

SAMREC Committee Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting	23 February 2022	Time	09:45															
Chaired by:	Tania Marshall	Location	Zoom															
Minutes prepared by:	Gugu Charlie																	
<p>Present:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Maria Antonaides</td> <td>Santoshnie Mathuray</td> <td>Seef Vermaak</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annelie de Bruyn</td> <td>Jacques Nel</td> <td>Nicole Wansbury</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tarryn Flitton</td> <td>Godknows Njowa</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rob Ingram</td> <td>Karin van Deventer</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jacques Nel</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>SAIMM Secretariat: Nazli Mamdoo</p> <p>Apologies: Vaughn Duke Ken Lomberg</p>				Maria Antonaides	Santoshnie Mathuray	Seef Vermaak	Annelie de Bruyn	Jacques Nel	Nicole Wansbury	Tarryn Flitton	Godknows Njowa		Rob Ingram	Karin van Deventer		Jacques Nel		
Maria Antonaides	Santoshnie Mathuray	Seef Vermaak																
Annelie de Bruyn	Jacques Nel	Nicole Wansbury																
Tarryn Flitton	Godknows Njowa																	
Rob Ingram	Karin van Deventer																	
Jacques Nel																		
Topic	Discussion																	
1. Welcome	Tania Marshall welcomed everyone to the meeting and apologies were noted.																	
2. Minutes of previous meeting	These were not confirmed.																	
3. Action items from previous meetings	<p>25 November 2021 Page 3, Item 7 – Technical Discussion: Ken Lomberg asked for questions to be put forward for discussion under this agenda item, but Dr Marshall was not aware of any topics that had come in and this was ongoing. Action: All</p> <p>25 November 2021 Page 3, Item 5 – CRIRSCO: Tania Marshall believed that this was ongoing.</p>																	
4. SAMCODES App	Tarryn reported that Jacques had joined her in a lot of meetings with the developers and things were going well. Jacques had been trained up in terms of adding content and helping to manage the App. A new e-mail support address had been created because they were having																	

problems with the previous e-mail address. Both Jacques and Tarryn had access to this and the App had been updated with that support e-mail address, as well as the guidelines. Tarryn would send Tania the guidelines to update on the SAMCODES website. Tania advised that this had to go to Andy McDonald.

Action: Tarryn Flitton

It was also noted that whenever content was updated on the SAMCODES website, it needed to be updated on the App as well. This would require communication between Tarryn Flitton, Jacques Nel and Andy McDonald. Any upcoming courses and training needed to be added and Tarryn would tie in with Camielah Jardine or Sam Moolla, as well as the GSSA side, in order to keep users updated.

Action: Tarryn Flitton

In terms of development, there was still an issue with the PWA (Progressive Web App) for the Apple users in that everything was working except for the Contents App. The Contents App was not clickable. The developers were looking at that.

The biggest thing for the App going forward was how to look at App analytics to see what features were being used the most, etc. Access would be granted to the Google Playstore App analytics for the Android users and then the developers would also try to get a better view for the PWA users.

Jacques advised that one of the things that he had noticed on the App itself was that there had been a reduction in usage for the users, who he thought of trying to get something going with regard to daily tips and tricks for using the SAMCODES App. He was part of a Project Management Telegram Group and on there they daily posed questions and ideas, topics, etc. The team thought it might be a good idea to have something to that effect; where there could be a group set up. This would not necessarily be a group, but possibly a channel. This was a great thing because, with a channel, one did not only have one-way communication, which would remove the risk of there being any discussions between users that might lead to some type of altercation, etc. The other thing to know was that it was possible to have up to 200k users on a telegram group. The link or the QR code could be built throughout the App or on the SAMCODES website. This was a great way to pose interesting questions, and one could also have polls to engage users and build content. The other good thing about having a channel was that the users could not see the details of the other users, only the number of people who were on the group.

Tania believed that there would probably need to be a training session for the older users. Jacques Nel advised that it was much like a WhatsApp group and was very simple to use. It was very interactive and was not reliant on one person doing the updates. It was also possible to share documents and was a good platform to engage users. Tania agreed that it sounded very interesting.

Tarryn suggested that a decision had to be made on whether to go for a whole new, different platform. This had not been discussed with the developers of the actual App. The question was whether it was something that could be built within the App; or whether it could be link the telegram option. For the telegram option, it would require someone to manage this going forward. It would be additional administration and she suggested that she and Jacques Nel should think about this in

	<p>more detail before proposing anything, as it had not been properly investigated as yet. SAMREC did want to engage its users somehow and become more interactive. She believed it was a great opportunity to get people engaged.</p> <p>Tania added that one of the things they found in the GSSA regarding social media was the problem around the lack of enthusiasm of people contributing. It started off very well but people either got busy, bored or lethargic. She welcomed any contributions in order to grow the thought processes going forward. She agreed that the trick was to get people consistently providing information and being consistently engaged. She believed that the young people would get very excited about it.</p>
<p>5. CRIRSCO</p>	<p>Tania advised that a new Executive Committee was put in place at the September meeting. Ken Lomberg moved to the Immediate Past President position and the Chairman now was Edison Ribeiro from Brazil. The Deputy Chair was Garth Kirkham from Canada, the Secretary was Wilfredo Lopez from Colombia and the Treasurer was Peter Stoker from Australasia. This Committee would stand for the next two years.</p> <p>An ESG Work Group had been established, of which Roger Dixon was the Chair. Theresa Steele-Schober was also heavily involved in that working group. The working group was made up of individuals from all of the various NROs and was looking to change the way in which the CRIRSCO template addresses ESG.</p> <p>There was a review of the Standard Definitions and Ken Lomberg was the Chair of that sub-committee.</p> <p>With regard to the countries coming into CRIRSCO, the Philippines were apparently very close to coming in and this would probably happen in the first half of this year. Ghana was taking the lead in West Africa.</p> <p>The ICMM had agreed to assist with financial support of CRIRSCO, as well as technical support.</p> <p>A new website was being designed and would be hosted out of the AusIMM. CRIRSCO was to become a legal entity; a not-for-profit organisation, based in the UK.</p> <p>Regarding JORC, there were four or five teams to examine various aspects of the JORC update, including Competent Persons, CP Registrations, ESG. Tania had heard that, in addition to JORC being a Stock Exchange requirement; in Australia and also New Zealand, their equivalent Department of Mineral and Energy Affairs required that any company (listed or unlisted) that wanted to apply for mining rights, had to supply a JORC-compliant CPR. So it looked as though it was moving out of purely the public domain, and getting into the private domain.</p>

6. Technical Discussion: ESG

Tania advised that the ESG Working Group, made up of representatives of SAMREC, SAMVAL and several large and small companies, was looking at all of the results that came out of the ESG Inquisition held last year; as well as other ESG experiences, to see how the SAMESG update had to go.

One of the things that came out of the last meeting was that the SAMESG Guideline would remain a guideline, modelled on the Diamond Guideline situation, where key aspects would be incorporated into the SAMREC Code as well as the SAMVAL Code; but there would be significant guidance in SAMESG which would identify the different levels of operation; mining; resource and reserve estimation; how it applied to different sized companies, etc. There would be some reporting details in Table 1. Again, this would be differentiated into exploration results, resources and reserves.

Ken Lomborg had advised that he was able to attend the first meeting, but he did not see his way clear to continue representing SAMREC on the ESG working group, due to pressures of work, etc. She asked members to think about this and Ken Lomborg could discuss this later.

Tania Marshall wanted to look at ESG issues and how it affected SAMREC. Some while ago, the SAMESG Committee put together a number of possible items. She stressed that it was not a draft of anything; it was just some working ideas as to the type of things that might be considered in Table 1 going forward.

She went through some of these points.

The existing Table 1 with regard to location, legal aspects, royalties and liabilities, RPEEE, technical studies, audits and reviews. These appeared to be the main areas within SAMREC where the ESG reporting was more applicable. She invited comments and thoughts on the potential guidelines on ESG, whether they thought they were applicable, too onerous, etc. so that when this was discussed in the ESG working group, there was some comment on what the SAMREC Committee thought of these things.

Within the Location Section (Point 1.2) – currently there was country profile to describe the information pertaining to the project hosting country, including relevant applicable legislation, environmental and social context, etc., i.e.

- *Assess at a high level relevant technical, environmental, social, economic, political and other key risks. What that would mean in an ESG context, to help explain what was required in this, would be to provide a high-level analysis of the ESG context within the area where the project is located and give an appropriate analysis of the material aspects and impacts that may need consideration. Include issues that are likely to remain material despite the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.*
- *Describe the location of any sensitive area within and around the project area included within the prospecting right area and within the zone of influence of the site*

Maria advised that this looked very much like the guidelines that were expected for SAMESG in terms of Table 1 and they had already been required to be included in CPRs. She wanted to understand the differences, i.e. whether this was a slight modification on that. Tania

confirmed that these were slight modification. The current SAMREC on the website did not require any of these ESG aspects to be reported. A primary copy was put on the website in an incorrect manner, but was rapidly taken down. This was based on that, with some changes. Maria was a bit confused, because CPRs had been submitted to the Readers Panel and they required all of these items. Tania advised that the team was trying to design something that was useful going forward.

Tarryn had downloaded Table 1 from the SAMCODES website and would include that Table. If this was not applicable yet, that could be what was leading to the confusion. Rob advised that the ESG requirements had not yet been incorporated in Section 12, which would happen at some time. That could be why there was some confusion to include ESG in CPRs.

A question was asked that whether or not it was a requirement, that had to be clarified with the Readers Panel to actually have a decision on that. There had been a lot of feedback on this for at least two different projects. Rob Ingram asked that an e-mail be sent to him to track this down. This was agreed. Rob understood that at present Table 1 did not include the ESG Guidelines and until these Guidelines were appropriate included into Table 1, there needed to be a clearer editing and better blending of requirements. Tania added that that was the point of this exercise and the aim was that, when this was discussed at the ESG Working Group in a month's time, SAMREC had something to say about it. Rob asked if he could be included in that Working Group. Tania agreed to pass that on to Andy McDonald.

Action: Tania Marshall

Tania reiterated that these guidelines were not part of Table 1 of the SAMREC Code. These were some of the suggestions that should be include in Table 1 as guidelines as to what could be spoken about when reporting on ESG issues. She just wanted to look at the first two points.

Tarryn asked whether the items on the right were on a country level. This was confirmed by Tania. Annalie cautioned that care should be taken in the message being sent. She fully understood and agreed with the link between ESG in SAMESG and Table 1, but care needed to be taken not to say that it had to go in. From a JSE perspective, they were hesitant to mandate any ESG disclosure because they did not know where the country was going in terms of mandating disclosures and they also did not know where the JSE Regulator was doing in terms of what was required regarding disclosures. From a JSE perspective, if it found its way into SAMREC Table 1, the JSE would somehow have to exclude it at this point in time. That was a concern from her perspective. She did not believe it should be a requirement in Table 1 at this point in time.

Tania added that this was a discussion only within the SAMREC group and it would take a long while before things happened. There were different sub-groups in the ESG Working Group looking at who the stakeholders were and what their requirements were in terms of ESG reporting. All of those things would need to be taken into consideration.

She asked if there were any issues with providing a map to identify the locality of sensitive receptors within the prospecting right area and *around* the project area included within the prospecting right area and within the zone of influence and including surface water features on the map. There was already a requirement for a map within Table 1. She

asked if there was any problem with providing this information on a map; or whether this should be a separate map.

Maria advised that the only problem she saw with the map was that, for exploration projects, that might not be available because specialist studies might not have been conducted yet. Tania responded that the thought going forward was that they would want to sub-divide this in terms of exploration resources and reserves, just as had been done in Table 1. So, under 'Exploration' there would be less information on the map. That would be for everything under consideration. Tarryn believed it probably needed to be split up into three different columns.

Under the Legal and Permitting requirements, some of the things they would be asking or suggesting information on would be a description of the recognised claims received during the reporting period; a description of any penalties, fines and damages which were due and payable by the target in response to an order of the Court; decision by a mediation; or a decision by an arbitrator whether or not subject to an appeal process. She asked if there was anything there that the team felt should not be applicable.

Annelie asked whether it was 'any' or all 'material' finds. Tania Marshall believed that was an important point, so in place of 'any', it should be 'material'.

Tarryn asked if Point 1.2 could be discussed again. She still did not understand why, on the right it was talking about at country level and she believed there was a disconnect. Tania agreed that there was a disconnect and noted that as something to be amended.

Regarding the point 'motivate whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that all ESG parameters, authorisations and licences could be obtained', Maria believed this related to the previous column that had always been in there and that all environmental parameters should be addressed in line with what was in the first requirements already.

Looking at royalties and liabilities, Tania advised that they were very general to what Maria had just mentioned under Table 1, the piece 'description of royalties that are payable and a methodology used in determining rehabilitation, liability, etc.' Here they were asking people to look at non-rehabilitation activities, liability and compliance costs, as well as current disclosure, social obligations, rehabilitation activities, material remaining liable and compliance costs, as well as providing a description of the mechanisms to address complete closure and the bonding applications. She asked whether this was a repetition of what there was in already, or was it looking at asking for too much information (or non-material information). Maria believed it talked to liability and the bonding obligations was relevant. She added that it should stay in and be incorporated in the first item. She was not sure whether unplanned closure was too much information for this, as surely the purpose of a CPR was to present a project that was economically viable. Kelly advised that in South African legislation, one would have to provide for premature closure, so it was nothing more than what legislation actually required. Tania Marshall suggested that maybe it would require a brief description (single paragraph). Maria believed that if one took social obligations, one could also get five pages just on this; so perhaps a brief description would be more applicable there as well. Kelly agreed.

Maria asked what compliance costs were. Tania Marshall advised that that was the money that someone was paid to do a rehabilitation assessment, ESG studies, etc. Maria queried whether that was relevant, as this was a company business output. Tania advised that it was part of the exploration results. Maria believed that it was not really part of the projected cash flow and, as it did come in, it was a very small part of a financial analysis on something. Tania agreed to query compliance costs, rehabilitation activities and other liabilities again.

Regarding describing any non-material issues, Maria believed that was applicable.

Regarding RPEEE, currently all Table 1 said was 'disclose and discuss the legal, governmental, permitting and statutory parameters, disclosures and discuss the Environmental, Social and Community parameters, and discuss any material risks. What ESG was proposing was what this meant, amongst others, was to provide a high-level description of organisational structure, policies, procedures and management plans and governance procedures in place to manage ESG issues. Providing a high-level analysis of what the internal context within which the project was located gave an appropriate analysis of the environmental context within which the project was located and gave an appropriate analysis of material aspects and inputs that may need consideration. This would include issues that were likely to remain material, despite the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

Regarding 'describe at high level the risks associated with any obvious ESG factors that could have a material modification to the planned estimation programme', Tania asked what questions SAMREC wanted to ask the SAMESG Committee regarding the application of these tree items. Maria suggested a question could be at what level of Governance they were asking these questions as well. Kelly believed they were asking for something that was beyond the CPR and most of this should come out of the sustainability report, as this was repeating a lot of information. There had been significant complaints about the size of the CPRs and if all of this data had to be included, the size of the reports would double. Tania agreed that that was one thing that SAMREC did not want to get into. Tarryn agreed that a lot of detail they were asking for was probably already in other documentation. This was the SAMREC Table 1 and was provided on an 'if not/why not' basis. The SAMREC Table could be put as an appendix to the CPR. SAMREC Table 1 was currently being done on an 'if not/why not' basis and this was asking for a lot of detail.

Nicole advised that, to her, the most important aspect was material risks. These should be identified first and then the first two points could be discussed in terms of those mitigating factors, etc. Her suggestion was to start with the risks and discuss those in terms of the other two points. That would be a good starting point from that perspective.

Tania added that all the material things that were going to impact a resource or reserve were required, but so much of that was operational and that detail could just swell the size of the report, which was not the aim. It was important to get the level of information correct. She believed that all the questions that were asked regarding estimation of RPEEE would be exactly the same questions that needed to be asked regarding the application of ESG within the technical studies section. To her, the fundamental question was '*report on any social and political issues that may have a material effect on the planned programme.*

Include issues that are likely to remain material despite the implementation of proposed mitigation measures' and then looking at issues that were likely to remain material despite the implementation of proposed mitigation. Annelie agreed.

Tania noted that the rest of the discussion seemed to be repetition. She had a query around 5.8 – *'to provide a description of ESG management system conformance audits undertaken during the reporting period'*.

Tania asked that, as everybody had been involved in the writing of the reports, what the ESG issues were that they had come across that they would like to see included in a CPR.

Maria advised that, from her perspective, the first and foremost was to know if all the required licences and permits were in place and also the section on mining layout. For the purpose of a CPR, the point was to present the mineral prospects and a sustainability report was a complete stand-alone as the Code gave so much more information. There had previously been a discussion around the overlap as to whether one would need to be a CP in ESG matters to be able to include all these things. She believed that was quite a major point and who would actually sign off on those items.

Tania asked what everyone thought of the idea of including, by reference, information in a CPR with regard to ESG issues and to refer to the sustainability report that the company had, to avoid the inclusion of all the material in the CPR, but maybe just include a paragraph and give reference to the sustainability report. She asked how that would affect the Readers Panel.

Rob agreed that if that was being done by references, his view was that it would be acceptable. The thing was that everybody recognised that, within Table 1, there was a certain degree of circularity with some of the requirements and it would be acceptable to refer back to something that had been covered in the appropriate detail. It was a question that of whether the practitioners in this committee believed this would be an appropriate way to cover it and it would certainly save duplication. He would have thought that, in a CPR, that that would be a reasonable approach.

Tania believed that two things were being discussed here: one was referring by reference to material that had already been discussed in the CPR, so that in Chapter V you just say: 'refer to Chapter I'. She was asking about having a summary in the CPR and saying: 'For detail, go to the company's sustainability report'.

Rob advised that, regarding the company's sustainability report, many companies were already calling these ESG reports. He suggested that this could be done, but there would have to be consensus opinions on that. The annual report ESG was sometimes an exercise in PR and just possibly it might not be appropriate to refer back to that in a CPR. That was a decision to be made by CPs and the company commissioning the report.

Tania asked for comments from CPs in the meeting. Seef advised that in terms of reference to an ESG sustainability report and trying to find the detail in another 200-page document was often a problem. He did not have a problem if there were certain facts in another document and the reference was accurate and to the point, but if another half-day had

to be spent trying to find something in a long document, this would be very cumbersome and would not add value.

Rob agreed.

Seef advised that, from a CPR perspective, definitely a dedicated risk relative to ESG would add tremendously and would make many of the other requirements superficial.

Godknows agreed that in the CPR there should be some kind of information, but then to say only by reference, i.e. maybe a paragraph or so just explaining what was important for the CPR. The details could then be found in the sustainability report.

Regarding Maria's question on who signed off on the ESG questions in terms of qualifications, Tania asked for thoughts around the table about an ESG specialist needed to sign off on these things. This could be a very onerous requirement from a junior company point of view.

Godknows advised that in the current process, it might be difficult for the junior companies to have all the expertise to sign off. His thinking was that there should be some kind of transition because clearly there was not a recognised body to house such specialists. He believed there might be some kind of transition in a year from now; but, going forward, the SAIMM and the GSSA should act together to have those CPs regulated.

Tania advised that the GSSA had created an ESG Division where they were housing all of these people who wanted professional registration. There are obviously questions on what qualifications were required and how that was all managed, but it was a work in progress. She asked what people thought about a certificate course or MSc-level course on ESG compliance for people wanting to sign off on ESG.

Maria was not sure whether that would add much value, because she believed that currently the assumption was that if you were including any kind of ESG descriptions, it would be fed from a different study. She was not sure that a certificate to sign off just on the portions of the CPR would be worth it; or even if it was then necessary for someone to sign off if there was always going to be reliance on experts coming from those fields already.

Tania was thinking more in terms of not making individuals specialists in any of those issues, but equipping them with the knowledge of what sort of questions to ask the particular specialist.

Maria believed that was the role of the ESP at the moment and a requirement was now being implemented to be registered. There were currently some issues regarding that and it had been extended because there were a few things that had been identified as problems. She added that an ESP already filled that role.

Tania added that there were some issues with the whole ESP discussion.

Maria advised that another approach regarding sign-off on these items in a CPR would be to address it in the 'reliance on other experts' section, i.e. the same as there was for other experts. The question that could be asked was whether the ESG was more important than some of the

	<p>other expertise that is used. CPs were used for mining and metallurgy, so why should the ESG person be any less important?</p> <p>Rob suggested that it was very difficult for a CP who was not competent in the field of ESG to sign off on a CPR that included the entire ESG aspects included in the report. He had seen, in the context of SK-1300 reports, that a CP/QP could only sign off on those areas of the report that they were competent to report on. That would be something that would be naturally assumed in the CPR here. He believed that, for ESG reporting, you would need sign-off by a competent ESG person.</p> <p>Tania suggested that it would be fairly easy to do in terms of Environmental or Social, but Governance would pose a challenge.</p> <p>Rob believed this would require more research.</p> <p>Godknows felt that SAMREC needed to take a step back and look at it from a high level rather than the nitty gritty.</p> <p>Tania thanked everyone for an interesting discussion and for their input.</p>
<p>7. General</p>	<p>Annelie advised that JORC was looking at registration of CPs and wanted each SAMREC Code to discuss this. Tania responded that it was one of the proposals that had been made to the Committee and this still needed to be discussed. One of the things they were looking at was having a list of all registered CPs, so that people could search through to see if there was an individual they wanted to hire. She understood that the Committee would bring their proposals together at the end of March and something should be in the public domain. Tarryn asked what the value would be of having a list and not having it validated. Tania understood that if she wanted to hire a CP, she would consult the list and see the people in Australia who worked in the industry that she was looking at getting CP in and she would then just know their contact details and could go to them. Tarryn responded that it was more of an advertising directory of CPs. Annelie noted that she had not read the article and suggested waiting until the end of March and to then assess whether this would be useful. Tarryn also asked who would maintain that list. She asked Annelie to circulate the article.</p> <p>Action: Annelie de Bruyn</p> <p>Godknows reported that he was privileged to be part of one of the discussions from an Australian perspective. The reason why they were following that path was because of what was happening in the ASX. Certain individuals had been saying they were competent when they did not meet the requirements. The reason why this had been suggested was trying to strengthen this point. It was something that was still being discussed.</p> <p>Tania added that there was also a proposal put on the table that CPs would have to write in their certificates why it was that they could be considered competent for that particular job so, in the certificate in the back, there would have to be a fairly detailed paragraph on why they would consider themselves a CP. As Godknows had said, these things were still being discussed.</p>

	<p>Annelie asked whether this could be put on the agenda for the next meeting; to consider this once the documents had been published. Tania agreed.</p> <p>Action: Tania Marshall</p> <p>Annelie believed that at some point the Committee needed to consider independent impartiality in order to give some guidance.</p> <p>Rob noted that a particular document had come from Australia, where a company wanted to have a secondary listing in South Africa. The document had been rejected as it was not compliant with JORC and with regulations that applied in Australia. However, on review, it was found that the document was not very satisfactory in terms of materiality, transparency and reasonableness. There was a certain amount of pushback, but a great part of the comments was taken note of and collected. However, the document which was then received – while improved, still included some assumptions that the Readers Panel had no power to do anything other than review and comment on. That was something that needed to be considered. Tania asked what the question was that Rob wanted to raise. He responded that it was about dual listings; and consultants and practitioners were going to find themselves involved with these more commonly in the future. They needed to be particularly aware of Sections 1812, 1817 and 1820 when they looked at this kind of work. The other thing was that, in the context of SK-1300, they take their time to study the requirements and the peculiarities of the system in North America if they were dealing with clients who had a primary listing in New York and a secondary listing in South Africa. He invited anybody who wanted to talk further about this to get in touch with him. Tania advised that this would go on the agenda for the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: Tania Marshall</p> <p>Karin van Deventer suggested that SAMREC needed to keep in mind that a lot of these regulations discussed were very applicable for big corporate companies but, for the smaller companies, she was not sure how they were going to be able to supply all the right technical people to sign off on everything. Tania agreed.</p>
8. Training	This was not discussed.
9. Closure	Tania thanked all members for their input and the interesting discussion. This was certainly not the last time that the meeting would continue discussing ESG issues.
Next meeting	The next meeting was scheduled 26 May 2022

Matters arising/Action Items

Meeting Date	Action	Responsible	Due	Status	Comments
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	Ongoing		
23/02/22	Send Tania guidelines to update on SAMCODES website	Tarryn Flitton	28/02/22		
23/02/22	Tie in with Camielah/Sam re upcoming courses & training for App	Tarryn Flitton	Ongoing		
23/02/22	Discuss inclusion of Rob Ingram on ESG Working Group with A McDonald	Tania Marshall	28/02/22		
23/02/22	Circulate article re JORC & registration of CPs	Annelie de Bruyn	31/03/22		
23/02/22	Add agenda item to discuss CP competency.	Tania Marshall	31/03/22		
23/02/22	Add agenda item of dual listing requirements.	Tania Marshall	31/03/22		