MINUTES OF THE SAMESG WORKING GROUP MEETING

HELD ON 28 JULY 2016 AT 11:30

IN THE DELVILLE WOOD ROOM, MILITARY MUSEUM

Present:	**Sarah Magnus (Chairperson)** **Carol Dixon** **Tommie Hurter** **Briony Liber** **Tania Marshall** **Teresa Steele-Schober** **Mark Taylor**
Apologies:	**Ferdi Bayliss** **Fred Cawood** **Kevin Davies** **Anneli Botha** **Robert Lewenson** **Ken Lomberg** **Kelly Redman** **Ingrid Watson**
In Attendance:	**Raymond van der Berg, SAIMM** **Ann Donnelly, Scribe**

---

1. WELCOME

Ms Magnus welcomed everyone to the first meeting of 2016 and extended a special welcome to Carol and Tania. She advised that the guidelines had been finalised. These were applicable with immediate effect, but would be a formal requirement as from 01 January 2017. The list of apologies was read out.

2. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

It was agreed that the group should be kept small and the goal moving forward was to have two meetings per year to discuss general items; and other matters would be discussed as and when they arose.

Ms Magnus and Ms Botha would remain on as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively.

Mr Hurter requested information on the formal requirements before he could commit to joining Working Committee. Ms Magnus responded that the purpose of the Committee initially was to consider important aspects that should be included in the SAMCODES. That had now been done and the function moving forward would be to work through any queries that may arise. She believed Mr Hurter would be invaluable in order to provide feedback on the industry worked with those guidelines. The objective of the Committee was how to improve the guidelines in order to assist the industry.

3. DISCUSSION OF PROGRESS TO DATE

Ms Magnus advised that the SAMREC Conference was held earlier in the year where the SAMCODES had been presented.

Moving forward, the Committee would focus on how it was going to contribute and how the information would be disseminated throughout the industry. She suggested that the Mineral Asset Evaluation School would be an important vehicle to do this.

Ms Magnus believed that a relevant issue would be to present guidelines on how to report on social aspects. Ms Botha had offered to give a presentation on how latent and residual impacts were mediated by in Australia. Ms Magnus enquired whether Ms Marshall thought this would be beneficial to the industry, i.e. Some practical examples of how specific regulations were applied.

Mr Hurter was also asked whether he would consider giving a presentation on how to apply specific recommendations. He agreed to consider this and revert.

Mr van der Berg advised that the Mineral Asset Evaluation School would be held from 27-29 June 2017. He mentioned that there were no specific time slots and that the conference would follow a theme over three days, i.e. starting with basics (Day 1), then moving to current (Day 2), and finally to futuristic (Day 3). Time slots for presentations would not be limited, but participants would be required to give an indication as to the length of their presentation. The proposed plan was that Day 1 would follow a basic lecturing format; Day 2 would be a cross between presentations, papers and discussions; and Day 3 would be a high powered CEO discussion regarding the future. The facilitator for that day was experienced in future strategy. Presenters would be required to indicate their discussion format. Ms Steele-Schober agreed to deliver a presentation on environmental projects. It was suggested that Ms Dixon or Mr Cross could deliver a presentation on legal interpretation. Ms Magnus agreed that it would be valuable to have an understanding of the level of detail on some of the many legal requirements. She confirmed that much of this had been included in the guidelines, via input from Mr Cross. Regarding the presentations, it was agreed that one-on-one conversations would be held within the next two weeks and feedback given thereafter to Mr van der Berg.

ACTION: Sarah Magnus

In terms of SAMESG supporting the Readers' Panel, Ms Marshall outlined the process that was followed for an internal review.

When a document was received by the Chairman of the Readers' Panel and there was a request for an environmental review, the Chairman would approach the SAMESG Committee directly to submit the name of a person with that skill. In summary; the request came down from that panel to the chair of the ESG Committee, who would then have discussions with the committee and identify an individual.

Ms Magnus queried whether SAMESG should build a body of suitable individuals who would be willing to volunteer for such requests. Ms Marshall responded that what worked in the other fields, e.g. SAMREC, was that the SAMREC Chairman identified people on the SAMREC Committee who were experienced in that particular field. These names were then put forward to the Chairman of the Readers' Panel who, together with the Deputy Chairman of the Readers' Panel and the SSC Chairman, would then select the most suitable individual for that particular review.

Ms Marshall advised that when there was a requirement for a person with a particular skill, that request would come down from the Readers' Panel to the Chair of the SAMESG Committee, who would discuss it with the SAMESG Committee.

4. GENERAL

Ms Steele-Schober advised that she had been in touch with many organisations that wrote CPR reports and had been at the launch. These companies advised that they had not heard about the ESG launch. She suggested that the Committee should consider how it had been published/broadcast, as there were many people who should have known about it, but did not.

In addition, Ms Steele-Schober noted that the versions on the website were all in editable format. She believed communications should be improved.

Ms Marshall responded that the SAMCODES website was currently undergoing a major revamp and there was a page dedicated to SAMESG. The SAMESG page belonged to the SAMESG Committee and it was up to the Committee to decide what to put on the website, i.e. information, links to conversations, documents, etc. She requested all information be submitted before 19 August 2016.

Ms Marshall expressed concern regarding website documents being editable, as it was her understanding that all content was in PDF format. All the Codes had been sent to the webmaster in converted PDF format. Ms Marshall requested that Ms Magnus be informed in order that she could check on this.

ACTION: All members / Tania Marshall

Ms Liber queried whether the website would be the sole method of communication, or whether other avenues were being explore. Ms Marshall reiterated that it was up to the individual Committee to decide with whom they wanted to communicate. Ms Liber agreed to discuss the communication strategy further with Ms Magnus.

ACTION: Briony Liber / Sarah Magnus

Ms Marshall confirmed that all presentations from the SAMCODES launch would be going on to the website, as well as the Companion Volume. Ms Marshall suggested that the SAMESG Committee provide her with a Word document outlining what should be included on the website. Thereafter, the website would be reviewed quarterly.

Ms Steele-Schober asked whether there was a plan on the website to subscribe to receive modifications on the SAMCODES, i.e. via a database. Ms Marshall believed that suggestion had merit and agreed to discuss this further with the webmaster.

ACTION: Tania Marshall

Ms Marshall asked that any other ideas be sent through to Ms Magnus. Ms Steele-Schober offered to assist while Ms Liber was away. Ms Magnus suggested sharing case studies to assist practitioners the applications. Ms Marshall advised that everything on the Readers' Panel was totally confidential, including the names of the individuals on that panel. Ms Magnus asked whether this could be done by removing any references, etc.

Ms Magnus reported that CRIRSCO had requested input and that she would liaise closely with Kevin Davies in this regard.

Mr van der Berg advised that the other SAMCODES working groups had scheduled their next meeting for 24 November 2016, as the Terms of Reference stipulated having two meetings per year. For the next year, the two other groups had elected to have quarterly meetings, to align with the SSC dates. Ms Magnus responded that, due to members frequently having to travel, the group would stick to the minimum requirement of two formal meetings per year. Mr van der Berg undertook to send the proposed meeting SSC meeting dates to Ms Magnus but indicated that there were likely to take place in November, February, May and August.

ACTION: Raymond van der Berg

Mr van der Berg mentioned that the other working groups made use of Skype, or dialled in. Ms Magnus agreed to investigate this further and added that the option of a mobile telecom could also be considered. Ms Liber recommended a better configuration of desks in order to facilitate discussion.

ACTION: Sarah Magnus

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on 24 November 2016 (time and venue to be advised in due course).

6. CLOSING

The Chairperson thanked everybody for attending.

SUMMARY OF KEY ACTION ITEMS
Sarah Magnus
Hold one-on-one conversations re presentations at Mineral Asset Valuation School
All Members / Tania Marshall
Advise Sarah Magnus of any website files that are not in PDF format. Sarah Magnus to submit information to Tania Marshall for amendment.
Briony Liber / Sarah Magnus
Discuss communication strategy.
Tania Marshall
Investigate possibility of website subscription for Code updates.
Raymond van der Berg
Set up meeting calendar and issue invitations.
Sarah Magnus
Investigate the possibility of mobile telecons.