SAMREC Committee Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting	29 February 2024	**Time**	09:45
Chaired by:	Nicole Wansbury	**Location**	Zoom
Minutes prepared by:	**Moipone Mkhize**		

Present:

Annalie de Bruyn	Marietjie Reynecke
Rob Ingram	Teresa Steele-Schober
Ken Lomberg	RenierVan Vuuren
Tania Marshall	Nicole Wansbury

SAIMM Secretariat:
Moipone Mkhize

Apologies:

Topic	**Discussion**
1. Welcome	Nicole Wansbury welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for joining. Ms Moipone Mkhize was taking over the administration and co-ordination function from SAIMM and she was welcomed to the meeting.
2. Minutes of previous meeting & actions arising	The minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2023 had been circulated and were approved, subject to the following changes: On the first page, Annalie de Bruyn noted that her name appeared under the apologies and confirmed that she had been at the meeting. On Page 3, the first sentence in the sixth paragraph should read: 'Mrs Steele-Schober added that, from the SAMESG perspective, they **had** not…." On Page 4, in Point 5 under CRIRSCO News, the last sentence in the second paragraph should read: 'She advised that the Definitions had been approved and the guidelines were in progress and would be completed in **2024**." In the second paragraph under Point 5, it should read: 'Ken added that Mr Edson Ribeiro from Brazil had been Chair for the **last**…' The third sentence in the fourth paragraph under Point 5 should read: 'JORC was in the process of getting its Code together, but was struggling on some things with the **ASIC Regulator'**.

	The last sentence in the fourth paragraph should be reworded to read: '***The CRIRSCO document would be circulated to everybody once completed'.*** Ken Lomberg suggested that the update of the Standard Definitions could be shared before that, which was agreed upon. Subject to those suggested changes, the minutes were accepted by Annalie de Bruyn and seconded by Ken Lomberg. The agenda was adopted as well.
3. Matters arising	In terms of the actions, Nicole Wansbury had reviewed these and there was nothing to add.
4. SAMCODES App	Ken Lomberg advised that the update from the SSC was that it was up to SAMREC to decide where they wanted the App to go. SAMREC had to consider whether to continue to support it, to approve it, or what they wanted to do with it. Nicole Wansbury reported that there had been several meetings with the developers and there had been discussions around whether to move to Apple, which was not an option because of the way that the App was set up. There was some development in terms of modifications that were being worked on. They were still tracking changes on the App and believed there had not been much change in terms of that. That would be raised once Tarryn Flitton was at the meeting, as they were required to give feedback on that. She invited comments on the App from the meeting. Annalie de Bruyn advised that the JSE was busy updating Section 12. They were also working on a simplification process, so that if a decision was made to keep the App, at some point they would have to update Section 12 on the App. Nicole Wansbury had made a note and would discuss that with Ms Flitton. **Action**: Nicole Wansbury Tania Marshall made a comment for her and some of the people who were not *au fait* with using social media, apps, etc. She found it very useful to look things up, following, and doing quizzes as well as interacting with her phone. One thing that might be considered was to leave the app as a static app and allow people to download it, look up the information they wanted and not get too bogged down in making it interactive with people. That was her opinion.
5. CRIRSCO News	Ken Lomberg reported that there had been discussions around the template and the new Standard Definitions, and those discussions were ongoing. They had also discussed what was happening with JORC, which was the Code that would have a big influence on the way forward. This was largely because they had done the most work on the CP. CRIRSCO was also waiting to see what JORC had done before the topic of the CP was dealt with in the template. That would quite enlightening because ASIC, the regulator in Australia, had indicated

	that they were no longer happy with people calling their competency on themselves; they wanted some sort of regulation, such as that of Canada, with an examination, etc. He was certain this discussion had been advanced, and they were not allowed to say anything about it at the CRIRSCO meeting in October, so he believed they were keeping this under wraps for the moment. In terms of this year, the annual meeting would be held in Vancouver, and it would be together with a mineral resource and mineral reserve symposium. They were having a three-day symposium from 16-18 October as part of the annual CRIRSCO meeting. The conference was being run by CIM and he advised that there was information from CIM on that. It was very similar to what the Australians had had last year. Teresa added that the ESG working group within CRIRSCO was 80% done with the ESG Guide. The definitions were approved at the AGM last year and they had been tasked with putting together the guide on those definitions. Following on from the next meeting at the end of March, they should have something to go out in public for comment to CRIRSCO as the broader community.
6. SAMESG	Teresa advised that in terms of the SAMESG Working Group, the focus was currently on refining the various drafts so that these could be circulated to the SAMCodes committees at the end on Q2. Table 1 was almost done. The SAMREC upfront part was almost completed. There was work that still needed to be done on a new ESG section to try and distil that down to a couple of requirements that would then talk to the guide. After that, the SAMESG Guide itself would be updated. The idea was to get those to the SAMCodes committees by the end of Q2, with a clear message that, in terms of SAMREC and SAMVAL, these were recommendations for consideration by the Code committees who could then decide how to take those recommendations forward in terms of work on the codes. The SAMESG Guidelines would be easier to finalise and implement and that would be ideal with how that was finalised and rolled out before the SAMREC and SAMVAL changes. Nicole mentioned that on the list of events for the year, there was feedback session in July. That would be crucial because during a lot of discussions she had had with Competent Persons and other people, they felt that with these new ESG requirements, they would be out of compliance if they did not incorporate some of the items listed and they could not get too much detail of the work that had been done previously because the documents had not been circulated yet. She suggested that perhaps the team also needed to go into more details about what they were planning to do. There was concern in the industry that it would put people out of compliance if they did not have specific items included. That needed to be taken back to the Committee. In terms of being out of compliance, Teresa said it would not come into force on Day 1 and put someone out of compliance, If the Codes were updated, there would be the usual transition period, etc. That was one side of the spectrum. The other side was that, remembering that SAMESG was a Guidance Note to provide guidance to those companies who wanted to elevate their reporting in line with these

	expectations, especially considering that there was likely to be a fair amount of alignment between what went in the SAMESG Guide and what they were expecting to see in JORC's update; there were a couple of moving parts and couple of bookends to this spectrum. She did not believe – certainly from a SAMCodes perspective The mechanisms to make that happen were in there currently until such time as SAMREC and SAMVAL decided to make changes to the Codes. That process would run its own course. Nicole commented that there were two parts to it: there was the guideline – which was the first piece of work being looked at and that would come out once it was approved; and then the regulatory things would come at a later stage. She suggested that it was just about getting people to understand the timing of things and what needed to be approved before even getting to that point. Teresa advised that the recent GSSA/UNFCE workshop which was run on PERC's platform was very informative. In addition to that, CRIRSCO had an hour-long webinar that ran over two days, again talking about UNFCE. In the CRIRSCO webinar, there were comments made around companies that thought they could comply with JORC 2012 and not talk to ESG, and had not been doing their CPD, and were out of touch with what the market was expecting. The guidance within SAMESG would be useful for those people who wanted to use it, but there was nothing forcing people to use it at this stage. Around the GSI14 that was launched recently, which seemed to be a mining standard for sustainability, Annalie asked how that fitted into the whole picture. Teresa responded that if it was a company reporting in terms of GRI standards or IFRS, it was valuable from the mineral reporting side of things because the work that one did required by those standards gave the information that was very useful when it came to mineral reporting disclosure. The thing with mineral reporting disclosure was the actual report that was published. In the industry, people were using Table 1 of the various codes and Table 2 to contribute to the project development work, so there was a lot of overlap, but there was also a slight distinction that, in the context of public reporting or mineral reporting, it was talking on that information and companies should be cross-referenced to their GRI reports.
7. CRIRSCO Standard Definitions	Nicole advised that the document was work in progress and it would be circulated.
8. TRAINING	It was reported that there was the Standard Training done by Ken Lomberg and Tania Marshall and Nicole asked whether any additional training had been added; or whether there were other opportunities where SAMREC could get involved. This was one of the things that had been discussed; to try and get more involvement and 'face time' with people about the Codes. There were potentially different avenues that could be explored in terms of what would be more feasible. Ken believed the Standard Training plan had been drawn up. There was also the Advanced version, which had not been run for quite a while that he believed would be easier to run in person rather than in a virtual environment, as it was much more interactive. They formed

	small groups and those groups got together and discussed case studies. He asked whether that would be valuable, and he volunteered to stand up for both of those. He asked whether a date had been set for the Standard Training this year. Tania responded that they usually ran every two years, and it was run last year. It was planned for 2025 and the alternate year, which was this year, would be devoted to Advanced Training. Ken asked if anyone believed SAMREC should be running the Advanced Training this year. Tania asked what the need was for this, or whether there would be an even more basic introduction to the SAMCodes. Ken believed that there should be an introduction to the SAMCodes instead. It was agreed to take this offline. **Action**: Tania Marshall & Ken Lomberg
8. Succession Planning	Nicole had held a discussion with Teresa and the SSC had sent out an updated Terms of Reference. She was not sure whether there was one for SAMREC itself. Ken did not believe there was anything that specified the terms of a chairperson. He suggested that perhaps it was time to formalise that and that a Past Chair position be created as well, to give support to the incoming Chair. Nicole advised that the idea was to create Terms of Reference and she would work on that and send it to the Committee for comment, etc. In terms of the length of office for the Chair, this should be bedded down this year. This would be circulated for comment and acceptance at the next meeting. Ken agreed to assist if necessary. **Action**: Nicole Wansbury
9. General	***Industrial Minerals Guideline*** Nicole advised that they were looking at an Industrial Minerals Guideline. There was very little currently in the Code itself and there seemed to be a need for more guidance on how to report on industrial minerals. The idea was to put a committee together with volunteers in the industry. This committee would then put together a guideline, similar to the Diamond Guideline, as a supplement. This would then be guidance as to how to report. They could then update a very small section in the Code itself that would point to the guideline in terms of what needed to be included, as well as guidance on reporting of industrial minerals. After the meeting, an e-mail would be put out with a request for volunteers for that committee. Nicole and Andy McDonald would put together a Terms of Reference for that committee and that would then be circulated to whoever decided to join. That would form part of the work being done this year. She asked that if members had names of anyone that the Committee believed should be on that committee, they should send these through to either Ken or herself. She and Andy McDonald would head up that committee. The idea would be to use what was currently available in the industry and she cited some of the examples that could be used in this regard. They were not starting from scratch and would use those as references going forward. ***SAMREC Rewrite***

	In terms of the SAMREC rewrite, they needed to start looking at this. JORC's website had a lot of reading in terms of the rewrite and the process that they had followed. The first things that needed to be bedded down was which components of SAMREC required updating; what were the main topics to be looked at, etc. There were a few topics which needed rewriting and ESG would have to become part of the Code (minimum standards). It was trying to get a broader audience and get more people involved in the working groups. Nicole would have a discussion with Monique, and she appealed to everyone on the call to ask them to forward this on to colleagues to get as many people involved as possible. Broader opinions were needed on this rewrite. **Action**: All Members Ken advised that they used to have monthly meetings and he suggested having the sub-committees meet more regularly. The work took a lot of time, but it did require commitment from the members of the different sub-committees. Nicole believed that was why it needed to be broader, to get more participation to juggle the work that needed to be done and invite different opinions. JORC had set milestones for the different parts of work that needed to be done and they kept the website updated on what had been done. Ken reminded Nicole that JORC had a professional project manager for this and SAMREC would not necessarily have that. It would require extra management to run it the way that JORC had done. Annalie asked whether it was possible to put something on the SAMCodes website, to say that there was a planned SAMREC rewrite and invite people to join the committee and advice that all meetings were virtual. Nicole believed that was a great idea. They had also discussed using social media, e.g. LinkedIn. Ken suggested also talking to SAIMM, GSSA, and the Mining Surveyors to publish something as an invitation. Annalie suggested an article in the mining journal. ***Audit Opinion*** Annalie saw that some of the bigger mining companies were providing an audit opinion on the resources and reserves. Her first question was whether that was a requirement in terms of SEC and if it was a requirement, whether there was a standard on how this should be done. Ken did not believe there was a definitive requirement for an audit. He suggested that many of the corporations and multi-mine companies had an internal policy of a three-year rolling review/audit. There should also be a distinction between an audit and a review. An audit would be re-running and a review would be looking at the process. So, there was nothing definitive and he believed that none of the exchanges had a requirement for that on an annual or running basis. The SEC Committee had committed to reviewing all TSRs on a three-year rolling time frame and giving comment about them; similar to what the JSE had done. He did not think there was anything new from that perspective and he would be very wary of trying to put something like that into the public domain. There were already comments about being onerous, etc. and he suggested that they wanted to streamline things rather than make them more compliance required. His feeling was that the annual reports should be 1-2 pages, with the resources and reserves; with hyperlinks to the detail

	required. He believed it should be made simpler for the actual annual report but, for more substantial back-up, as in formal CPRs, but not to publish those; just have them available on request or for people to look at if necessary. Ken believed there were enough regulations and that people who had not complied entirely with the Code should be brought to book. He believed that would be more important than adding more regulations, complications, etc. to the reporting of resources and reserves. Nicole added that, from an environmental perspective, companies had their standards that they applied in terms of auditing, etc. and she asked whether there was a requirement when a CPR document was filed in terms of endorsements. Annalie responded that CPR was required with new listings and when doing a CAT1 transaction, not when there were material changes. There was a requirement that said that when you announce a material update, then the JSE might ask for a CPR in the background and that must be signed off by a CP, not necessarily an independent CP. Currently, there were no requirements that insisted on independence. Some discussion followed on this. Ken commented that another important aspect was that there was often a feeling that the company had to have full disclosure. It was important that what was done followed the principles of materiality and transparency, but care should be taken not to take the responsibility of deciding on behalf of an investor. The investor needed to understand what was there; be properly informed about risks, etc.; but they had to make their own decision. They could not pass that on to a CP if they had not done the proper due diligence. There should not be too much regulation involved. When looking at mining disclosures, Annalie advised that everything happened within the company, e.g. internal CP; but that internal CP was under the control of the Board of Directors. If there was undue influence there was no independent party to verify everything before it went into the market. There had not been big issues over the last couple of years, but it was a risk. Ken suggested that was not the Code's responsibility; it was the responsibility of the Stock Exchange. Annalie advised that she was just inviting an opinion. Some discussion followed. ***UNFC/GSSA*** Ken advised that the UNFC meeting held recently would be up on the GSSA YouTube channel within the next few days.
9. Closure	Nicole thanked everyone for their active participation.
Next meeting	The next meeting was scheduled for 30 May 2024 and communication would be sent out regarding the new guidelines and the committees that were being formed. She asked people to reach out to their contacts and get others involved.

Matters arising/Action Items

Meeting Date	Action	Responsible	Due	Status	Comments
29/02/24	Put forward questions for discussion under 'Technical Discussions'	All members	Ongoing		
23/02/22	Tie in with Camielah/Sam re upcoming courses & training for App	Tarryn Flitton	Ongoing		
25/05/23	Keep Tarryn informed of any event, news, update to be included on website	All	Ongoing		
25/05/23	Bring up representation from other SAMCode committees on App at SSC Meeting	Ken Lomberg	Jan 2024		
29/02/24	Discuss update of Section 12 on App with Tarryn Flitton	Nicole Wansbury	May 2024		
29/02/24	Discuss training programme offline	Tania Marshall & Ken Lomberg	May 2024		
29/02/24	Draft ToR for SAMREC with regard to Chair	Nicole Wansbury	May 2024		
29/02/24	Recruit colleagues to assist on the SAMREC rewrite	All members	May 2024		