

Introduction

Presented by: Alex Doll, Consultant

LING.CO

Most important concept!

ILLING.CON

ALL MODELS ARE WRONG, BUT SOME ARE USEFUL.

Geometallurgy

• Geometallurgy and **grinding**

LING.COM

- It is often desirable to be able to load ore hardness information into the mine block model.
- Allows the mining engineers to better schedule ore delivery to the plant, and to run more sophisticated net present value calculations against ore blocks.
- Requires hundreds of samples from drill holes distributed across the orebody.

Geometallurgy

• Geometallurgy and **plant recovery**

LING.CON

- It is often desirable to be able to load leaching information into the mine block model.
- Allows the mining engineers to run more sophisticated net present value calculations against ore blocks.
- Requires hundreds of samples from drill holes distributed across the orebody.

Sampling

NG.CON





Block model

ING.CON



source: GEOVIA Surpac brochure

 Geologic systems can be modelled as a structure of equally sized blocks arranged in a regular grid.

SAGMILLING.COM 911 Metallurgist

Interpolation

- Interpolation is the mathematical method used to estimate a parameter in the spaces between known positions with known values.
 - A simple interpolation method could be a linear weighted average of the two nearest points.
 - Geostatisticians use more complex methods, such as *kriging*.



Interpolation

- Consider the same 1-dimensional model with measurements at points A&B.
- Try an inversedistance-squared weighting.



Interpolation

G.CO

- Consider a
 3-dimensional model with measurements at points A,B,C,D
- A 'polygon' displays the rock unit that X belongs to.



SAGMILLING.COM 911 Metallurgist

Interpolation by kriging

- The most common interpolation is some form of kriging.
- Kriging uses nonlinear, directional interpolation constrained by domains.



SAGMILLING.COM 911 Metallurgist

Check the domains

- Domains determined for assay data may not apply for process parameters
- Geostatisticians should re-domain the process data to verify.
- Example: Grade may be determined by alteration, but grindability may be determined by tectonic stress fields.
- You must check!

Domains

G.CO

- Example grinding data, top from a 'hematite' domain and bottom from a 'magnetite' domain.
- Shapes are different

 confirms each must be interpolated separately.



Example domain definitions

LLING.CON

 Collahuasi, Chile
 – C. Suazo, Procemin 2011

UGM		alteration	lithology
1	1°	sericite, argillic, Chl-Ser	intrusive
2	1°	sericite, argillic, Chl-Ser	host rock
3	1°	qtz-ser, propylitic, biot, K	intrusive
4	1°	qtz-ser, propylitic, biot, K	host rock
5	2°	sericite, argillic, Chl-Ser	intr.+host
6	2°	qtz-ser, propylitic, biot, K	intr.+host



– C. Suazo, Procemin 2013

SAGMILLING.COM 911 Metallurgist

Variogram

• A variogram plots the average difference between two arbitrary points and the distance between the points.



Variogram

G.CO

• Warning: oversimplified!!!



Plotting the Distance, m
 example grade difference vs. distance from earlier slide

Variogram

ING.CO



- Y-axis shows variance
- The population variance is shown as the "sill"

Variogram

G.CO

• A published variogram from Adanac Moly suggests that the maximum spacing between samples should be 200 m or less.



2015-11-12

How many samples?

- Area of influence of a sample
 - How "close by" must a sample be to have importance in geostatistics.
 - Observed as the location of the "sill" of a variogram of grindability versus distance.

LING.CON

 So you should know the variogram result of a geometallurgy program to plan a geometallurgy program.





G.CO

Additive parameters

Additivity

G.CO

- Geostatistics only works if the values you are "mixing" have a linear mixing characteristic.
- A parameter is "additive" if you can combine two samples of a known value, and the blend test results in the arithmetic average of the two.
 - Eg. mix one sample "10" and a second sample "20"
 - The blend should give a result of "15"

Additivity

• Values suitable for block modelling

LING.COM

- Not all grindability results are suitable for block model interpolation, they must be "additive"
 - e.g. mixing two samples with "10" and "20" should give "15". Work index, SGI and A×b results do not have this property.
- Specific energy consumption is generally additive, so E_{total} , E_{SAG} and/or E_{ball} can be interpolated.

Additivity of process parameters

LLING.CON

- A variety of process models exist, and you can create your own. You will need to evaluate which models are useful for your mine.
 - The process models need to make useful predictions of process behaviour.
 - The process models need to have additive parameters suitable for geometallurgy.

Geometallurgy program

- Procedure for a geometallurgy program:
 - collect samples distributed around the orebody

G.CO

- test in the laboratory, use at least 2 methods
- run all samples through comminution models
- distribute specific energy values into block model
- run geostatistical checks (variograms) and repeat (do a second, in-fill, sample collection program)
- provide mining engineers with a model populated with grindability values; run annual production forecasts.



Mine Planning by Geometallurgy

G.CO

The block model

• A block model containing geometallurgical data will include:

LING.CON

- grindability information suitable for estimating the maximum plant throughput,
- recovery information suitable for estimating the metal production,
- (flotation plants) concentrate grade predictions for smelter contracts.

Grindability models

• Specific energy consumption models determine how much energy is required to grind a sample.

- *E* given in kW·h/t {alternative notation: kW/(t/h)}

LLING.CON

• Mill power models determine the amount of grinding power available

-P given in kW

Dividing *P* by *E* gives the circuit throughput
 t/h = *kW* ÷ (*kW*·*h/t*)

Throughput predictions

• Grindability, in the form of specific energy, will be interpolated for a block.

– in this example, E_{SAG} = 6.0 kWh/t

ILLING.CON

- The metallurgists will supply the typical power draw of the SAG mill (at the pinion).
 - Yanacocha is about 14,000 kW
- Throughput = 14,000 kW ÷ 16.0 kW = 875 t/h



G.CO

Net Smelter Return prediction

- The mining engineer can estimate the revenue of a block using the recovery equation(s) and the block model parameters.
 - Gold recovery *R* is known by interpolation.

LLING.CON

- Revenue=block mass (t) × grade (g/t) × recovery
- If there are penalty elements in the block model, is may be necessary to estimate their recovery, too.

Block value prediction

• Determine the value of a block

LING.CON

- Revenue
 - include penalties, if applicable
- Operating costs (\$/t)
 - include mill power draw, kWh/t × t/h × k/kWh
 - include other operating costs
- Processing time can be included as a cost penalty
 - revenue form harder blocks worth less than revenue from softer blocks.

New cut-off calculation

• The variable revenue benefits blocks with good recovery characteristics.

LLING.CON

- The variable grindability benefits blocks with lower power consumption.
- Applying a penalty for difficult to process blocks benefits easy to process blocks.

Benefits of geometallurgy

• Permits future production to be accurately predicted. Future sales can be estimated.

ILLING.CON

- Identifies "problem" areas within the mine where throughput may be low or recovery may suffer.
- Allows better optimized mine plans with more accurate NPV predictions per block.

Variable mining rate

• Operate the mine to keep the SAG mills full.

LING.CON

- A grinding geometallurgy database allows mine planners to schedule more ore to the mill.
 - Do not plan a "nominal" throughput rate for the whole mine life...
 - mine more in years with soft ore, and
 - mine less in years with hard ore.
 - If possible, defer hard ore until later in the mine life.

Variable gold production

LLING.CON

- The gold production in each year of a mine life will be different, and can be calculated from
 - block gold grade,
 - block gold recovery,
 - block throughput calculated from the grindability.
- The pit optimizing software will pull the pit towards softer ore with better recovery.

Summary of benefits

LLING.CON

- The pit shape and equipment fleet will change due to the new NPV equations,
- the pit will probably be mined more rapidly,
- production is advanced into earlier mine years,
- a more optimal pit shape will all result from a fully applied geometallurgy program, and
- no nasty surprises.

Stages of a geometallurgy program

- Decide which process parameters to collect
 - plant surveys, fitting models to plant data
- Conduct a drilling program to obtain samples of future ore

G.CO

- Conduct a laboratory program determining parameters for samples
- Supply geostatisticians the parameters and their spatial locations
- Interpolate the parameters into the block model
 - check variograms, conduct in-fill drilling and recycle
- Generate a mine plan with a variable ore throughput
- Generate a cash flow with a variable gold production rate
Cost of a geometallurgy program

- Plant surveys, engineering time fitting models to plant data
- drilling program to obtain samples of future ore
- laboratory program determining parameters for samples

LING.CO

- Geostatistician time to interpolate parameters into the block model
 - check variograms, conduct in-fill drilling and recycle
- Mine engineering time to generate a mine plan
- Sustaining capital cost of mine fleet needed to support variable throughput rates

Geometallurgy for scoping studies

• Early project evaluation will not use a full program:

ILLING.CON

- Use about 5-15 intervals of half-core (from the resource drilling program).
- Do laboratory work for one set of process models.
- Unlikely enough data will exist to do variograms or kriging. Work with cumulative distributions instead of geometallurgy.

Geometallurgy for prefeasibility

• Collect at least 50 more half-core samples from the resource drilling.

ILLING.CON

- The quantity should be sufficient to permit creation of variograms.
- Do the first circuit of the geometallurgy program stages, but exclude the recycle.
- Determine how much of the orebody is unrepresented by samples.
- Do the variable rate mine plan and gold production schedule.

Geometallurgy for full feasibility

ILLING.CON

- Using the variograms from prefeasibility, determine how many more samples are needed
 - These extra samples should be dedicated metallurgical drilling. Use the whole core for a greater variety of metallurgical tests.
- Do the "recycle" loop and determine updated variable rate mine plans and gold production.

Geometallurgy for operation

ILLING.CON

- Do the program indicated for prefeasibility and feasibility to establish the initial mine plans.
- Do annual drilling to keep extending into the next 5 years of future ore.
- Revise the process models (did they work?).
- Revise the mine plans based on the updated geometallurgy database.

• Los Bronces, Confluencia (Chile)

LLING.CON

- Design of pit for an expansion project included plant recovery and ore grindability parameters.
- Collahuasi (Chile)
 - Monthly throughput predictions are within 5% of actual.

- Freeport-McMoRan study
 - Geometallurgical database used to compare SAG milling to HPGR in a detailed study.
- Andina, Piuquenes tailings (Chile)

LLING.CON

Recovery and regrind energy for re-mining a tailings pond.

Escondida variograms

NG.CO





 Los Bronces, Rajos Infiernillo & Donoso Modelamiento y estimación

LLING.CON







Unidades geometalúrgicas						
UGMs de Flotación	UGMs SPI,BWI	UGMs Crusher Index	UGMs Sulfuros Primarios	UGMs Sulfuros Secundarios		
6015	20	80	6015	1		
6020	40	91	6020	2		
3515	80	111	3515	3		
3520	91	112	3520	4		
4020	101	113	4020	5		
8015	102	114	8015			
9115	103		9115			
	104					
	105					
	106					

Litología	Litología	Litología	Litología	Litología
Redox	Sólidos	Redox	Redox	Redox
Estilo Mxx	Textura	Textura	Estilo Mxx	Solidos
				Indicadores

Rocha *et al.* GEOMET2012

• Adanac Molybdenum, Canada

LLING.CON

- Flotation model using interpolated parameters:
 - k, R_{max} value for molybdenum
 - k, R_{max} value for non-sulphide gangue
- Different models run at different grind P_{80} sizes
 - *k*, R_{max} values change at each P_{80} .



Final thoughts

- Grade proxies and process mineralogy are often called geometallurgy, but they are different
 - Grade proxy is where a process variable (eg. recovery) is closely related to a grade (%Cu)
 - Process mineralogy is a careful mapping of minerals (rather than elements)
 - useful to predict recoveries, rate constants, etc.

Most important concept!

ILLING.CON

ALL MODELS ARE WRONG, BUT SOME ARE USEFUL.



G.CO

• References

 Brissette, M. & de Souza, H. (2012) `Metallurgical testing of iron ore from the Labrador Trough`, Mineral Resources Review Conference, retrieved from http://www.nr.gov.nl.ca/NR/mines/MRR2012_LookBack/Brissette%20and%20de %20Souza%20(SGS)%20Iron%20Ore%20Metallurgical%20Testwork.pdf

- Bulled, D. (2007) `Flotation circuit design for Adanac Moly Corp using a geometallurgical approach`, Proceedings of the 39th Canadian Mineral Processors Conference, Ottawa, Canada.
- Preece, R. (2006) `Use of point samples to estimate the spatial distribution of hardness in the Escondida porphyry copper deposit, Chile`, Proceedings of International Autogenous and Semiautogenous Grinding Technology 2006, eds. Allan, M., Major, K., Flintoff, B., Klein, B. & Mular, A., Vancouver, Canada.

• References

 Rocha, M., Ulloa, C. & Díaz, M. (2012) `Geometallurgical modelling at Los Bronces mine`, Proceedings of the International Seminar on Geometallurgy (GEOMET 2012), eds. Barahona, C., Kuyvenhoven, R. & Pinto, K., Santiago, Chile.

 Suazo, C., Hofmann, A., Aguilar, M., Tay, Y. & Bastidas, G. (2011) `Geometallurgical modelling of the Collahuasi grinding circuit for mining planning`, Proceedings of the 8th International Mineral Processing Conference, eds. Kracht, W., Kuyvenhoven, R., Lynch-Watson, S. & Montes-Atenas, G., Santiago, Chile.

• References

Suazo, C., Muñoz, C., & Mora, N. (2013) `The Collahuasi geometallurgical modelling and its application to maximizing value`, Proceedings of the 10th International Mineral Processing Conference, eds. Álvarex, M., Doll, A., Kracht, W. & Kuyvenhoven, R., Santiago, Chile.

G.CO

– NI43-101 report, Zafranal project