

**SAMVAL
MINUTES OF THE SAMVAL RE-WRITE MEETING
HELD ON 27 JUNE 2013 2012 AT 08:00
AT THE MILITARY MUSEUM, DELVLLE ROOM**

Present: **A S Macfarlane (Chairman)**
M Austin **Dr T R Marshall**
R Becker **J E McGill**
H Bornman **G Njowa**
A N Clay **K Redman**
R C Croll **D J van Niekerk**
V G Duke **A van Zyl**
A Kinghorn

Apologies: **J Botha** **A MacDonald**
A M de Bruyn **S Mathuray**
R Davel **M Mokitimi**
Dr C Dohm **B Scott**
H Hartmann **I Wermuth**
C Hudson

In Attendance: **S Moola (Manager, SAIMM)**

1. Welcome

Mr Macfarlane welcomed everyone to the meeting and requested them to introduce themselves.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2013 were tabled and accepted subject to the following corrections:

Page 1, Minute 2, paragraph 3: '...dual membership should read 'dual **registration**'.

Page 2, Minute 3, paragraph 3, line 4 : should read:' it could be a problem...'

Page 3, Minute 6, paragraph 2, line 8: '...sub-class of membership...' should read 'sub-class of registration...'

Page 4, Minute 9 , bullet 7: Tale should read **Table**

3. Matters arising from the previous minutes

Valuation of Inferred Resources: The committee discussed this at length and it was agreed that SAMREC and SAMVAL needed to be guided by each other, and it was necessary to have a discussion with other international organisations. I was also agreed that too many hard and fast rules for individuals needed to be avoided. Mr Macfarlane stated that a short statement which said "in the case of inferred resources these could be valued subject to the following qualifying statements".

Finalisation of definitions: Mr Duke confirmed this had been completed.

PLATO: Mr van Niekerk stated that letters had been sent to the Parliamentary Committee and he felt that the surveying fraternity had not completely thought through the implications of this. Mr Macfarlane advised that the issue affecting PLATO had already been discussed at the SSC

meeting. He added that as it was an SSC matter it should be discussed at that level. Mr van Niekerk questioned whether the SSC was sufficiently well informed of all the issues at hand; there were significant issues to look at with regard to competency and registration. Mr Macfarlane agreed to raise this with Mr Ed Swindell, the Chairman of the SSC.

4. Finalisation of papers

All the papers had been completed and finalised. In reply to Mr Clay's question on how it differed to the IMVAL Code, Mr Duke replied that it was similar but when the editing was being done the points would be picked up. Cross references with the IMVAL code could be raised by the Editorial Committee. Ms Moolla was requested to forward all the papers to the Editorial Committee to begin the review process.

Ms Moolla was requested to remove this item off the agenda.

5. Review process

The review process was:

- Mr Croll to set up the first meeting of the Editorial Committee
- The scope of the committee as previously agreed would be confirmed
- Look at the content of the 3 papers
- Look at how to incorporate the papers into the existing Code

Committee members were agreed as follows:

Scope – Julian Upshall/Jeannette McGill

Definition – Andy McDonald/Godknows Njowa

Competency – Dirk van Niekerk

Principles – Vaughn Duke/Bretton Scott

Oil and Gas – Andy Clay

Mr Riaan Davel and Ms Annalie de Bruyn would also serve on the committee.

As Messrs Breton, Duke and Njowa had attended the majority of meetings their input on the committee would be invaluable.

The three critical items were"

- Matrix of issues
- Structure
- Terms of reference for the Editorial Committee

The terms of reference for the Editorial Committee were:

- Incorporate the position papers on scope, definitions, principles and competency (only take what is sufficient and practical)
- Consider structure (should the existing structure be maintained)
- Focus on content
- Editing process
- Take into account other issues

6. Report back: Competency Sub-group

The Competency Sub Group has completed and approved the position paper, to the point of identifying the required competencies and tasks for the CV, and has examined the registration requirements, and made recommendations in this regard.

This position paper will be circulated as follows, for final comments, before the next phases of work.

- SAMVAL Working Group for final comments and concerns : these should be sent to the secretariat asap;
- SAMREC Working Group for comments;

Upon receipt of these comments, the document will be forwarded to the SSC Chairperson, with a covering letter. Comments received from the SSC will then be incorporated.

Bilateral discussions will then be held, to discuss the paper and its contents, and to ascertain the position of the various parties, as follows:

- The JSE, to ascertain if this process satisfied the JSE registration of CV requirements;
 - SACNASP, to ascertain if it is prepared to create a specialist class of membership for CVs;
 - SAICA, to ascertain its position, and to ascertain if it is prepared to create a specialist class of membership for CVs;
 - ECSA, to ascertain if it is prepared to create a specialist class of membership for CVs;
 - PLATO/IMMSA/GeoMatics to ascertain if it is prepared to create a specialist class of membership for CVs;
 - The SA Council of Valuers to ascertain its position, and to ascertain if it is prepared to create a specialist class of membership for CVs;
 - The Chair Person of CRIRSCO to address concerns of CRIRSCO and SAIMM;
- Responses to these discussions will be considered, and then a multi-party workshop to include all these organisations will be held to establish the registering bodies and processes.

Thereafter, the following issues must be considered by the Competency sub group:

1. Position with regard to ROPO's, and international alignment/misalignment, and consequences;
2. Common set of processes that do not compromise CV by way of residence or jurisdiction;
3. Application of discipline, and disciplinary processes;
4. Appropriate Code of Ethics;
5. Legal standing;
6. Desired/ideal future position.

7. Registration of CPs/CVs

Mr van Niekerk stated that the following points on the matrix needed to be considered

- a. Who are requisite registration bodies?
- b. Registration of ROPOs
- c. Who is referring authority
- d. Clarify disciplinary process
- e. Which Code of Ethics is binding
- f. Custodian/competence of Readers Panel

In reply to Ms McGill's question Mr Macfarlane advised that there was no formal registration in other countries and that everyone handled it differently. He stated that we were preserving parochialism but there was no other quick solution at this stage. The Canadians were cutting back on ROPO agreements.

8. Report bak: Valuation of inferred resources

This had been discussed.

9. Valuation event: Sub-committee membership

Mr Macfarlane reported that the structure of the event had been changed as it clashed with two other major events which would affect attendance. A one-day event would be held a day before the Mining Indaba started. The second part of the event would be held in March in Johannesburg.

10. Matrix of outstanding questions/issues

The matrix would be updated and circulated. Mr Macfarlane explained how it had been developed. The issues had been listed in the previous minutes. The next meeting would deal only with the matrix, and the committee would go through it line by line.

11. International report back

IMVAL

Mr Macfarlane reported on the process which had led to him, Mr Clay and Mr Njowa putting together a draft guidance note for IMVAL. The outstanding feedback from the Canadians had only been received in mid-May and a decision had to be made on how to incorporate it. It was felt that it was better for IMVAL to have a wider scope and each national Code could then be more focused and narrower within its scope. The updated structure for IMVAL would be in four parts:

- History, relationship, link
- Definition, principles
- Standards
- Guidance

Once he had spoken to the Canadians and updated the guidance note he would circulate it to everyone and then arrange a telecom. He added that the IVSC were keeping a watching brief on the process, although they were not a part of it.

12. General

There was nothing to discuss.

There being no further matters to discuss, the meeting ended at 10:02.

SUMMARY OF KEY ACTION ITEMS

Alastair Macfarlane

PLATO issues to be discussed with Mr Ed Swindell

Sam Moolla

To forward position papers to Editorial Committee

Rob Croll

To convene Editorial Committee

SAMVAL Working Group

To submit final comment and concerns on competency position paper

Sam Moolla

To forward the position paper with covering letter to SAMREC, SSC and SAMVAL

Alastair Macfarlane

Arrange workshop for statutory bodies

Alastair Macfarlane

To update the IMVAL guidance note