SAMREC
MINUTES OF THE
SAMREC WORKING GROUP MEETING
Held on 30 May 2013 at 10:30 at the Military Museum, Delville Wood Room

PRESENT:	**K G Lomberg (Chairman)**	
	M Austin	**T Flitton**
	A Bals	**P S Gräbe**
	A de Bruyn	**M Lynn**
	J Botha	**T R Marshall**
	W Botha	**S Mathuray**
	A N Clay	**C Morgan**
	R C Croll	**H Schnetler**
	R Davel	**M R Tlala**
	M Davidson	**D Young**
APOLOGIES:	**V Chamberlain**	**M McWha**
	Dr C E Dohm	**K Redman**
	V Deonarain	**Dr G L Smith**
	F Harper	**J Sullivan**
	K Johnstone	**E Takolia**
	L Korff	**J V Visser**
	A S Macfarlane	
In Attendance:	**S Moolla (Manager, SAIMM)**	

---

1. WELCOME

Mr Ken Lomberg welcomed everyone present to the meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2013 were accepted as tabled.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Page 3, Discussion on the process involved for the revision of the SAMREC Code:
Mr Lomberg stated the working group are probably going to do a road show and take this to all the regions and all the SAIMM and GSSA Branches and that a meeting would have to be arranged with the DMR regarding what we were doing and work out a process out with them.

4. DISCUSSION ON THE PROCESS INVOLVED FOR THE REVISION OF THE SAMREC CODE

Mr Lomberg reported that a notice had been sent out through the SAIMM and GSSA to get any commentary that needed to be addressed on the Code. To date no feedback had been received and the closing date was the next day (31 May 2013). At the SSC meeting it was noted that even if commentary was received, people were probably going to wait for the draft before commenting. There were six issue papers that needed to be incorporated but which would be done independently. Ms Tania Marshall had put together the section on exploration results and would be working through it to see how to introduce it into the Code and to address all the other issues. Mr Lomberg added that he had received comment on the JORC process and he and Ms de Bruyn had worked on a schedule for the re-write of the SAMREC Code it and it seemed that it could be done by the third or fourth quarter of 2014. Issues would continue to be addressed through the sub-committees.

He added that before the regions were visited we should try to get an appointment with the Director General of the DMR in Pretoria and explain to them what we are doing to get their approval. Ms de Bruyn agreed to facilitate this and make an appointment for an hour with the Director General. Once the appointment was set a decision could be made on who should attend the meeting. He added that the meeting would be to explain to the DMR what the working group was planning to do and to assist in facilitating this. The areas that would be covered were Gauteng, Rustenburg, Witbank, Polokwane, Pietermaritzburg and Durban.

5. INTEGRATION OF THE PREVIOUS WORK – EXPLORATION RESULTS

Mr Lomberg reported that there were six papers that the working group had been through and one of them was exploration results. This had come as a query from the JSE about the use of information in declaring exploration results. Ms Marshall had taken it on board together with people from the coal industry that had been looking at this and there had been some movement. Last year she presented a lot of information and she had gone through it phrase by phrase to see if what was there was in line with what we wanted. The SAMREC Code was going to be compared with three or four other Codes maybe PERC, JORC and SIM.

In reply to a question raised Mr Lomberg stated that at the end of the process we would have to follow JORC's example. They had taken the old Code and the new Code and put them side-by-side and then distributed it. JORC had received over a hundred comments at that time. Our process would be the same, *i.e*, we had to do the comparison, consult with the industry and then get sign off from the SSC. He confirmed that it had to be circulated to all parties including CRIRSCO so that everyone knew what we had done in the same manner that JORC did.

Mrs Marshall explained that they had started off with the exploration results and spent many months trying to sort it out. However, the new JORC and PERC had then come out and there were some points in there which were really useful. She had taken the original document that had been agreed on and put in a track changes version with all the things that were different or in addition to the JORC and PERC comments. In some cases a huge amount of what they had in JORC and PERC were already included but perhaps in a different way and she had not included these.

The committee went through the recommendations that Tania made and the discussion would continue at the next meeting. Mr Lomberg thanked Mrs Marshall for all the effort that she had made into putting the document together.

5. COMPARISON OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODES

There was no discussion.

6. GENERAL

<u>Report on PLATO</u>

Mr Bals reported on the status of PLATO. He stated that PLATO was a Council formed about forty years ago by what was then called the Department of Land Affairs which has now transitioned to the Department of Land Reform and Rural Development. In 2005 an attempt was made to pass a Bill that saw the Council, the constitution, delegation and objectives change. What was given as public comment was then rejected by the six professions proposed to be governed by this Council. The six professions are Land Surveying, Mine Surveying, Engineering Surveying, GIS Practitioners, Topography Surveying and Hydrography Surveying. It took ten years to put the clause together for the Council and after the decline of the Chief Surveyor General for a period of almost five years it came back in 2010 with an unchanged format except for the title which was now called the Geomatics Council. . The Bill was built on greater power to the Minister and State representation, but there was no mention of the objections from mine surveyors. He explained the process and added that where they were affected was when mine surveyors sign off applications for prospect mining rights. This had been taken out of the current Bill and the proposed Bill referred to professional land surveyors. The other issue was with the SAMREC and SAMVAL Codes. The new Council would not be representative of the profession and would compromise its state as a statutory body referred to in these Codes. He further explained the process that they had followed to make presentations to the Portfolio Committee. They were currently waiting for the Portfolio Committee's feedback. However, they thought that they had a fifty per cent chance of success at getting a major change accepted so they had decided to go ahead with Plan B which was setting up the Institute of Mine Surveyors (IMSSA)as a statutory body. We had also registered IMSSA with SACNA as a professional body. A special general meeting would be convened in the next month to change the constitution and draft a disciplinary code which would hopefully position them as a potential ROPO. Once this was complete would make a formal presentation to the SSC to recognise them as a ROPO. Mr Lomberg confirmed that the SSC, the SAIMM and the Chamber of Mines would send letter to the Portfolio Committee in this regard.

After further deliberation Mr Croll recommended that the issue be taken up with the SAIMM and GSSA to find out what they were doing to keep in touch with what goes to Parliament and to assign people to keep a watching brief to avoid this kind of situation happening again.

Mr Lomberg thanked everyone for their time and contributions,

There being no further matters for discussion the meeting ended at 12:27.

SUMMARY OF KEY ACTION ITEMS
Annalie de Bruyn
Set up a meeting with the Director General of the DMR
Ken Lomberg
Decide who should attend the meeting with the DMR