bring out that in that case of CPR is written badly or non-compliant. Ms Marshall raised the question if it has been to the JSC panel. The chance of taking that CP to some form of disciplinary action or noting it through, they might be on SATMAS or ECXO, they should be compliant to whomever they are registered with. According to Ms Flitton one step could be to have an independent peer-review, which means someone outside the company does the review. Ms Glitse agreed that this might help. Ms Glitse continued to explain. Maybe before the document is finalised it has to be sent to Marc to cast an eye and make sure all is good and nothing is missing. This is done internally, and it was brought up that externally they might run into confidentiality issues by doing this. Dr Lock said that the Canadian approach to this is to file a report prepared by an independent qualified person rather than an internal qualified person. Ms Flitton are putting both of those two categories in one basket and say maybe both of them need to be reviewed by an external, not prepared by. Dr Lock stated that at the moment, if a publicly available report does not appear to be in accordance with the SAMREC code, or whatever code needed, then there is already a procedure in place for a complaint to be made to the SAMREC Committee, which sometimes can take years to get an opinion. Ms Marshall stated that there were only one particular circumstance that took longer than a year, the rest was done fairly quickly. So Dr Lock suggested to log a complaint according to the procedures already in place. Currently the committee agreed that there are no specific procedures to deal with non-listed companies. SAMREC defines a public report is anything that is or may come into the public domain, it is the main part and this is a problem.

Ms Glitse would also like to see a JC paper to come out, where they give statistics on how many CPR's have been reviewed the last year, and also to give an indication of which ones were compliant. Ms Marshall brought under the attention of the committee members that every year they do publish the statistics on the website under the JSC Tab, Rob Ingram compiles these statistics, then he present it to the SCC, and that document is put on the website. The committee suggested that this document or statistics should be done as a presentation.

## **11. CLOSING**

Ms Marshall announced that the next meeting is set as the 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2019 and the meetings for the rest of 2019 will then be distributed.

Ms Marshall thanked all the members for their participation and all to have a good break and to travel safely if they are going anywhere.

**SUMMARY OF KEY ACTION ITEMS**

**1. Mark Stevenson**

Mark Stevenson has been requested to circulate minutes of the SANS document.

**2. Ken Lomberg**

Ken Lomberg to provide feedback on the SAMCODES demo app presented to CRIRSCO.

**3. Matt Mullins/Ken Lomberg**

Matt Mullins to drive the formation of the sub-committee that will look at sponsorship options for the SAMCODES app.

**4. Ken Lomberg**

Ken Lomberg has to ensure that Dr Norman Lock's concerns regarding the definition of the competent person is raised at CRIRSCO.

**5. Steven Rupprecht/Tania Marshall**

Feedback to be provided on the SAMCODES app that was presented to CRIRSCO.