SAMVAL Committee Meeting Minutes
27 November 2025

Date of Meeting	27 November 2025	**Time**	08:30
Chaired by:	Vaughn Duke - Chair	**Location**	MS Teams
Minutes prepared by:	Sandy Williams		

Present:

Vaughn Duke	Jaco Lotheringen	Zakaria Rashid
Hannes Bornman	Andy McDonald	Nicholaas Steenkamp
Andy Clay	Matt Mullins	Andrew van Zyl
Kerron Johnstone	Godknows Njowa	Veri Yadi
Georges Karam		

SAIMM Secretariat:
Sandy Williams

Apologies:

Tania Marshall	Kelly Redman	Camielah Jardine

Topic	Discussion
1. Welcome and apologies	Vaugh Duke welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted.
2. Previous minutes and action items	Vaughn Duke an initial correction to a typo in his own name. Andy Clay noted an issue under Section 2 of the previous minutes where an action item wrongly noted Vaughn Duke was supposed to send Andy Clay's PowerPoint summary on "food resources." Vaughn acknowledged this was clearly a mistake, likely caused by the AI transcription. Sandy Williams suggested that the reference should have been to be inferred resources. Andy Clay requested that the section concerning "the debate" be formally raised as a matter arising for the current meeting. Andy MacDonald noted that his apology for the meeting of 09 October was not reflected in the minutes. Vaughn Duke instructed that this omission be rectified. **Action**: Sandy Williams The minutes were confirmed as correct, subject to the proposed amendments. **Proposer**: Andy Clay **Seconder**: Jaco Lotheringen

3. Matters arising	Vaughn Duke stressed that the participants of the upcoming workshop must read and review the circulating input materials, including contributions from Hannes Bornman and Jaco Lotheringen. Andy Clay asked for clarity on authorship and noted that two discussion documents—"the problem with INF, internal draught discussion" and "possible reserves from indicated resources"—did not list their authors and argued that including the author was good practice. Jaco Lotheringen clarified that the "inferred paper" was non-formal preparatory notes, not a formal paper, but confirmed he contributed the material on "the problem with INF." Vaughn stated that the origin of the second document was unknown (having been done a "long time ago") but reassured Andy that they were purely background material for discussion. Vaughn Duke noted that the action item suggesting the immediate assignment of a Task Group for the inferred resource issue should be an outcome determined after the workshop, not a predetermined action, and asked for its deletion. Vaughn addressed the action item and asked Godknows Njowa to submit a succinct paragraph on regulated expectations. Godknows confirmed that he did not want to pre-empt the discussion at the workshop and wanted instead for the discussion to be meaningful and without pre-emptive conclusions. Vaughn agreed that both pre-emptive action items should be deleted. **Action**: Sandy Williams
4. Inferred Resources/Possible Reserve Workshop Planning and Confirmation	Sandy Williams confirmed that the full-day workshop was set for 05 December 2025. Vaughn Duke announced that the meeting format would change from face-to-face to virtual on MS Teams, as many key attendees had opted not to attend physically, which made a physical venue superfluous. Jaco Lotheringen commented, "it is what it is," and accepted the change. Vaughn thanked Godknows Njowa for drafting the structured program, which would serve as the basis for the workshop. Andy Clay objected and stated that the objectives, purpose, and potential outcomes of the workshop had not been formally communicated in writing. He stressed that Committee decisions must be reached by consensus and argued against making decisions by a simple vote which risks ignoring or excluding objections. Hannes Bornman countered and argued that the Committee should operate as a meritocracy based on majority agreement and asserted that one dissenting voice should not be able to "scuttle the whole process." Andrew Van Zyl inquired whether the Committee had a formal constitution or document outlining the required majority or quorum. Vaughn Duke agreed with Hannes Bornman that decisions relied on a majority vote following the SAIMM practice and warned that pursuing absolute consensus prevents progress, meaning they "can't have the tail wagging the dog." Vaughn asked Sandy Williams to investigate the Committee’s terms of reference from the SSC regarding quorum and voting procedures. Andy MacDonald provided clarity and stated that any conclusion reached during the workshop would only be recommendations submitted to the SSC for consideration.

	Vaughn agreed that the workshop's purpose was to establish clarity and common understanding, documenting arguments, including dissenting rulings (like Hannes Bornman's suggestion of a "dissenting judge's ruling"). Vaughn assured Andy MacDonald that he planned to encapsulate this proposed approach for the opening address of the workshop. Godknows Njowa asked how the Committee should address an individual who might hold motives not aligned with the industry's best interests. Vaughn Duke suggested that the open discussion should expose such agendas. Hannes Bornman reinforced the need to refrain from using inflammatory language and to focus the debate strictly on the issues at hand, not the individuals and noted that attacking the person means the argument is lost. Vaughn Duke confirmed that while robust debate is necessary and that personal attacks would not be tolerated.
5. Conference Feedback and International Engagement	Vaughn Duke informed the Committee Members that he had offered SAMVAL's support to review the draft code being developed by Kazakhstan. In the absence of objections, consensus was assumed. **Action**: Vaughn Duke Andy Clay raised the status of the post-IMVAL conference feedback (a list of nine points) that he had compiled and sent to Vaughn Duke and Keith Spence and asked what action was taken regarding the relationship with IMVAL. Andy MacDonald recommended formalising these notes on a SAMVAL letterhead for submission to IMVAL. Vaughn explained he withheld formal submission because the Committee first needed to discuss and agree that Andy Clay's notes accurately represented the crucial points of the conference to ensure they did not unintentionally introduce a non-agreed viewpoint. Jaco Lotheringen suggested that Andy Clay's IMVAL notes should be identified as the next issue for discussion after the upcoming inferred resources workshop. Vaughn Duke agreed to share the views with those who attended the conference for initial discussion and reiterated that formal submission on a SAMVAL letterhead would wait until the group had considered the content. **Action**: Vaughn Duke
6. General	No other business was raised.
7. Next meeting	The next meeting was scheduled for 26 February 2026.
6. Meeting closure	Vaughn Duke thanked all participants for their attendance and engagement. The meeting ended at approximately 09:25.

Matters arising/Action Items

Meeting Date	Action	Responsible	Due	Status	Comments
27/11/25	All workshop participants must read and review the circulating input materials (including contributions from Presenters/Speakers).	All	05/12/25		Essential preparation for the full-day workshop on inferred resources.
27/11/25	Confirm SAMVAL's offer to review the draft code being developed by Kazakhstan.	Vaughn Duke	Ongoing		Committee agreed by consensus to confirm this offer of support.
27/11/25	Manage the process of discussing Andy Clay's nine points of post-IMVAL conference feedback before formal submission on SAMVAL letterhead.	Vaughn Duke/Committee	Ongoing		The feedback must be discussed and agreed upon by the Committee before being formalised and sent to IMVAL.