

**MINUTES OF THE SAMVAL WORKING GROUP MEETING**  
**HELD ON 07 MAY 2015 AT 08:00**  
**IN THE DELVILLE WOOD ROOM, MILITARY MUSEUM**

<b>Present</b>	<b>K Redman (Chairman)</b>	
	<b>H Bornman</b>	<b>T Marshall</b>
	<b>J Botha</b>	<b>S Mathuray</b>
	<b>A Clay</b>	<b>G Njowa</b>
	<b>V Duke</b>	<b>J Odendaal</b>
	<b>A M de Bruyn</b>	<b>M Tlala</b>
	<b>A Kinghorn</b>	<b>D van Niekerk</b>
	<b>J Luckmann</b>	<b>A van Zyl</b>
	<b>A MacDonald</b>	
<b>Apologies:</b>	<b>E du Toit</b>	<b>B Scott</b>
	<b>H Hartman</b>	<b>E Takolia</b>
	<b>J Ruddy</b>	
<b>In Attendance:</b>	<b>R van der Berg</b>	<b>SAIMM</b>
	<b>A Donnelly</b>	<b>Scribe</b>

---

## 1. Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and a list of apologies was read by Mr van der Berg.

## 2. Acceptance of previous minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2015 were accepted as a true reflection of proceedings. Proposed by A Kinghorn and seconded by J Luckmann.

## 3. Matters Arising

### 3.1 Finalisation of draft Code

Ms Redman advised that in terms of the finalisation of the Code; for comparison purposes, both the version showing changes made at this meeting and the previous version would be circulated to working group members. Although most of the outstanding issues had been dealt with, there were still a few issues to be discussed. Once these had been incorporated, the Code would be scrutinised and any minor changes would be made. This document would be sent out as Version 12 for final comment.

**Action: Ms K Redman**

Mr MacDonald reminded the meeting that the draft Code would require ratification by the SSC before going out for public comment.

### **3.2 Roadshows**

Mr Kinghorn advised that the Witbank roadshow had been well-attended and much interest had been shown and people were eager to see the Code. The Rustenburg roadshow had been held on 06 May, with Mr Njowa hosting. No feedback had been given as yet. Mr van der Berg advised that the Johannesburg roadshow initially planned for May would now take place in June. The Chairman commented that there should be added interest due to fact that the Code would then be out for public comment. The Johannesburg roadshow would be combined with the Johannesburg Branch Meeting at Worley Parsons in Melrose.

### **3.3 IMVAL**

In terms of IMVAL, the Chairman advised that some progress had been made and the decision by the IMVAL Committee was to finalise the IMVAL template and put it out to industry. A few updates were being finalised and it was anticipated that a draft should be ready to go out to industry by the end of May. Mr van der Berg and Ms Moolla would be requested to circulate this broadly to interested and affected parties.

Mr Clay added that there had been a lot of e-mail traffic and provided some feedback from a recent conference call. There had much debate around the issue of "property" vs "asset". Originally, this was replacing Guideline 14 in the IVSC and this should slot into that framework. Bill Roscoe (Chairman) handled the debate very well and it was decided to leave IMVAL as is, i.e. it would remain as "property" and not "asset". SAMVAL did not have a CRIRSCO similarity as with SAMREC, so there was a question as to whether to align with IVSC or not. The registration process was still open. Mr Clay believed it was very important for SAMVAL to have its own clear and concise document, under its own jurisdiction. There should be flexibility from both sides. VALMIN's document had been finalised and was available on their website.

Mr MacDonald raised two concerns. The first was that the term "property" was around real estate and not around mineral assets. The other concern was regarding jurisdiction and whether this would depend on where the plant was based. Mr Clay replied that there was a legal framework and connotations. Ms Redman queried whether this did not depend on the commissioning entity in terms of their requirements. The SAMVAL document alluded to that and that had been the principle used. A Competent Person had to play a role in advising the client but the final onus rested with the person issuing the instructions.

**Action: R van der Berg/S Moolla**

The IMVAL Code would be very similar to SAMVAL (principles-based) and would not be prescriptive. Provided the two Codes were in parallel, with similar processes and definitions, Mr Clay did not foresee problems. IVSC wanted the outstanding issues resolved.

In terms of getting a workshop together regarding final feedback on the outstanding items, the Chairman advised that this would be done in two weeks' time in order to finalise the draft Code before the SSC Meeting. Mr Clay queried the need for another workshop. The Chairman replied that this would only be necessary if major issues arose for discussion. While it was important not to allow one person to hold up the process, if there were issues that had been raised by people, those people should be assured that these had been addressed.

Mr van der Berg was requested to set up a meeting with Mr Rob Croll during the week commencing 11 May to discuss outstanding issues. Mr van Niekerk reiterated that there had been ample opportunity to raise significant issues and issues of principle. Mr Duke queried whether these issues had not been raised at a previous meeting by Mr Croll. Ms Redman advised that Mr Croll had advised that he had issues, but they were never put on the table. The alternative was to finalise the document to ensure that nothing had been missed; send out Version 12 to working group members and allow two weeks for final comment. All agreed to this approach.

**Action: R van der Berg**

Ms Redman suggested revisiting the list of "parked" issues, which should be a separate document. The purpose of doing that was to show that these issues had not been ignored, but were issues that had not been resolved. It was agreed to send out only the Code for final comment and not the separate list.

#### **4. Finalisation of Draft Code**

The Chairman advised that amendments had been made to Version 11 and the document to be sent out to working group members would be Version 12.

The following changes were discussed:

- A Table of Contents had been added.
- Full descriptions had been provided for institutions, etc., with acronyms following in brackets after the description. Regarding PLATO, it was suggested that a footnote be included to advise of the proposed name change. Depending on the time of release of the SAMVAL Code, this could be updated with the new name change.

**Action: K Redman**
- Under 1.2 History, discussion followed on whether to name various other bodies and learned societies; the decision was made to leave the *status quo*. Mr van Niekerk suggested looking at the more detailed SAMREC list. Ms Redman agreed to check on organisations, but there was consensus that the history from 2008 could not be rewritten and that current/new developments should be reflected elsewhere.

**Action: K Redman**
- Ms Redman had aligned definitions and these should be checked.
- Under 3.9 Complaints and Discipline, Mr van Niekerk commented that there should be a disciplinary code in order to regulate behaviour and suggested that this be included under Point 2.1.3, which stated that: "*The Valuation Report is based on work that is the responsibility of suitably qualified and experienced persons who are subject to an enforceable Professional Code of Ethics.*" Mr Bornman replied that the word "enforceable" implied that such a code was in place. It was agreed to change the wording in Point 2.1.3 to read: "*The Public Report is based on work that is the responsibility of suitably qualified and experienced persons who are subject to an enforceable Professional Code of Conduct/Ethics and a Disciplinary Code.*"

**Action: K Redman**
- Abbreviations should be checked, i.e. wherever reference was made to an official body, the official abbreviation should follow in brackets. Ms Redman requested assistance in this regard. Mr Njowa recommended consistency regarding the use of acronyms or abbreviations for organisations, provided such acronyms/abbreviations existed.

**Action: K Redman**

## 5. Timelines/Schedule

The Chairman reiterated that the document would be sent to the full working group for comment. The cut-off date for comments would be 20 May 2015 in order to allow the SSC members to view the draft Code prior to their meeting on 28 May 2015. The final format of the document should align with the SAMREC Code and the SAIMM Secretariat would fine-tune this. Continued liaison with the SAMREC working group was essential and Ms Redman would meet with Mr Ken Lomborg in this regard.

**Action: K Redman & All Members**

Mr Clay commented called for volunteers to assist Ms Redman on Version 12 and Ms de Bruyn and Mr Njowa put forward their names in this regard.

**Action: A de Bruyn and G Njowa**

## 6. General

Mr van Niekerk thanked the Chairman and Mr Macfarlane for their efforts in putting together the final draft Code.

Mr Njowa gave feedback on the roadshow that he had hosted. The roadshow had been well attended. He advised that a question had arisen regarding engagement of property valuers and the meeting discussed this point.

## 7. Date of next meeting

The next meeting would be held on 14 July 2015 at 08:00.

The Chairman thanked all for their participation and the meeting concluded at 09:30.

### SUMMARY OF KEY ACTION ITEMS

#### **Kelly Redman:**

Update all suggested changes to the Code  
Check for inconsistencies re definitions  
Send Code to working members for final comment  
Liaise with Ken Lomborg re standardisation between SAMVAL/SAMREC Codes

#### **Raymond van der Berg:**

Send out IMVAL template to all RPO's and interested members  
Set up meeting with R Croll re outstanding issues

#### **Godknows Njowa & Annelie de Bruyn**

Assist Ms Redman with changes to Version 11 of the Code

#### **All Members**

Peruse Version 12, once received, and submit final comments by 18 May 2015