



	<p>had done was to put all the training done over the past two years on YouTube via open access. This included all of the courses and the last SAMCODES Introductory Training that had been done. Dr Marshall confirmed that the SAMCODES Conference was still with SAIMM and it was being sold.</p>
<p><b>3. Action items from previous meetings</b></p>	<p><b>26 August 2021</b></p> <p><b>Page 3, Item 4 - SAMCODES App:</b> It was confirmed that the list of sponsors had been updated.</p> <p><b>Page 3, Item 4 - SAMCODES App:</b> Regarding Admin users from SAIMM for the App, Ken Lomborg knew that Jacques Nel was involved. Tarryn added that it was currently just Jacques and herself. She believed that if an SAIMM person could be added to assist, that would be helpful, as well as someone from SAMVAL and SAMESG. She had done a training session with Jacques Nel and he was up and running. She welcomed any more people who could assist.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> All</p> <p><b>Page 3, Item 6 - SAMCODES Conference:</b> The SAMCODES Conference would be discussed further on the agenda.</p> <p><b>Page 3, Item 7 - Technical Discussion:</b> Ken Lomborg asked for questions to be put forward for discussion under this agenda item, but he had not received any response as yet. He asked members to continue giving this some thought and to put forward any aspects for discussion.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> All</p>
<p><b>4. SAMCODES App</b></p>	<p>Tarryn Flitton reported that hopefully the message had been received via the SAMCODES Conference. The site had been updated and recently the Android app had also been updated. There was a new version on the Google Play Store. There were one or two small items sitting with the developers, but nothing really significant. Ken Lomborg thanked her for all the effort.</p> <p>Maria Antoniadis was not up to speed of the purpose of the App and was trying to understand who the intended audience was. From what she could see, it was basically just a sort of 'on demand', 'quick access' to the Code. She asked if there was a bigger purpose to it. Tarryn responded that it was a mobile, friendly view of the Codes, because the idea was that users would download the pdf onto a mobile device and then zoom in and zoom out. This had a search functionality and it had been broken the Code into smaller parts there were a bit easier to navigate through on a mobile device. It has also been made easier to link to any resources that were not necessarily part of the SAMCODES. Ken Lomborg added that it was basically electronic usage and South Africa was one of the first CRIRSCO countries to do this. Tania Marshall also added that, regarding the use of the app, when looking at the specifications on the website, it could be seen that over the last year, there had been a dramatic increase in the number of people using or accessing SAMCODES from their mobile devices via the app; so it was obviously working for people to be able to access it when they were not sitting in front of their computers in the office. Ken Lomborg advised that the Apple version was still using the 'work around' and Tarryn did</p>

	<p>not believe it would be possible to put this on the Apple App Store, so the team was using a PWA (Professional Web Application), which is working well. Notifications were now being received, so when content was being added, then it could be sent to both the Android and Apple users. Jacques Nel confirmed that it was working via his Apple phone.</p>
<p><b>5. CRIRSCO</b></p>	<p>Ken Lomborg reported on the CRIRSCO annual meeting held two weeks before the SAMCODES Conference. The meeting was once again virtual and followed the same pattern as the previous year. This included a whole lot of admin meetings, a technical meeting where it was resolved that CRIRSCO would try and do two or three things outside of the conference, i.e. looking at the Standard Definitions and the other was looking at ESG aspects. Roger Dixon would be participating in the ESG meetings and the first meeting was scheduled for next week. There were a number of countries that were getting close to membership, i.e. China and the Philippines. Ken Lomborg's term as Chairperson finished at the end of the current year and Edson Ribeiro from Brazil would be taking over from Ken. Garth Kirkham from Canada and Wilfredo Lopez from Colombia had joined the Executive. CRIRSCO had also managed to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the ICMM, who continued to support CRIRSCO financially as well as in other ways. One of the other interesting developments was that West Africa (predominantly Ghana) was putting together a code and the person driving this was the same person who was largely responsible for the SK-1300. He invited any questions on CRIRSCO.</p> <p>Jeremy Witley was looking at the KAZRC Code and noticed that this had been significantly updated since July, compared to the code that had first been introduced. Basically, they had copied and pasted the whole CRIRSCO template and had not even bothered to put 'Kazakhstan' on anything; it was literally just a copy and paste of the original table. Ken Lomborg responded that that was quite a common way of doing things and most of the non-English speaking countries pretty much did that. It was an editing challenge and their code, in their language, was 'the' code. Ken Lomborg would advise them to have a careful look at that. Jeremy Witley also suggested letting them know to clear the old version from the website.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Ken Lomborg</p>
<p><b>6. SAMCODES Conference</b></p>	<p>The SAMCODES five-day (mornings) Conference was held in October. Ken Lomborg believed it went well and an interesting range of topics had been covered; both from SAMREC and SAMVAL. He invited comments from the floor.</p> <p>Seef Vermaak asked that, in terms of access to the presentations or recordings, he had contacted SAIMM but had not received a response. He trusted that there would be some publication of the papers, but he also expected either a link or a copy and asked whether something would be forthcoming. Ken believed that paid-up members would be copied, but he would follow this up with SAIMM.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Ken Lomborg</p> <p>Seef Vermaak added that he enjoyed attending the conference and there were two things that he thought were worth mentioning. From the discussions that Andy Clay prompted, and also the issue of the potential</p>

questionnaire regarding the whole application of the SAMREC Code. He asked whether this was something that the committee should deliberate, as to whether there was value in an industry-wide questionnaire aligned to this presentation. Ken Lomborg believed that was a good thing and suggested that he and Rob Ingram should have a conversation to consider whether that was appropriate and whether it could be put forward. Rob Ingram believed that his request was directed for at the SSC; so perhaps this would come up at the SSC meeting.

Steven Rupprecht asked how many attendees there were and whether there could be a separation between the authors and the non-authors, to get an idea. Ken Lomborg believed there were about 40 people most days, possibly 25-30 who were authors. Steven Rupprecht still believed that SAMREC was still not getting attendance from the Competent Persons on the mines and that this should be addressed somehow. To him, it was an area that should be improved. Tania Marshall commented that the SAMVAL Committee had the same issue and, for the next couple of meetings, they would go to specific companies and ask specific individuals, i.e. CFOs and Business Managers, to attend a SAMVAL meeting where they would discuss issues that were applicable to them. A different group of companies would be approached for every meeting. She suggested that this could be a model that SAMREC could follow. Steven advised that this had been proposed forward before Covid and maybe this could be reinvestigated.

Tarryn Flitton agreed with Steven's comments and believed one of the problems was that CPs did not have enough time; and the other was around costs. It was suggested that all the CPs should be pushed to attend SAMCODES workshops rather than mornings of a specific week. Papers could be made available in the journal to get to the CP's. Showing them videos of the conference would not necessarily help. If it was free and on-demand, people might very well attend.

Tarryn believed that the beginning of the conference was a bit tough. There were interesting papers and then there was a lull on the Wednesday. As soon as polls and general discussions were involved, things improved. There was also an issue with the playing of pre-taped video presentations, i.e. Implats. The video was not of a high quality and it was asked if this would be shared with the participants.

Steven added that in terms of getting to the wider audience, he found that getting to the masses through the local branches and societies that typically met after hours was a great way. The other thing was the discussion on Inclusive vs Exclusive Mineral Resource and he believed consideration should be reserved on how that was being dealt with in future for improved transparency.

Tania Marshall wondered whether there was any possible way to get the training officers on the big mines to include the free training event in their training programmes. She asked whether there was a way that SAMCODES could get contact with training officers to get this as part of their basic training done at the mines. Ken Lomborg believed that was a good idea and suggested making a list of contacts.

Tarryn Flitton agreed that this was a good idea, although it involved a lot of effort from the SAMCODES side. Dr Marshall responded that it would go onto the website, but not everybody who needed to see it would visit the website. Steven added that there was a lot of support for CPD points, so if such training on the mines could be informed

	<p>through CPD credits, it would also get more airtime. Dr Marshall would add that to the website, to say that this training added X number of CPD points. Karin van Deventer mentioned that the larger companies all did something around training in some for or another. Her concern was that in many of the smaller companies, training was non-existent and that the consultants, as well as the people working within those companies, often had not idea. Even though they were not JSE listed, they should be using the SAMREC Code for their reporting. The basic training for next year was the same as the one that was free on the website, so she was not sure whether it would be equal to the basic training. There would definitely be SAMCODES advanced training in 2022.</p> <p>Jeremy Witley advised that it was a very difficult time of year for people in his consulting group to attend. October to December was very busy in consulting. Ken Lomborg responded that previously it had been held earlier in the year, but he believed that late in the year presented other difficulties.</p>
<p><b>7. Technical Discussion: ESG</b></p>	<p>Ken Lomborg referred to the ESG inquisition that had been put together by Tanie Marshall. His first question was what people had taken out of the inquisition.</p> <p>Jacques Nel had attended and found it very relevant and a very hot topic throughout the world currently. It was a good meeting and he would definitely like to be more involved.</p> <p>Maria Antoniadis added that it was interesting that everybody was on the same page. It was a new topic for many people and it was reassuring to see that other people were also struggling to investigate how to incorporate the issues in their organisations. It was good to hear the discussions between people from industry.</p> <p>Seef believed it was a good success in terms of lifting the general awareness. He was a little bit disappointed in the number of participants in the survey. He supported the notion of the survey but it was the same issue of general attendance. Overall, he believed it lifted general awareness. One comment he had in terms of finalising the updates and amendments and potential JSE reporting requirements was that there was an urgency to move forward at speed and not to drag it out.</p> <p>Teresa Steele-Schober commented that the survey, from an ESG perspective, confirmed a lot of what they had suspected in terms of lack of awareness of SAMESG and the confusion around the role of SAMESG. That was very informative and would be taken forward when doing the update. The comment made by Maria was somewhat disheartening in terms of the fact that ESG was not a new topic to people because obviously it had been around for a long time; but people were only now waking up to the impact of ESG as an integral part of their organisations. She believed it was great that ESG was getting more air time. The ESG inquisition achieved its purpose well in that it painted a picture of where there were perceptions, where there were gaps, what the understanding was and how people were responding to it. That was the whole purpose of it; the purpose was not to find answers or make decisions, it was really to get broad perspectives from a range of people. She believed that it had achieved that really well. The challenge now was to condense and consolidate the learning side of that and to take it forward.</p>

Ken Lomborg asked, from a SAMESG perspective, what it would like to see from ESG; what aspects were relevant for SAMESG to provide guidelines to; and which things should be included in the SAMREC Code itself.

Steven advised that, from a SAMREC Code perspective (and particularly Table 1), he believed that everyone agreed it should be fully integrated. Currently, Table 1 (without SAMESG) already had quite a few areas of duplication and he believed it should be restructured to group all the ESG matters in a specific grouping to make it clear. Should anything need to be added from SAMESG, it would be easier to facilitate. Ken Lomborg responded that comment was important.

Teresa Steele-Schober asked that if the objective of integrating ESG into SAMREC was agreed, she was confused as to how grouping ESG under a single, separate heading would facilitate that integration. She did not believe anyone wanted another 'tick box' where there was superficial information that was put in the back of a report because Table 1, Section 7.8A stated that one needed to talk about ESG. What she would like to understand from the people around the table, who brought a lot of experience in authoring CPRs, was how to go about integrating ESG in a manner that drove integrated thinking.

Ken Lomborg added that one of the comments which was quite relevant to him was that care had to be taken that there was not a 'data dump' of ESG information on top of the report. The ESG information, when put into reporting Mineral Resource and Mineral Reserve, needed to be relevant.

Maria also pointed out that this was a challenge that everyone was facing. Steven Rupprecht advised that, in the rewrite, SAMREC still needed to incorporate ESG into the SAMREC Code. Right now, it was not actually incorporated in the same way as was done in the SAMVAL Table.

Teresa gave some examples of how and where ESG could be integrated in the SAMREC report. Tarryn Flitton suggested that we could add a 4<sup>th</sup> column in Table 1. Ken Lomborg was concerned that the ESG requirements had to be balanced with all the other technical aspects. Maria noted that from her experience both in consulting with CPs and clients, people were not fully aware as to the importance of ESG. She did not believe people fully understood all the implications.

Tania Marshall commented that, over the last couple of years, SAMCODES had made quite an effort to reach people. If everyone had any practical advice on how to do this better, they should put this forward. SAMCODES has done presentation after presentation, but generally the people who do not attend are the people who do not know. She asked how to get those people to the presentations, or how to get the presentations to them. She advised that practical ideas would be gratefully received.

Jeremy Witley noted that on ESG and SAMESG, quite a lot of audits were done on Mineral Resource and Mineral Reserve for mining companies, and whenever the scope was put together, they brought up ESG. They nearly always received the same responses, i.e. it was in the sustainability report. He believed that even in industry, the link between the Mineral Resource and ESG was still something that required a long way to develop. The sooner it was more explicitly explained in the

	<p>SAMREC Code, the better, as it would raise a lot more awareness with the CPs.</p> <p>Training of the CPs was a big concern. Teresa Steele-Schober pulled up the results of the ESG survey to refresh her memory on some of details. One of the questions specifically asked what role SAMESG should play in terms of guiding the content of various reports produced by companies. She shared the results with the meeting and advised that this was a very key point to take into the updating of SAMESG; that SAMESG was never designed to govern what should be put in a sustainability report. It had a role to play, but it had a clear mandate to support Mineral Resource and Mineral Reserve reporting, both in CPRs and annual reports.</p> <p>Rob Ingram commented that integrating ESG requirements into the Code was probably preferable to having a duplicated report covering ESG. Awareness of the requirements of ESG amongst major companies appeared to be gaining momentum. In the past, there had been a supplementary report on sustainability. He went on to explain that some of the reports were stretching to over 200 pages and he was concerned that if ESG was incorporated, these would bloat the reports further.</p> <p>An observation was also made that the Readers' Panel recently received the first of a group of SK-1300 format reports done using the SAMREC Code. One of the constant complaints from readers was the confusion of who the CP was; the consulting company or an individual? Clause 9 of the Code was quite specific about the individual being the CP. Companies were now wanting to list in America and it was commonplace in North America for the names of the CPs not to be included in the technical report. The reason for that was that no individual geological consultant could afford the professional litigation insurance, particularly in the USA. The cost of such litigation on an individual was insurmountable. The reports that had been reviewed under SK-1300 did not include the names of the CPs.</p> <p>Ken Lomborg advised that the big challenge was that it had to be relevant and his concern was the difference between operational ESG and planning ESG. Most of what was being done was on the planning side and there had to be a distinction.</p> <p>Teresa Steele-Schober responded to Rob Ingram's comments. The big challenge was to take the world of sustainability information and distil the information to a level that would answer the 'so what' questions.</p> <p>Linda Iaccheri believed ESG issues were very multi-disciplinary and she did not believe that a CPR could cover all this. She believed it was beyond the experience of the CP, although it belonged to the Modifying Factors. Ken Lomborg maintained it was about having the right individuals involved in the CP's team.</p>
<b>8. Training</b>	This had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

<p><b>9. General</b></p>	<p>Ken Lomberg asked if there were any comments on what Rob Ingram had brought up regarding identifying the Competent Person.</p> <p>Tarryn Flitton understood that people were trying to avoid Section 11 liability under SK-1300, but the only way one could actually get a company to take responsibility was if it was a third party, i.e. a consultancy, and it could not be the actual company that that person worked for. There still had to be CPs or QPs who needed to take on the responsibility/liability. If companies were complying with the JSE rules, they would have to list the CP; so she was not sure what that move had been about.</p> <p>Ken Lomberg agreed that if the CP was not named, it was not SAMREC-compliant. Tania Marshall commented that there was nothing that SAMREC could do about what was in the SK-1300 and their rules were their rules. SAMREC rules were SAMREC rules and she did not understand why SAMREC should be trying to make them converge. Rob Ingram advised that it was against Clause 9 and that this had been an issue with readers for many years. Steven Rupprecht agreed that a company should have a CPR and if they were listed in the USA, they would have a TRS because SK-1300 had its specific rules which were not congruent with the SAMREC Code. There were differences between CPRs and TRs. He believed they were two different things although most of the things were congruent. Tania Marshall asked how the situation was dealt with for companies listed in Australia or Europe; and whether the JSE received JORC reports, PERC reports, or NI43-101 reports and why this should suddenly be so different. Rob Ingram responded that, in the past, reports done under the NI43-101 and JORC had been reviewed, but these were not very common. There had only been a handful over the last ten years. This had been the first experience with SK-1300 and there were a number of matters that needed to be considered. Tania Marshall had always been under the impression that wherever the primary listing of the company was; they reported under those regulations and that the secondary listing stock exchange simply accepted the report that had been submitted to the primary stock exchange. She added that a South African company wanting to report overseas would first do the SAMREC report to the JSE and what they did with the NYSE was entirely up to them. In response to a suggestion from Rob Ingram, Tania tabling this for a future SSC meeting, when Annalie de Bruyn from the JSE would be present.</p> <p>Tarryn Flitton believed that companies wanting to list with the JSE should give the JSE whatever was required by the JSE, unless the JSE provided the dispensation.</p>
<p><b>Next meeting</b></p>	<p>The next meeting was scheduled 24 February 2022</p>
<p><b>Meeting closure</b></p>	<p>Mr Lomberg thanked everyone for their attendance and contribution. The meeting ended at 11:25.</p>



**Matters arising/Action Items**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Due</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
25/11/21	Put forward questions for discussion under 'Technical Discussions'	All members	Ongoing		
25/11/21	Advise CRIRSCO member companies from non-English speaking countries to edit their translations of the template thoroughly	Ken Lomberg	Feb 2022		