
THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THIRD EDITION

EDITOR
ERIK RICHER LA FLÈCHE

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

The Mining Law Review
Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Mining Law Review - Edition 3
(published in October 2014 – editor Erik Richer La Flèche).

For further information please email
Nick.Barette@lbresearch.com

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

Third Edition

Editor
ERIK RICHER LA FLÈCHE

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW

THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW

THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW

THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW

THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW

THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW

THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY REVIEW

THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW

THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW

THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW

THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW

THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW

PUBLISHER
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
Nick Barette

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGERS
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee, James Spearing

ACCOUNT MANAGER
Felicity Bown

PUBLISHING COORDINATOR
Lucy Brewer

MARKETING ASSISTANT
Dominique Destrée

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Shani Bans

HEAD OF PRODUCTION
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Jo Morley

SUBEDITOR
Matthew Hopkins

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2014 Law Business Research Ltd
www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of October 2014, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-909830-26-4

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ANDERSON & ANDERSON LLP

ASHUR LAW FIRM

BOOKBINDER BUSINESS LAW

CARCELÉN, DESMADRYL, GUZMÁN, SCHAEFFER & TAPIA – ABOGADOS

CGA – COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS

CRA – COELHO RIBEIRO & ASSOCIADOS

EKVITA LLC

EMERY MUKENDI WAFWANA & ASSOCIATES PC

ENGLING, STRITTER & PARTNERS

ENSAFRICA (EDWARD NATHAN SONNENBERGS INC)

GENI & KEBE SCP

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS

HERGÜNER BİLGEN ÖZEKE ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP

HOLLAND & HART LLP

MAYER BROWN INTERNATIONAL LLP

MINTER ELLISON LAWYERS

MIRANDA CORREIA AMENDOEIRA & ASSOCIADOS

PÉREZ BUSTAMANTE & PONCE

PINHEIRO NETO ADVOGADOS
QUINZIO & CÍA ABOGADOS
REM LAW CONSULTANCY
RICAURTE RUEDA ABOGADOS
RSM BOGARÍN Y CÍA SC
SALAZAR & ASOCIADOS ABOGADOS
SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (AU)
STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP
TABACKS ATTORNEYS AND CORPORATE LAW ADVISORS
ȚUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIAȚII
VÁZQUEZ, SIERRA & GARCÍA SC
WILLIAM FREIRE ADVOGADOS ASSOCIADOS

CONTENTS

Editor's Prefacevii
	<i>Erik Richer La Flèche</i>
PART I	MINING LAW1-317
Chapter 1	ANGOLA.....1
	<i>João Afonso Fialho and Marília Frias</i>
Chapter 2	AUSTRALIA.....12
	<i>Rob Merrick and Nathan Colangelo</i>
Chapter 3	AZERBAIJAN25
	<i>Ilgar Mehti</i>
Chapter 4	BOTSWANA37
	<i>Jeffrey Bookbinder and Chabo Peo</i>
Chapter 5	BRAZIL.....51
	<i>William Freire</i>
Chapter 6	CANADA.....65
	<i>Erik Richer La Flèche, David Massé and Jennifer Honeyman</i>
Chapter 7	CHILE76
	<i>Marcelo Olivares</i>
Chapter 8	COLOMBIA.....86
	<i>Margarita Ricaurte</i>

Chapter 9	DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO97 <i>João Afonso Fialho and Marília Frias</i>
Chapter 10	ECUADOR.....109 <i>Jaime P Zaldumbide and Jerónimo Carcelén</i>
Chapter 11	GHANA.....115 <i>Innocent Akwayena and Enyonam Dedey-Oke</i>
Chapter 12	GUINEA.....130 <i>Stéphane Brabant and Yann Alix</i>
Chapter 13	IVORY COAST143 <i>Raphaël Wagner</i>
Chapter 14	MEXICO154 <i>Alberto M Vázquez and Humberto Jiménez</i>
Chapter 15	MONGOLIA.....172 <i>Sebastian Rosholt</i>
Chapter 16	MOZAMBIQUE189 <i>João Afonso Fialho and Nuno Cabeçadas</i>
Chapter 17	NAMIBIA202 <i>Axel Stritter</i>
Chapter 18	PORTUGAL.....220 <i>Rui Botica Santos and Luis Moreira Cortez</i>
Chapter 19	REPUBLIC OF CONGO.....231 <i>Emery Mukendi Wafwana, Nady Mayifuila, Sancy Lenoble Matschinga, Antoine Luntadila Kibanga and Kékéli J Kodjo</i>
Chapter 20	ROMANIA242 <i>Ciprian Dragomir and Bogdan Halcu</i>

Chapter 21	SENEGAL.....	253
	<i>Mouhamed Kebe</i>	
Chapter 22	SOUTH AFRICA	262
	<i>Modisaotsile Matlou</i>	
Chapter 23	TURKEY.....	282
	<i>Safiye Asli Budak and Yavuz Selim Günay</i>	
Chapter 24	UNITED STATES	294
	<i>Karol L Kaballey, David I Stanish and Robert A Bassett</i>	
Chapter 25	UZBEKISTAN.....	306
	<i>Anvar Ikramov</i>	
PART II	CAPITAL MARKETS.....	321–431
Chapter 26	AUSTRALIA.....	321
	<i>Simon Rear, Clare Pope, Chris Rosario, Ben Stewart and Pasan Wijesuriya</i>	
Chapter 27	BRAZIL.....	334
	<i>Carlos Vilhena and Adriano Drummond C Trindade</i>	
Chapter 28	CANADA.....	342
	<i>Erik Richer La Flèche, David Massé and Jennifer Honeyman</i>	
Chapter 29	COLOMBIA.....	353
	<i>Juan Carlos Salazar T</i>	
Chapter 30	MONGOLIA.....	362
	<i>Sara K Phillips and David C Buxbaum</i>	

Chapter 31	MOZAMBIQUE379 <i>Pedro Couto, Jorge Graça, Paulo Ferreira, Márcio Paulo and Gisela Graça</i>
Chapter 32	NAMIBIA384 <i>Axel Stritter</i>
Chapter 33	SOUTH AFRICA398 <i>Catharine Keene, St Elmo Wilken, James Cross, Melissa Grobbelaar, Candice Gibson and John Mankoe</i>
Chapter 34	TURKEY.....412 <i>Safiye Aslı Budak and Yavuz Selim Günay</i>
Chapter 35	UNITED KINGDOM420 <i>Kate Ball-Dodd and Connor Cahalane</i>
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS433
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS ...453

EDITOR'S PREFACE

I am pleased to have participated in the preparation of the third edition of *The Mining Law Review*. The Review is designed to be a practical, business-focused 'year in review' analysis of recent changes and development, and a look forward at expected trends.

This book gathers the views of leading mining practitioners from around the world and I once again warmly thank all the authors for their work and insights.

The first part of the book is divided into 25 country chapters, each dealing with mining in a particular jurisdiction. Countries were selected because of the importance of mining to their economies and to ensure broad geographical representation. Mining is global but the business of financing mining exploration, development and – to a lesser extent – production continues to be concentrated in a few countries, with Canada and the United Kingdom being dominant. As a result, the second part of this book includes 10 country chapters focused on financing.

The advantage of a comparative work is that knowledge of the law, developments and trends in one jurisdiction may assist those in other jurisdictions. Although the chapters are laid out uniformly for ease of comparison, each author has complete discretion as to content and emphasis.

From my vantage point, the past year was marked by two trends: first, uncertainty continues to weigh down the mining sector, and second, in Canada and a few other jurisdictions, extractive industries are being asked to share in a meaningful way the fruits of their activities with local communities and indigenous peoples.

The world economy continues to progress at a very deliberate pace. Commodity prices have come down from their lofty heights. Investor appetite for mining stocks has not returned to 2008 levels and large mining companies have publicly identified assets for divestiture. Private equity has raised substantial amounts in 2013 and 2014. Heavy industry, often encouraged by governments, remains on the lookout for opportunities to secure raw materials at competitive prices.

In previous economic cycles, the foregoing would have ushered in a period of lower valuations combined with an active M&A market, but this is not happening now. Valuations for 'quality assets' are stable. Sellers hope that the world economy will resume

a higher growth trajectory. Buyers have access to money but are cautious; they are unclear as to the direction of the world economy, including – most importantly – the US and Chinese economies, and are sceptical of current valuations. In other words, there is no consensus as to where things are going and this is inhibiting transaction activity in the mining space. Until there is clarity from the United States and China, this state of affairs is unlikely to change.

The other trend deals with 'place-based' resource development. In Canada and a few other jurisdictions, mining companies, communities and indigenous peoples are adopting local approaches to resource development.

Place-based resource development refers to a participatory process that begins early in the project life cycle. The process recognises, implicitly or explicitly, that acceptance by local communities and indigenous peoples is a condition precedent to a project. This is more often than not reinforced by laws or policies at the national, state or provincial level. A place-based development model also recognises that communities and indigenous peoples should derive substantial economic benefits from a project.

In some cases, local communities and indigenous peoples will want to invest and be partners in a project. At other times they will limit their involvement to the preferential provision of labour, goods and services. In all cases, however, local communities and indigenous peoples are no longer content merely to accommodate projects in exchange for limited social and infrastructure benefits: they want meaningful participation and greater benefits.

A place-based approach means, *inter alia*, that the promoter of a project will enter into an agreement with the local community or indigenous people. These agreements have become quite sophisticated. This type of agreement rarely has to be made public and this naturally hinders the transfer of knowledge. To remedy this, some communities and indigenous peoples have prepared negotiation and drafting guides. One of the better ones is the Walter & Duncan Gordon Foundation IBA Community Toolkit (<http://gordonfoundation.ca/north/iba-community-toolkit>). I strongly recommend it to anyone working on project planning, negotiation and development.

As you consult this book you will find more on topics apposite to jurisdictions of specific interest to you, and I hope that you will find this book helpful and relevant.

Erik Richer La Flèche

Stikeman Elliott LLP

Montreal

October 2014

Chapter 35

UNITED KINGDOM

*Kate Ball-Dodd and Connor Cahalane*¹

I INTRODUCTION

The United Kingdom is a leading destination for mining companies seeking to have their shares traded on a public stock exchange. As at 31 August 2014, there were 34 mining companies admitted to trading on the London Stock Exchange's Main Market, with a combined market capitalisation of approximately £200 billion, including many of the world's largest mining groups by market capitalisation. The London Stock Exchange's growth market, AIM, continues to be a popular listing venue for the mining sector, with 136 mining companies admitted to trading as at 31 August 2014 with a combined market capitalisation of approximately £4.1 billion.²

i New issues

While equity markets in general have performed well in the UK and internationally over the 12 months ended 31 August 2014, with a number of global indices touching on their all time highs, falling commodity prices and ongoing uncertainty in relation to China's economic growth have continued to have an adverse impact on investor confidence in the mining sector.

In the 12-month period from 31 August 2013 to 31 August 2014, no new mining companies were admitted to trading on the Main Market.³ During this period, three companies cancelled their admissions to the Main Market: in August 2013 Central Rand Gold Limited moved its listing from the Main Market to AIM; in September 2013

1 Kate Ball-Dodd is a partner and Connor Cahalane is a senior associate at Mayer Brown International LLP.

2 Source for Main Market and AIM statistics is the London Stock Exchange website, www.londonstockexchange.com.

3 Excluding re-admissions.

Latin Resources Limited delisted from the Main Market while maintaining its listing on the Australian Stock Exchange (ASX) and in November 2013 Eurasia Natural Resources plc (ENRC) delisted from the Main Market following a takeover by Eurasian Resources Group BV, a bid vehicle formed by the founding shareholders of ENRC.

Six mining companies were admitted to trading on AIM in the 12-month period from 31 August 2013 to 31 August 2014. The largest new mining entrant to AIM by market capitalisation during that period was Bacanora Minerals Limited, an exploration and development company with operations in Mexico with a primary focus on borates and lithium, which raised £4.75 million resulting in a market capitalisation of £66.5 million on its admission in July 2014.

ii Secondary offerings

The largest Main Market secondary offering in the period from 31 July 2013 to 31 July 2014 was by Aquarius Platinum Limited, which in April 2014 raised £136.7 million through a rights issue to its shareholders on the Main Market as well as the ASX and the Main Board of the Johannesburg Stock Exchange. In October 2013, Kenmare Resources plc raised £66.3 million through a placing of ordinary shares and warrants and, in the same month, Hochschild Mining plc completed a £45 million placing.

During the same period, the largest secondary offering on AIM was by Wolf Minerals Limited, a specialty metals company with tungsten and tin projects in the United Kingdom, which in May 2014 raised £100 million through a placing. The next largest secondary offering on AIM was by Firestone Diamonds plc, a diamond producer with projects in Lesotho, Botswana and Finland, which raised £70 million through a placing and open offer in May 2014. Sirius Minerals plc, a potash development company, raised £43 million in March 2014 through a placing of ordinary shares and warrants.

II CAPITAL RAISING

i General overview of the legal framework

Under the UK listing regime, different admission criteria and listing rules will apply depending on whether a company is seeking to have its shares (or other securities) admitted to a regulated market governed by the EU Prospectus Directive,⁴ such as the Main Market, or to AIM, which has a more flexible regulatory structure.

Official List

In order to be admitted to the Main Market, a company must first apply to the UK Listing Authority (UKLA), a division of the UK's Financial Conduct Authority, to join the Official List.

Mineral companies

For the purposes of the Listing Rules (LR), which set out the admission requirements for the Official List, a mineral company is a company with material mineral projects (not

⁴ EU Prospectus Directive (2003/71/EC).

just those whose principal activity is the extraction of mineral resources). The materiality of projects is assessed having regard to all the company's mineral projects relative to the company and its group as a whole. Mineral projects include exploration, development, planning or production activities (including royalty interests) in respect of minerals, including:

- a* metallic ore, including processed ores such as concentrates and tailings;
- b* industrial minerals (otherwise known as non-metallic minerals), including stone such as construction aggregates, fertilisers, abrasives and insulants;
- c* gemstones;
- d* hydrocarbons, including crude oil, natural gas (whether the hydrocarbon is extracted from conventional or unconventional reservoirs, the latter to include oil shales, oil sands, gas shales and coal bed methane) and oil shales; and
- e* solid fuels, including coal and peat.

Admission requirements

The Official List is divided into two segments: standard listings and premium listings. A standard listing is one that satisfies the minimum requirements laid down by the EU Prospectus Directive. A premium listing denotes a listing that meets more stringent criteria that are not required by the EU Prospectus Directive but that are seen as providing additional investor protections. A mineral company may apply for either a premium or standard listing provided it complies with the relevant admission requirements.

Standard listing

A mineral company seeking a standard listing must comply with the general admission requirements set out in the LR.⁵ These include a requirement that the company is duly incorporated (either within the UK or, if a non-UK company, in the company's place of incorporation), and that the securities must be free from any transfer restrictions (subject to certain exceptions).⁶ If the company is making an offer of new securities, any necessary constitutional, statutory or other consents required must be obtained prior to listing.⁷ The expected market capitalisation of the securities to be listed must be at least £700,000 in the case of shares and £200,000 in the case of debt securities. While the UKLA has a discretion to admit a company with a lower market capitalisation if it is satisfied there will be an adequate market, from a practical perspective it is likely that the market capitalisation would need to be significantly higher for a listing to be economical.⁸ While there is no requirement for a company seeking a standard listing to confirm to the UKLA that it has sufficient working capital to meet the requirements of the business for the next 12 months, if the company is also producing a prospectus (which is likely to be the case

5 LR 2.

6 LR 2.2.4R. For example, this does not prevent the company's shareholders from entering into agreements among themselves restricting their ability to transfer shares.

7 LR2.2.2(3)R.

8 LR 2.2.7R and LR 2.2.8G.

– see below), it will be required to include a working capital statement in the prospectus confirming whether the business has sufficient working capital for that period.

Premium listing

If a mineral company is seeking an admission of its shares to the premium segment of the Official List, in addition to the minimum requirements applicable to all listings set out above, the company must confirm to the UKLA that it has sufficient working capital available to meet the requirements of the business for the next 12 months.⁹ At least 25 per cent of the class of the company's shares to be listed in the premium segment must be in the hands of the public in one or more EEA countries at the time of admission.¹⁰ Where the company is already listed in a non-EEA country, shareholders in that country may be taken into account. For this purpose, 'public' means shareholders other than those holding 5 per cent or more of the class of shares being admitted, and also excludes shares held by the directors of the company or any persons connected to the directors.

Mineral companies are exempt from the premium listing requirement (which would otherwise apply) to have at least 75 per cent of their business supported by a historic revenue earning record.¹¹ If a mineral company seeking a premium listing cannot comply with the requirement to have published accounts covering at least three full years because it has been operating for a shorter period, then it must have published or filed historical financial information since the inception of its business.¹²

Controlling shareholders and relationship agreements

Following amendments to the LR that came into effect in May 2014, where an applicant for a premium listing will have a controlling shareholder on admission, the issuer must have in place a written and legally binding relationship agreement with the controlling shareholder and have a constitution that allows the election and re-election of independent directors to be conducted in accordance with a dual voting structure set out in the LR.¹³

A controlling shareholder is defined as any person who exercises or controls (on their own or together with any person with whom they are acting in concert) 30 per cent. or more of the voting rights.¹⁴

The relationship agreement must include provisions that are intended to ensure that the controlling shareholder complies with the following undertakings:

- a* transactions and arrangements with the controlling shareholder (or any of its associates, or both) will be conducted at arm's length and on normal commercial terms;

9 LR 6.1.16R.

10 LR 6.1.19R.

11 LR 6.1.9.

12 LR 6.1.8.

13 LR 6.1.4B.

14 LR 6.1.2A.

- b* neither the controlling shareholder nor any of its associates will take any action that would have the effect of preventing the new applicant or listed company from complying with its obligations under the LR; and
- c* neither the controlling shareholder nor any of its associates will propose or procure the proposal of a shareholder resolution that is intended or appears to be intended to circumvent the proper application of the LR.

Independent business

All applicants for a premium listing must now be able to demonstrate that they will be carrying on an independent business as its main activity.¹⁵ The LR set out the following guidance on factors that will indicate when a company will not be considered to have an independent business:

- a* a majority of the revenue generated by the new applicant's business is attributable to business conducted directly or indirectly with a controlling shareholder (or any associate thereof) of the new applicant;
- b* a new applicant does not have:
 - strategic control over the commercialisation of its products;
 - strategic control over its ability to earn revenue; and/or
 - freedom to implement its business strategy;
- c* a new applicant cannot demonstrate that it has access to financing other than from a controlling shareholder (or any associate thereof);
- d* a new applicant has granted or may be required to grant security over its business in connection with the funding of a controlling shareholder's or a member of a controlling shareholder group;
- e* except in relation to a mineral company (which have specific eligibility requirements in relation to their interests in mineral resources – see below), a new applicant's business consists principally of holdings of shares in entities that it does not control, including entities where:
 - the new applicant is only able to exercise negative control;
 - the new applicant's control is subject to contractual arrangements that could be altered without its agreement or could result in a temporary or permanent loss of control; or
- f* a controlling shareholder (or any associate thereof) appears to be able to influence the operations of the new applicant outside its normal governance structures or via material shareholdings in one or more significant subsidiary undertakings.¹⁶

Prospectus

As well as complying with the above admission requirements, a company seeking admission to the Official List (to the standard or premium segment) or making a public offer of securities in the UK must publish a prospectus setting out sufficient information to enable investors to make an informed assessment of the assets and liabilities, financial

15 LR 6.1.4.

16 LR 6.1.4A.

position, profits and losses, and prospects of the company.¹⁷ The company must also confirm in the prospectus whether it has sufficient working capital to meet the requirements of the business for the next 12 months. The prospectus must be submitted for review by the UKLA, which will assess whether the document complies with the disclosure requirements set out in the Prospectus Rules (PR). A prospectus must not be published unless it is approved by the UKLA.¹⁸ In the case of an offer of shares, the company and its directors must take responsibility for the contents of the prospectus, and may be liable for any inaccurate or misleading information in the document or for failure to comply with the relevant disclosure standards.¹⁹

Specific eligibility requirements for mineral companies

In addition to the independent business requirements set out above, if a mineral company seeking admission to the Official List (to the standard or premium segment) does not hold a controlling interest in a majority by value of the properties, fields, mines or other assets in which it has invested, the company must be able to demonstrate to the UKLA that it has a reasonable spread of direct interests in mineral resources and has rights to participate actively in their extraction, whether by voting or through other rights that give it influence in decisions over the timing and method of extraction of those resources.²⁰

Specific content prospectus requirements for mineral companies

In March 2013, the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) published an updated edition of its recommendations for the consistent implementation of the EU Prospectus Directive, with revised recommendations as to the content requirements for prospectuses published by mineral companies.²¹ When reviewing a prospectus, the UKLA will take into account these recommendations, which in effect supplement the requirements of the LR and PR.

The recommendations recognise that mineral companies are distinct from other companies in that a key factor in the assessment of their value relates to their reserves and resources. The recommendations seek to ensure that appropriate levels of transparency and assurance over the reserves and resources figures are made available to investors by setting out a framework for the additional disclosure of reserves and resources information, including the following information segmented using a unit of account appropriate to the scale of the company's operations (rather than on a per-asset basis):

17 Section 87A(2), Financial Services and Markets Act 2000.

18 A company that has its home Member State in another Member State may also have a prospectus approved by the competent authority in that jurisdiction and seek to have the prospectus 'passported' into the UK pursuant to Articles 17 and 18 of the EU Prospectus Directive.

19 PR 5.5.

20 LR 6.1.10.

21 ESMA update of the Committee of European Securities Regulators' recommendations for the consistent implementation of Commission Regulation (EC) No. 809/2004 implementing the Prospectus Directive (20 March 2013).

- a* details of mineral resources and, where applicable, reserves and exploration results and prospects;
- b* anticipated mine life and exploration potential or similar duration of commercial activity in extracting reserves;
- c* an indication of the duration and main terms of any licences or concessions, and legal, economic and environmental conditions for exploring and developing those licences or concessions;
- d* indications of the current and anticipated progress of mineral exploration or extraction, or both, and processing, including a discussion of the accessibility of the deposit; and
- e* an explanation of any exceptional factors that have influenced the foregoing items.

Competent persons report

A competent persons report (CPR) is also required for all initial public offering prospectuses regardless of how long the company has been a mineral company. A CPR may also be required for secondary issues, but not where the company has previously published a CPR and has continued to update the market regarding its resources, reserves, results and prospects in accordance with one of the recognised reporting standards.

The CPR must be prepared by a person satisfying the competency requirements of the applicable codes or of the organisation set out in the recommendations, or who is a professionally qualified member of an appropriate recognised association or institution with at least five years of relevant experience.

The content requirements for the CPR are set out in the ESMA 2013 recommendations. These requirements vary depending on whether the CPR relates to a company with oil and gas projects, or a company with mining projects. The CPR must be dated not more than six months prior to the date of the prospectus, and the company must confirm that no material changes have occurred since the date of the CPR that would make it misleading. A list of acceptable internationally recognised reporting and valuation standards is also set out in the recommendations. The mining reporting codes are aligned with the Committee for Mineral Reserves International Reporting Standards (and do not include US SEC Industry Guide 7 on mining, or the Russian or Chinese standards).

Depository receipts

Companies incorporated outside the EU seeking admission to the Main Market often choose to do so through an issue of depository receipts. This is particularly the case for companies located in jurisdictions with restrictive foreign exchange controls where requirements to pay dividends in the local currency could make an investment in the company's shares less attractive to international investors. Depository receipts are negotiable instruments that represent an ownership interest in a specified number of the company's shares. The underlying shares are issued to a depository, which in turn issues depository receipts that can be denominated in a currency other than the issuer's local currency. Dividends received by the depository can then be converted from the local currency into the currency of the depository receipts. Depository receipts may only be admitted to the Official List through a standard listing.

High Growth Segment

In March 2013, the London Stock Exchange launched the High Growth Segment, a new Main Market segment that sits alongside the premium and standard segments and provides an alternative route to market for European companies. As the High Growth Segment is an EU-regulated market, companies listed on this segment must comply with certain EU standards, including the Financial Conduct Authority's Disclosure Rules and Transparency Rules and the Prospectus Rules. However, as companies on the High Growth Segment are not admitted to the Official List, the LR do not apply and instead companies must adhere to the London Stock Exchange's High Growth Segment Rulebook.

The High Growth Segment is intended to attract medium and large high-growth companies that do not meet the eligibility criteria of the premium segment, in particular in relation to the free float requirement. However, the eligibility criteria for the High Growth Segment requires all companies seeking admission to be revenue-generating trading businesses, and mineral resource companies at the exploration stage are expressly listed as being ineligible for admission to the High Growth Segment.²² As at 31 August 2014, no mineral companies have been admitted to the High Growth Segment and of the two companies who have been admitted to the High Growth Segment, one (Just Eat plc) has moved up to the Premium Segment.

AIM

AIM is the London Stock Exchange's market for smaller and growing companies. Due to its status as an 'exchange regulated market' for the purposes of the EU Prospectus Directive, AIM is governed by a more flexible regulatory regime than the Main Market.

Role of the nomad

While admission to the Official List is regulated by the UKLA, the London Stock Exchange oversees the regulation of AIM and compliance with the AIM Rules. Each company seeking admission to AIM must appoint a corporate finance adviser that has been approved by the London Stock Exchange to act as a nominated adviser or 'nomad'. The company's nomad is responsible for assessing whether the company is an appropriate applicant for AIM, and for advising and guiding the company on its responsibilities under the AIM Rules.

Admission requirements

Unlike the Official List, there are generally no minimum market capitalisation requirements for a company seeking admission to AIM. However, investment companies must raise a minimum of £3 million in cash through an equity fundraising to be eligible for admission to AIM.²³

22 Guidance Note 2 to Rule 2.1 of the High Growth Segment Rulebook.

23 Rule 8, AIM Rules for Companies. For this purpose an 'investing company' is any company that has as its primary business or objective the investing of its funds in securities businesses or assets of any description.

There are also no express minimum requirements as to the applicant company's trading history or the number of shares in public hands although the nomad will consider this when assessing the company's suitability for listing. The shares must however be freely transferable and eligible for electronic settlement.

Fast-track admission to AIM

Companies that are already listed on certain other exchanges may qualify for AIM's fast-track admission process, in which case the company will not be required to produce an admission document.²⁴ To be eligible for fast-track admission, a company must have its securities traded on an AIM designated market²⁵ for at least the past 18 months, and should also have substantially traded in the same form during this period. Examples of mining companies who have used the fast-track process include Wolf Minerals Limited, which is also listed on the ASX and was admitted to AIM in November 2011, and Central Rand Gold Limited, which transferred its listing from the Main Market to AIM using the fast-track process in August 2013.

Admission document

A company seeking admission to AIM (other than a fast-track applicant) is required to publish an admission document. The company's nomad will be responsible for assessing whether the admission document complies with the content requirements set out in the AIM Rules. While these requirements are less onerous than those that apply to a prospectus, a company preparing an admission document is subject to a general requirement to disclose any information that the company reasonably considers necessary to enable investors to form a full understanding of the assets and liabilities, financial position, profits and losses, and prospects of the applicant and its securities for which admission is being sought, the rights attaching to those securities and any other matter contained in the admission document.²⁶

Due to the less onerous disclosure requirements, and as the admission document is reviewed and approved by the company's nomad rather than the UKLA, the process and timetable for admission to AIM can often be shorter and more flexible than the process for admission to the Official List.

Prospectus requirement for AIM companies

Although AIM is not a regulated market for the purposes of the EU Prospectus Directive, where a company seeking admission to AIM is also making an offer of its securities to the public in the UK, the admission document may also need to be approved as a prospectus

24 However, as with any company seeking admission to AIM, a fast-track applicant may be required to produce a prospectus under the EU Prospectus Directive where, for example, an offer of securities is made to the public and no relevant exemption is applicable.

25 These include the Australian Securities Exchange, Deutsche Börse Group, NYSE Euronext, Johannesburg Stock Exchange, NASDAQ, NYSE, NASDAQ OMX Stockholm, Swiss Exchange, TMX Group and the UKLA Official List.

26 Schedule 2(k), AIM Rules for Companies.

by the UKLA unless it can avail of an applicable exemption. Where a company is offering its shares through a private placement, it will usually seek to rely on an exemption available for offers addressed solely to qualified investors, or fewer than 150 natural or legal persons per EU Member State (i.e., other than qualified investors).

Specific content requirements for mineral companies

In addition to the general requirements set out in the AIM Rules, a mining company seeking admission to AIM is required to comply with the AIM Guidance Note for Mining, Oil and Gas Companies (the Guidance Note).²⁷

The Guidance Note states that nomads are expected to conduct full due diligence on mining companies seeking admission to AIM, including by carrying out site visits and personal inspections of the physical assets where it is practical to do so. A formal legal opinion from an appropriate legal adviser is also required on the incorporation status of the company and any relevant subsidiaries, as well as the company's title to its assets and the validity of any licences.

Competent persons report

A mining company seeking admission to AIM is required to include in its admission document a CPR on all its material assets and liabilities. The CPR must comply with the disclosure requirements set out in the Guidance Note and the company's nomad is responsible for ensuring that the scope of the CPR is appropriate having regard to the applicant's assets and liabilities.

The CPR must be prepared no more than six months prior to the date of the admission document by a person who meets the minimum requirements for competent persons set out in the Guidance Note. These require the competent person to be a professionally qualified member of an appropriate association, independent of the applicant and to have at least five years of relevant experience.

Where information is extracted from the CPR for inclusion elsewhere in the admission document, that information must be presented in a manner that is not misleading and provides a balanced view. The Guidance Note also requires that the competent person must review the information contained elsewhere in the admission document that relates to the information in the CPR, and confirm in writing to the applicant and the nomad that the information is accurate, balanced, complete and not inconsistent with the CPR.

Lock-ins for new mining companies

The Guidance Note and the AIM Rules require that, where a mining company seeking admission to AIM has not been independent and earning revenue for at least two years, all related parties (which include the directors and any shareholders holding 10 per cent or more of the voting rights) and applicable employees must agree not to dispose of any interest in the company's securities for at least one year from the date of admission to AIM.

27 AIM Guidance Note for Mining, Oil and Gas Companies (June 2009).

ii Tax considerations

In general terms, the UK tax regime does not distinguish between domestic mining companies and overseas mining companies that are subject to UK tax (for example, as a result of being tax resident in the UK or carrying on a trade through a permanent establishment in the UK).

The basic UK tax regime for mining companies is similar to that for other companies – the main rate of corporation tax is 21 per cent (set to reduce to 20 per cent from 1 April 2015), there is no limit on the period for which tax losses can be carried forward and set off against future profits (provided that they are incurred in the same trade that suffered the losses and relief is not withdrawn in certain circumstances following a change in the ownership of the company incurring the losses), and the usual withholding taxes regime applies. In broad terms, withholding tax applies (subject to any applicable double tax treaty and certain other exemptions) to interest and royalty payments. There is no withholding tax on dividends.

The usual capital allowances regime for long-life assets (8 per cent writing down allowance per annum) and plant and machinery (18 per cent writing down allowance per annum) applies to mining companies. In addition, persons engaged in mining activities can benefit from the mineral extraction allowance, which is a form of capital allowance available to those who carry on a mineral extraction trade (a trade consisting of, or including, the working of a source of mineral deposits) and incur qualifying expenditure. Qualifying expenditure for these purposes can include expenditure on mineral exploration and access, and expenditure on acquiring mineral assets (defined as mineral deposits, land comprising mineral deposits, or interests in or rights over such deposits or land).

A major advantage offered to mining companies by the UK is that there are no specific mining or mineral taxes (although excise duty is payable on mineral oils, at varying rates, unless an exemption applies). There is also, generally, no UK VAT on exports. However, mining companies' activities may render them subject to the following indirect taxes:

- a* climate change levy: a tax on energy, with a variable rate depending on the nature of the fuel used;
- b* aggregates levy: a tax on the commercial exploitation (which includes both extraction and importation) of gravel, sand and rock, currently charged at £2 per tonne – this is subject to various exemptions, including exemptions for spoil from any process by which coal or another specified substance has been separated from other rock after being extracted from that rock, and for spoil from the smelting or refining of metal; and
- c* landfill tax: a tax on the disposal of waste to landfill, currently charged at the standard rate of £80 per tonne or the lower rate of £2.50 per tonne, depending on the material being disposed of; there is an exemption for the disposal of naturally occurring materials extracted from the earth during commercial mining or quarrying operations, provided that such material has not been subjected to and does not result from a non-qualifying process carried out between extraction and disposal.

Apart from the mineral extraction allowance, there are no special allowances or incentives for persons engaged in mining activities, or their investors or lenders.

III DEVELOPMENTS

On 1 October 2012, ESMA published a consultation paper seeking views on proposed further amendments to its recommendations regarding mineral companies. These include proposed amendments to the definition of ‘material mining projects’ to clarify that materiality should be assessed from the point of view of the investor; and projects will be material where evaluation of the resources (and, where applicable, the reserves or exploration results, or both) that the projects seek to exploit is necessary to enable investors to make an informed assessment of the prospects of the issuer. In addition, ESMA proposes to establish a rebuttable presumption within the definition of materiality that mineral projects can be material both where the projects seek to extract minerals for their resale value as commodities; or the minerals are extracted to supply (without resale to third parties) an input into an industrial production process (which includes but is not limited to the example of stone extracted in the cement and aggregates industry) and there is uncertainty as to either the existence of the resources in the quantities required or the technical feasibility of their recovery.

The consultation paper also sets out a proposal to amend certain of the existing exemptions from the requirement to publish a CPR, including a new exemption for non-equity securities (other than depositary receipts over shares).

ESMA expects to publish revised recommendations in due course.

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

KATE BALL-DODD

Mayer Brown International LLP

Kate Ball-Dodd is a partner in the corporate department of Mayer Brown International LLP. She has a wide-ranging corporate practice that encompasses corporate finance, mergers and acquisitions (including public takeovers), equity fund raisings, joint ventures, and corporate governance. She advises a number of quoted companies and financial intermediaries on the UKLA Listing Rules and Disclosure and Transparency Rules, the Prospectus Rules, the AIM Rules, the Takeover Code and general company law. Ms Ball-Dodd speaks regularly at external conferences on corporate governance and takeovers.

CONNOR CAHALANE

Mayer Brown International LLP

Connor Cahalane is a senior associate in the corporate department of Mayer Brown International LLP. He advises on international and UK corporate and commercial transactions with a particular focus on public and private mergers and acquisitions and equity capital markets transactions for mining companies. He also advises on general company law and corporate governance matters.

MAYER BROWN INTERNATIONAL LLP

201 Bishopsgate
London EC2M 3AF
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 3130 3000
Fax: +44 20 3130 3001
kball-dodd@mayerbrown.com
ccahalane@mayerbrown.com
www.mayerbrown.com