

**To:** Members of the (New) Technical Advisory Group  
**From:** Alistair Jones, TAG Chair

**Technical Advisory Group Meeting  
10 and 11 Oct 2017  
MINUTES**

*For the draft minutes, attendees and discussion on 10<sup>th</sup> are shown in red, attendees and discussion on 11<sup>th</sup> shown in blue. Attendees and similar discussion on both dates shown in black. This is simply to enable checking.*

*Attendees:* Alistair Jones (Chair), Karin Ask, Frank Denelle, Adrienne Hanly, Michael Haschke, Ulrich Kral, Satinder Purewal, Hari Tulsidas, Charlotte Griffiths,

**Approval of draft agenda**

1. The draft agenda was approved with the addition of a report on the recent conference in Cairo sponsored by African Minerals Development Centre

**Minutes**

2. This was the first meeting of the new Technical Advisory Group (TAG) so there were no minutes to approve.

**Introductions**

3. Brief introductions were made.

**New organisation**

4. The new EGRC Bureau Structure was described. Two aspects were highlighted:

- The last EGRC annual meeting agreed to form Minerals and Petroleum Working Groups (WG). Chairs have been appointed and beginning to form the groups.
- The structure has been reorganised to help the Bureau, Technical Advisory Group and Working Groups to work more efficiently.

5. It was asked how links with external bodies should work and at which levels in the structure to enable effective and consistent communication.

Action: The UN Secretariat will raise this with the EGRC chair for potential discussion at the Bureau.

**Draft Terms of Reference**

6. Draft Terms of Reference for the new TAG had been proposed by the chair and circulated previously. Three aspects of the draft were highlighted:

- The new Minerals and Petroleum WGs will take on much of the work that the previous TAG did on developing Minerals and Petroleum documents (helping with bridging documents, case studies) and in responding to external requests for advice.
- The scope and responsibilities of the new TAG is described
- The generic scope of the commodity Working Groups is described, so as to delineate the TAG and WG work.

7. It was suggested that the Minerals WG could not spend more than 10% of its time working on Bridging Documents and Case Studies and providing advice. Most of their time is planned to be spent on developing a Minerals Management System. It was recognised that this is partly a resourcing issue. It is important to recruit members to the WG who have the skills,

time and willingness to work on Bridging, Case Studies and providing advice. It was also recognised that for the next year, the level of work on Bridging was likely to be low, e.g. reviewing updates to the Chinese Minerals Bridging Document. Work on a Russian Bridging Document may become but probably not before one year's time. It was agreed to accept this generic scope for the Minerals WG for one year and then to review.

8. It was asked whether the Anthropogenic WG should have a ToR. It was proposed that all WGs should develop a ToR in time, but that this is not a matter of urgency for existing groups which are already working effectively. It was suggested that ToR could be tailored to each WG but should not be too prescriptive. There was also a suggestion that all WGs could have the same ToR since this is generic. It was considered that this might not be practical at present given that different WGs have very different emphases of work because of the different nature and status of different commodities.

9. A formal link with the UNFC Revision Task Force was proposed. Action: The chair will discuss this proposal with the EGRC chair.

10. It was suggested that the role of the TAG should go beyond coordination and support and be to review and validate. There was discussion of how the review process should work. A proposal is that a review team is formed for each document. This team could be composed of members from different WGs with an appointed leader. This would help promote integration and consistency. This proposal was largely supported, but further clarity in the ToR on the review process was requested.

11. There was some discussion of having more specific performance management, how we would be measured, timelines, goals, objectives and key performance indicators. Concern was expressed by others at being too demanding, e.g. with performance indicators since all doing this work are volunteers with limited time and variable availability. Being specific about plans and aims would be helpful.

12. It was suggested that there should be more clarity about the time commitment for TAG members and funding.

13. Action: the chair will develop a second draft and circulate this by email for further comments. Once agreed the ToR would be submitted to the Bureau for agreement.

#### **Petroleum WG Terms of Reference**

14. The chair of the Petroleum WG had drafted a Terms of Reference, and this was circulated before the meeting. Unfortunately, there was insufficient time to discuss this, and it was agreed to defer this to another meeting.

#### **Transition to the new organisation**

15. An important consideration in the transition is that work that is currently ongoing in the original TAG continues seamlessly. Some ongoing reviews were identified, and it was agreed that the same people as are currently working on these will continue, though they will now be located in different working groups. These are examples of how future reviews will be done by teams from across the WGs. In addition, some members of the previous TAG who are now in the Petroleum WG, are developing case studies on the RF13 to UNFC Bridging. It was agreed that these same people should continue the work with the Petroleum WG.

16. Action: To facilitate the transition, the chair will compile and circulate a summary of work currently ongoing in the original TAG. This will include details of who is leading and working on each project

17. It was agreed that the new organisation can now operate.

### **Planning**

18. It was agreed that to facilitate planning, the chair would compile a list of documents to be submitted to the April 2018 EGRC meeting, together with key milestones and timings up to that meeting. This will facilitate setting up appropriate review processes and help identify any cross-WG support that is required.

Action: Each WG chair will email to the TAG chair a list of documents to be submitted to the April 2018 EGRC meeting, together with key milestones and timings up to that meeting.

### **Cairo conference sponsored by African Minerals Development Centre**

19. A conference took place in Cairo 2-6 Oct, sponsored by African Minerals Development Centre under auspices of UN Economic Commission for Africa. This is an initiative to set up an African Mineral Resource Classification (AMREC) system based on the UNFC. Spearheaded by the African Minerals Development Centre (AMDC), AMREC is the continental framework that will harmonize, adapt, and develop the UNFC according to the principles of the Africa Mining Vision (AMV). This will cover minerals and petroleum in the first phase, and then be extended to Renewables in the next phase. The intent is to present a framework document to next EGRC. This will require review by TAG, probably by end 2017.

### **Next meeting**

20. It was proposed to schedule the next TAG conference call during the week beginning 20<sup>th</sup> Nov. Action: Hari will issue a doodle poll to select a firm date.