

It had also been agreed to retain the repetition of definitions from the SAMREC Code and this was conveyed to Mr Dixon. Ms Marshall advised that, in terms of CRIRSCO, SAMOG had to be a stand-alone Code, as well as combined with any other Code.

The Chairman advised that all the instances of "shall/must" had been updated as per Mr Dixon's request.

The issue of whether the section on valuation of minerals resources and reserves should be mandatory or as a guideline was addressed in the document.

The section on the valuation of material (exploration target mineralisation) had been addressed.

Ms Redman had responded individually to those who had raised comments and the Code was sent to SSC for sanction and then on to the FSB.

3.2 Activities

Mr van Niekerk advised that he had not been in a position to follow this matter up, as he had not received a copy of Mr Clay's letter. All the comments submitted had been dealt with by the Competition Commission and the Council for the Built Environment. The Competition Commission was waiting for a meeting with the Minister of Public Works, which would cover not only engineers but also other professions, to give some guidance as to how the CC should proceed. Mr van Niekerk was unsure of how successful that would be, but believed that a draft should be given to the Minister to allow him a chance to peruse this to allow him to give feedback. It had not been possible to influence the strategy at this point. To date it was proving difficult to obtain an interview with the Minister. All the relevant Acts emanated from the Department of Public Works. It was agreed that this item would be held over, with a reminder to Mr Clay to send Mr van Niekerk a copy of the letter he had sent to ECSA.

Action: D van Niekerk / A Clay

In terms of the call for papers for the 2016 conference, Ms Redman advised this was progressing. Mr van der Berg confirmed that 52 abstracts and 24 papers had been received. The ratio of papers received were around two-thirds for SAMREC and one-third for SAMVAL.

Ms Redman confirmed that the latest copy of the Code had been sent to Mr Martinson, as requested.

The roadshow invitation list had been reviewed.

4. COMMENTS RECEIVED FOR FINALISATION OF THE DRAFT CODE

No comments had been received from the first (JSE) round of public consultation, for either SAMVAL or SAMREC. It was anticipated that some comments would be received from the FSB process of public consultation. Mr van Niekerk queried whether any positive comments had been received and Mr Njowa replied that no comments had been received at all. This raised a concern that people had not read the draft Code. Mr Duke believed that it should be recorded that no feedback had been received in order for the process to continue.

From a SAMVAL point of view, Ms Redman advised that the content of the Code had not fundamentally been changed much and she did not expect to receive many Acomments.

5. FEEDBACK ON THE FSB PROCESS

Ms de Bruyn reported that the Code had not been submitted to the FSB as yet. The matter was on the agenda and the Code would be submitted by the end of the following week. Having said that, she advised that it would be counter-productive for the Code to be sent for public consultation during December and advocated waiting until early January for publication in the Government Gazette for public consultation. This would allow sufficient time before May 2016 and she believed this slight delay would not impact on the launch of the Code. Depending on the amount of comments were received from the FSB process, it might be necessary to change the Code, although she believed this was unlikely.

The Chairman agreed and believed it was pointless to send this out over December and the meeting concurred.

6. FEEDBACK ON THE PROPERTY VALUATORS

Ms Redman reported that Mr van der Berg had finally been able to set up a meeting on 03 December, but that as she would be working outside the country at that time, she would be unable to make that date. As a result, Mr van der Berg was trying to set up another meeting.

Mr van Niekerk queried what the difficulty was in setting up a meeting with this relatively small group of people. Mr van der Berg responded that it was due to pressure of work and people being away from office. He did not foresee the meeting taking place until January 2016 and would follow up on this.

Ms Redman advised that this should be pursued and invited Mr van Niekerk to attend the meeting with her, as he had attended the first meeting around 18 months ago. Mr van Niekerk commented that Dr Becker had suggested that it was a waste of time engaging with that Council and believed it was not the correct home for registering the Mineral Asset Valuers. Mr van Niekerk did not agree with this view, as it had previously been agreed to investigate all the possibilities before deciding on the best option. Mr van Niekerk did not agree with Dr Becker's view to abandon the exercise and go with SACNASP. He would want to have proper discussions with the property valuers, as that was the business under consideration. His view was that if one looked at valuation, there should be commonality across the valuation profession. Should this turn out not to be a good solution, other options could then be considered.

Ms Marshall advised that she understood that Dr Becker had left SACNASP and was now at one of the universities. She queried whether there had been a replacement. Ms Redman advised that there was no replacement to date. Dr Becker was completely up to speed and whoever came in might not have the same background and knowledge and we would have to start over again.

In terms of Mr van Niekerk's comments, she agreed that every option should be pursued. She believed it might be necessary to accept the fact that there would be more than one place for people to register, e.g. SAICA for Accountants. Mr van Niekerk suggested that this discussion would have to be revisited once all the options were identified. The difference was that people who were already registered with certain statutory bodies would be considered Competent Persons to perform certain parts of the work, e.g. ECSA for Engineers. Regarding Mineral Asset Valuers, this would involve collating information from various areas and it would be necessary to look at the competency profile that had been drawn up. That profile was different to the profile for engineers, scientists, accountants, etc. Such people would have to have skills over and above the normal, in order to be able to perform this work. He queried that, if there was going to be regulation, whether this would be done using the current dispensation, or whether there would be a new option for the Valuers.

Mr Duke agreed and believed that it was important not to drop the ball on this issue. It was an important aspect and formed part of the building blocks. Ms Redman confirmed that the matter would be pursued and an informed decision taken, based on all the options. Mr van Niekerk was concerned that at the time the decision was made, the group was under pressure and it was now necessary to complete the process in order to make an informed decision and recommendation to the SSC on the next step. Should there be a better dispensation, a change could be made to the Code. It was agreed that it was crucial to hold the planned meeting in order to draw up the principal agreement, which would drive whatever happened thereafter.

Ms Redman advised that it was also important to speak to them, because in their IDoW they did speak about mineral assets. Mr van Niekerk stated that with all the councils under the umbrella of the Built Environment, it would be possible to have dual registrations. It could be that there was an agreement that an engineer could perform that work, but they would determine the competency standards. Property valuers did not have the competency to drive that, they would have to do exactly the same as SACNASP and get the experts in to advise them how to do this. They would run the show but they don't have the intricate knowledge on what the competencies should look like. They would have to bring in professionals to act in an advisory capacity, i.e. "Our people would be registering our people".

Mr Duke commented that these issues would sort themselves out and one of the purposes of this committee was to wrap up these tail-end issues, which would then form a solid basis to implement the guidelines.

Ms Redman responded that it was still necessary to go through the FSB process and it might be difficult if comments were received, but that would be in the New Year. In the meantime, she would like to get this appointment and set up something on a more regular basis. She invited Mr Duke to be part of those discussions and he accepted. Ms Redman advised that the idea was to have regular engagement with them. Mr van Niekerk suggested using part of this meeting to invite those people to attend. Ms Redman agreed that the first meeting was crucial and invited interested members to be involved.

Action: R van der Berg

7. INPUT FROM SAMESG

The Chairman queried whether a reference to the SAMESG Guidelines should be included in the SAMVAL Code. She suggested that this could form part of the table right at the end of the document (Item 9). In theory, it would just summarise the necessity of taking into account the impact on the social, environmental and government aspects.

Ms Marshall responded that it could be quite onerous to deal with all the SAMESG requirements. Ms Redman advised that this was part of the standards in any event. Mr Duke agreed to the reference, provided it was not too prescriptive, i.e. wording to the effect of: "*Cognisance should be taken of the requirements of SAMESG*". Ms Redman did not believe that SAMESG was any more prescriptive than international standards and questioned at what point this should be included. It was suggested that this be changed before going through the FSB process (as part of the table). All agreed.

Ms Redman suggested that the final SAMVAL document be sent out with a request for comments by latest next week. She agreed to change the wording in the last section and Mr van der Berg would send this out, together with the SAMESG document.

Action: K Redman / R van der Berg

Should any feedback be received before Wednesday, 25 November 2015, Mr van der Berg should send these to Ms Redman via text message. If there was serious concern, this could be removed, if justified. This could always be added later. Ms Redman had read the SAMESG Guidelines and there was nothing that concerned her, as most of this was covered via the international code.

Action: R van der Berg

8. IMVAL FEEDBACK

Ms Redman advised that IMVAL was not progressing. The IMVAL template had been finalised and sent for public comment. The only comment received was around putting the table at the back of the document. There were comments from Canada and Australia which were to be included by the new chairman. This had not been done as yet. The new chairman was Dr William (Bill) Roscoe. There was not much to report and there was uncertainty on whether this would fit with the IVSC. It did not impact on the Code and much of the IMVAL reference had been removed. Mr Duke questioned whether this would go forward and if so, it should be included in the code; if not, it would be removed. He suggested that this should be discussed at SSC level. Ms Redman agreed to check the Code on what was still there with regard to IMVAL. A decision could be taken on that before it went to FSB. IVSC believed there was some duplication.

Action: K Redman

9. GENERAL

There was nothing raised under "General".

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was suggested that meetings be scheduled for both January and February 2016. If either meeting was deemed unnecessary, it would be cancelled. All agreed.

Action: R van der Berg

The Chairman thanked all for their participation and the meeting concluded at 10:30.

SUMMARY OF KEY ACTION ITEMS

Kelly Redman

Compile list of comments made and responses given

Andy Clay and Dirk van Niekerk:

A Clay to send D van Niekerk a copy of his letter to the Competition Commission
D van Niekerk to follow up with ECSA

Raymond van der Berg

Set up meeting re property evaluators

Raymond van der Berg and Kelly Redman

R van der Berg to send out SAMVAL Code with request for comments, once changes had been made by K Redman
Any comments to be sent via text message to K Redman

Raymond van der Berg and Kelly Redman

Set up meeting re property evaluators

Kelly Redman

Check Code with regard to IMVAL references

Raymond van der Berg

Set up meeting dates for January and February, 2016