

SIMULATION OF CORRELATED VARIABLES

A Comparison of Approaches with a Case Study from the Yandi Channel Iron Deposit

Chris De-Vitry

**School of Mathematical Sciences
Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Studies
University of Adelaide**

Submitted: 12th of February 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
LIST OF FIGURES	6
LIST OF TABLES.....	13
ABSTRACT.....	15
DECLARATION	16
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	17
1 INTRODUCTION	18
1.1 Introduction and location.....	18
1.2 Background and objectives	21
1.3 Why choose Yandi for this study?	22
1.4 Previous work at Yandi	23
1.4.1 Introduction.....	23
1.4.2 BHPB resource estimates.....	23
1.4.3 BRC Conditional Simulation and scheduling.....	23
1.4.4 BRC Multipoint Conditional Simulation.....	23
1.4.5 BRC Min-Max Autocorrelation Factors case study.....	24
1.5 Abbreviations	24
1.6 Methodology and outline of this study	26
2 GEOSTATISTICAL BACKGROUND	28
2.1 Introduction.....	28
2.2 Stationarity.....	28
2.3 Gaussian transformation.....	28
2.4 Kriging	29
2.5 Co-Kriging and the Linear Model of Co-Regionalisation.....	30
2.6 Introduction to diffusivity and multivariate Gaussianity	31
3 BACKGROUND TO CONDITIONAL SIMULATION.....	32
3.1 Introduction.....	32
3.2 Conditional Simulation	32
3.2.1 Overview of Conditional Simulation.....	32
3.2.2 Conditional Co-Simulation	33
3.2.3 Strengths and limitations of Conditional Co-Simulation.....	33
3.3 Conditional Simulation using the Stepwise Conditional Transform.....	33
3.3.1 Overview of Conditional Simulation using the Stepwise Conditional Transform	33
3.3.2 Strengths and limitations of Conditional Simulation using the Stepwise Conditional Transform	35
3.4 Conditional Simulation using Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors	36
3.4.1 Outline of Conditional Simulation using Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors.....	36
3.4.2 Strengths and limitations of Conditional Simulation using Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors	37
3.5 Indicator Simulation	37
3.6 Concluding comments on stationarity and assumptions.....	38
4 GEOLOGY AND DATA DESCRIPTION.....	39
4.1 Geological setting and sedimentology.....	39
4.2 Domaining at the Yandi Channel Iron Deposit.....	39
4.3 The simplifying and grouping nature of domains	42
4.4 Wireframing of domain boundaries	42
4.5 Data description and preparation	44
4.5.1 Selection of the study area	44
4.5.2 Overview of the data.....	44
4.5.3 Sample coding and compositing	45
5 EXPLORATORY DATA ANALYSIS AND STATISTICAL VALIDATION OF DOMAINING	46
5.1 Introduction.....	46
5.2 Overview of Discriminant Analysis	46
5.3 Using scatterplots of assay variables to separate geochemically distinct populations	47
5.4 Data preparation and exploratory data analysis of Population Three	47

5.5	Discriminant Analysis to determine data structure and classify samples into domains	48
5.6	Exploratory data analysis to identify domains within Population Three.....	50
5.6.1	<i>Scatterplots of SiO₂/Al₂O₃ versus Fe for domain identification.....</i>	50
5.6.2	<i>Discriminant Analysis for domain identification</i>	51
5.7	Visualisation of populations on cross sections	52
5.7.1	<i>Introduction.....</i>	52
5.7.2	<i>Visualisation of populations identified from the scatterplot of SiO₂/Al₂O₃ versus Fe .</i>	52
5.7.3	<i>Visualisation of the results from Discriminant Analysis.....</i>	53
6	VALIDATION AND EXPLORATORY DATA ANALYSIS OF THE M3 DOMAIN	54
6.1	Introduction.....	54
6.2	Stationarity assessment via moving window statistics.....	54
6.3	Exploratory data analysis of the Final M3 Domain	57
6.3.1	<i>Univariate exploratory data analysis</i>	57
6.3.2	<i>Bivariate exploratory data analysis</i>	60
6.3.3	<i>Implication of exploratory data analysis for resource estimation.....</i>	63
7	TESTING OF GEOSTATISTICAL MODELS AND ASSUMPTIONS	64
7.1	Testing the diffusivity assumption	64
7.2	Testing the bi-Gaussianity and multivariate-Gaussianity assumptions via scatterplots....	66
7.3	Testing the bi-Gaussianity and multivariate Gaussianity assumptions via madograms ...	68
7.4	Testing the bi-Gaussianity and multivariate Gaussianity assumptions via back-transformed variograms.....	69
7.5	Testing the bi-Gaussianity and multivariate-Gaussianity assumptions via rodograms.....	73
7.6	Discussion on the acceptability of assumptions	74
8	BLOCK SIZE, A POTENTIAL PROBLEM FOR ORDINARY KRIGING AND UNIFORM CONDITIONING	75
8.1	Introduction.....	75
8.2	Experimental variography and variogram modelling.....	75
8.2.1	<i>Introduction.....</i>	75
8.2.2	<i>Declustering and Gaussian transformation</i>	75
8.2.3	<i>Experimental variograms and variogram modelling.....</i>	76
8.3	Block model creation and assessment of block percentage fill for estimation by Ordinary Kriging.....	77
8.4	Background to QKNA.....	78
8.5	QKNA	78
8.6	Problems with block Ordinary Kriging and Uniform Conditioning.....	81
9	CHOOSING PARAMETERS FOR CONDITIONAL SIMULATION.....	82
9.1	Introduction.....	82
9.2	Simulation grid creation	82
9.3	Selecting the search neighbourhood parameters for Conditional Simulation.....	82
9.4	Method of Conditional Simulation and implementation details.....	83
9.5	Variance reproduction in Conditional Simulation	84
10	CONDITIONAL CO-SIMULATION.....	85
10.1	Experimental variograms and cross-variograms	85
10.2	Statistical validation of the Gaussian co-simulations	87
10.3	Statistical validation of the back-transformed co-simulations.....	87
10.4	Scatterplot reproduction of the back-transformed co-simulations.....	89
10.5	Variogram reproduction of the back-transformed co-simulations.....	90
10.6	Trend reproduction of the back-transformed co-simulations.....	92
11	SIMULATION USING MIN/MAX AUTOCORRELATION FACTORS	93
11.1	Generation and validation of MAF.....	93
11.2	Experimental variograms of MAF	95
11.3	Statistical validation of the MAF simulations	96
11.4	Statistical validation of the back-transformed MAF simulations	97
11.5	Scatterplot reproduction of the back-transformed MAF simulations.....	98
11.6	Experimental variogram reproduction of the back-transformed MAF simulations	100
11.7	Trend reproduction of the back-transformed MAF simulations	101
12	SIMULATION USING THE STEPWISE CONDITIONAL TRANSFORM	103
12.1	Generation and validation of SCT	103

12.2	Experimental variograms and variogram models of the SCT.....	105
12.3	Conditional Simulation of the SCT	108
12.4	Statistical validation of the SCT simulations.....	108
12.5	Statistical validation of the back-transformed SCT simulations	108
12.6	Scatterplot reproduction of the back-transformed SCT simulations.....	109
12.7	Experimental variogram reproduction of the back-transformed SCT simulations.....	111
12.8	Trend reproduction of the back-transformed SCT simulations.....	112
13	COMPARISON OF SIMULATIONS TO BLAST-HOLE DRILLING.....	114
13.1	Introduction.....	114
13.2	Limitations with blast-hole data	114
13.3	Selection of area for the validation of simulations	114
13.4	Exploratory data analysis of blast-hole drilling.....	116
13.5	Creation of an SMU sized block model	116
13.6	Comparisons of simulation to blast hole and resource definition drilling	118
13.7	Increasing the space of uncertainty.....	118
14	COMBINING GEOLOGY AND ASSAY VARIABLE SIMULATION.....	122
14.1	Introduction.....	122
14.2	Statistical and spatial characteristics of clay pods.....	122
14.3	Indicator Conditional Simulation of clay pods.....	127
14.4	Experimental variograms and cross-variograms of assay variables within clay pods and CID 135	
14.5	Parameters for Conditional Co-Simulation within simulated geological domains	138
14.6	Statistical validation of the Gaussian co-simulations	138
14.7	Statistical validation of the back-transformed co-simulations.....	138
14.8	Scatterplot reproduction of the back-transformed co-simulations	139
14.9	Variogram reproduction of the back-transformed co-simulations.....	141
14.10	Trend reproduction of the back-transformed co-simulations	144
15	DISCUSSION AND COMPARISON OF SIMULATION METHODS	145
15.1	Introduction and methodology.....	145
15.2	Gaussian statistics and search strategy.....	146
15.3	Back-transformed univariate statistics and histograms.....	146
15.4	Correlation coefficients and scatterplots.....	147
15.5	Experimental variograms and cross-variograms	148
15.6	Trends	148
15.7	Spatial patterns.....	148
15.8	Space of uncertainty	151
15.9	Person implementation time.....	151
15.10	Summary.....	152
16	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	153
16.1	LMC and GLMC recommendations.....	153
16.2	MAF recommendations.....	153
16.3	SCT recommendations	154
	REFERENCES	155
	APPENDIX 1 COKRIGING SYSTEM UTILISED WITHIN ISATIS	159
	APPENDIX 2 DETAILED INFORMATION ON CASE THREE DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS	161
	APPENDIX 3 MOVING WINDOW STATISTICS FOR THE M3 AND C4 DOMAINS WITHIN THE VARDOM TWO ORIENTATION DOMAIN.....	162
	APPENDIX 4 MOVING WINDOW STATISTICS FOR THE FINAL M3 DOMAIN	164
	APPENDIX 5 TESTS FOR BIVARIATE GAUSSIANTY.....	170
	APPENDIX 6 EXPERIMENTAL VARIOGRAMS AND VARIOGRAM MODELS FOR QKNA	175
	APPENDIX 7 UNIVARIATE STATISTICS FOR THE GAUSSIAN CO-SIMULATIONS	177
	APPENDIX 8 UNIVARIATE STATISTICS AND HISTOGRAMS FOR THE BACK-TRANSFORMED CO-SIMULATIONS.....	182
	APPENDIX 9 EXPERIMENTAL VARIOGRAMS AND CROSS-VARIOGRAMS FOR DRILL HOLE DATA AND CO-SIMULATION ONE	187
	APPENDIX 10 MOVING WINDOW STATISTICS FOR SIMULATIONS AND DRILL HOLE DATA.....	191
	APPENDIX 11 UNIVARIATE STATISTICS FOR THE GAUSSIAN SIMULATIONS OF MAF	198

APPENDIX 12 UNIVARIATE STATISTICS AND HISTOGRAMS FOR THE BACK-TRANSFORMED MAF SIMULATIONS.....	203
APPENDIX 13 MOVING WINDOW STATISTICS FOR MAF SIMULATIONS AND DRILL HOLE DATA.....	208
APPENDIX 14 UNIVARIATE STATISTICS FOR THE GAUSSIAN SIMULATIONS OF SCT.....	215
APPENDIX 15 UNIVARIATE STATISTICS AND HISTOGRAMS FOR THE BACK-TRANSFORMED SCT SIMULATIONS.....	220
APPENDIX 16 MOVING WINDOW STATISTICS FOR SCT SIMULATIONS AND DRILL HOLE DATA.....	226
APPENDIX 17 HISTOGRAMS AND MOVING WINDOW STATISTICS FOR LMC/GEOL SIMULATIONS AND DRILL HOLE DATA.....	233

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Map of the Pilbara region showing the location of the Yandi CID (BHP Billiton, 1999)....	19
Figure 2. Map of the Yandi mine lease and individual deposits (BHP Billiton, 2002).	20
Figure 3. Diagram explaining linear estimation.....	22
Figure 4. Ordinary Kriging estimate (left) and Conditional Simulation (right) of Fe.....	22
Figure 5. Diagrammatic thesis outline.	27
Figure 6. An example of the SCT for Fe, SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ : Transformation of the raw primary assay variable a. to Gaussian b.; c. dividing the primary assay variable into quartiles; transforming the SiO ₂ distribution (Q1 c.) from raw d. to Gaussian e.; f. dividing the secondary assay variable into quartiles; and transforming the Al ₂ O ₃ distribution (Q1 f.) from raw g. to Gaussian h.	35
Figure 7. Examples of problematic bivariate distributions for geostatistical simulation: nonlinear relations (left), mineralogical constraints (centre), and heteroscedasticity (right), from Leuangthong and Deutsch, 2003.	36
Figure 8. Geological sketch map of the Pilbara region showing the location of the Yandi CID (Stone et al., 2002).	41
Figure 9. Schematic cross section of the Yandi CID (Whitehouse, pers. comm., 2007).	43
Figure 10. Drill hole location map showing the location of individual mesas and the Vardom Two Orientation Domain (orange drill holes).	44
Figure 11. Scatterplot of SiO ₂ versus Fe with three different geochemical populations highlighted.	47
Figure 12. A scatterplot of SiO ₂ /Al ₂ O ₃ versus Fe. Note the two trends defined by high (blue) and low (green) SiO ₂ /Al ₂ O ₃ ratios.	51
Figure 13. Scatterplot of Root 1 versus Root 2 coloured by domain. For a description of the domain codes (i.e. M3, M3SA etc) refer to Table 2.	52
Figure 14. Scour and fill channel within the Yandi CID (Stone et al., 2002).	53
Figure 15. Mean trace element concentrations versus Northing for 2m composites: M3 Domain and Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	55
Figure 16. Mean concentrations of LOI, SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for 2m composites: M3 Domain and Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	55
Figure 17. Mean concentrations of Fe and TiO ₂ versus Northing for 2m composites: M3 Domain and Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	56
Figure 18. Plan view of samples in the M3 (crosses) and C4 (red circle with a black cross) domains in the Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	56
Figure 19. Histograms of assay variables from the Final M3 Domain.	58
Figure 20. Scatterplots of mean versus standard deviation within 100m x 100m x 8m panels. The solid black line represents the average standard deviations conditional to the assay variable grades.	59
Figure 21. Scatterplots of Fe versus SiO ₂ , TiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ and MgO for the Final M3 Domain.	61
Figure 22. Scatterplots of MnO versus S for the Final M3 Domain.	62
Figure 23. Scatterplots of SiO ₂ versus Al ₂ O ₃ , SiO ₂ versus TiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ versus TiO ₂ for the Final M3 Domain.	62
Figure 24. Ratio of cross-variogram to variogram (downhole): Fe indicators 57% and 59% (left) and P indicators 0.03% and 0.04% (right).	64
Figure 25. Ratio of cross-variogram to variogram (downhole): SiO ₂ indicators 3% and 5% (left) and Al ₂ O ₃ indicators 0.5% and 1% (right).	65
Figure 26. Ratio of cross-variogram to variogram (downhole): LOI indicators 9% and 10%.	65
Figure 27. Ratio of cross-variogram to variogram (horizontal): Fe indicators 57% and 59% (left) and Fe Indicators 57% and 58% (right).	66
Figure 28. Scatterplot of Fe versus SiO ₂ (left) and Fe versus Al ₂ O ₃ for samples separated by 0m. Points are coloured on frequency.	67
Figure 29. Scatterplot of P versus LOI (left) and SiO ₂ versus Al ₂ O ₃ (right) for samples separated by 0m. Points are coloured on frequency.	67
Figure 30. Fe versus SiO ₂ (left) and Fe versus Al ₂ O ₃ (right) downhole h-scatterplots for samples separated by 2m (± 0.5m).	67
Figure 31. P versus SiO ₂ and SiO ₂ versus Al ₂ O ₃ downhole h-scatterplots for samples separated by 2m (± 0.5m).	68
Figure 32. SiO ₂ versus SiO ₂ downhole h-scatterplot for samples separated by 2m (± 0.5m).	68

Figure 33. Ratio of square root of variogram to madogram for Gaussian transformed variables: Downhole variogram. The dotted horizontal line represents the average ratio for all data.	70
Figure 34. Fe, SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ and LOI back-transformed variogram models and experimental variograms: Horizontal variogram fan and downhole variogram. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0, N30 etc while the vertical variograms are annotated a D-90.	71
Figure 35. P back-transformed variogram model and experimental variogram: Horizontal variogram fan and downhole variogram. For the bottom figure, no weights were used in the Gaussian transformation while in the upper figure weights were utilised. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated a D-90.	72
Figure 36. Experimental rodogram versus the theoretical rodogram for Fe (left) and P (right).	73
Figure 37. Experimental rodogram versus the theoretical rodogram for SiO ₂ (left) and Al ₂ O ₃ (right).	73
Figure 38. Experimental rodogram versus the theoretical rodogram for LOI.	74
Figure 39. Raw data from the study area with a 100m x 100m grid overlain.	76
Figure 40. Average block fill percentages for various block sizes.	78
Figure 41. Mean slope for Fe versus number of samples per quadrant for selected block sizes. ..	80
Figure 42. Mean slope for LOI versus number of samples per quadrant for selected block sizes. ..	80
Figure 43. Mean of maximum positive weights for LOI versus number of samples per quadrant for selected block sizes.	81
Figure 44. Experimental variograms, cross-variograms and models of selected Gaussian transformed assay variables. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	86
Figure 45. Experimental variograms and models of selected Gaussian transformed assay variables. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	87
Figure 46. Histogram of weighted Fe for drill hole data and Co-Simulation One.	88
Figure 47. Scatterplot between Fe versus SiO ₂ for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.	89
Figure 48. Scatterplot between Fe and Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.	89
Figure 49. Scatterplot between SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.	90
Figure 50. Scatterplot between P and LOI for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.	90
Figure 51. Fe experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	91
Figure 52. P experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	91
Figure 53. Average P versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.	92
Figure 54. Average LOI versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.	92
Figure 55. Scatterplot at lag zero of MAF1 versus MAF4 (left) and MAF1 versus MAF2 (right).	93
Figure 56. Experimental cross-variograms between MAF1 and MAF3. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	94
Figure 57. Histograms of MAF3 and MAF5.	94
Figure 58. Experimental variograms and model of MAF1 (left) and MAF2 (right). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	95
Figure 59. Experimental variograms and model of MAF3 (left) and MAF4 (right). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	96
Figure 60. Experimental variogram and model of MAF5. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms is annotated as D90.	96
Figure 61. Histogram of weighted Fe for drill hole data and MAF Simulation One.	98
Figure 62. Scatterplots of Fe versus SiO ₂ for drill hole data (left) and MAF Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.	99

Figure 63. Scatterplots of Fe versus Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and MAF Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.....	99
Figure 64. Scatterplots of SiO ₂ versus Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and MAF Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.	99
Figure 65. Scatterplots of P versus LOI for drill hole data (left) and MAF Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.....	100
Figure 66. Fe experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and MAF Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	100
Figure 67. LOI experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and MAF Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	101
Figure 68. Average LOI versus RL for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	102
Figure 69. Average Fe versus Northing for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	102
Figure 70. Scatterplot at lag zero of SCT-SiO ₂ versus SCT-LOI (left) and SCT-Fe versus SCT-SiO ₂	104
Figure 71. Histogram of Gaussian SCT-Al ₂ O ₃	104
Figure 72. Scatterplot of original versus back-transformed SCT-Al ₂ O ₃	105
Figure 73. Scatterplot of original versus back-transformed (dynamic class expansion) SCT-Al ₂ O ₃	105
Figure 74. Experimental variograms and models of SCT-Fe (left) and SCT-P (right). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	106
Figure 75. Experimental variograms, cross-variograms and models for SCT-SiO ₂ , SCT-Al ₂ O ₃ and SCT-LOI. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	107
Figure 76. Histogram of weighted Fe for drill hole data and SCT Simulation One.....	109
Figure 77. Scatterplots of Fe versus SiO ₂ for drill hole data (left) and SCT Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.....	110
Figure 78. Scatterplots of Fe versus Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and SCT Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.....	110
Figure 79. Scatterplots of SiO ₂ versus Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and SCT Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.....	111
Figure 80. Scatterplots of P versus LOI for drill hole data (left) and SCT Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency.....	111
Figure 81. SCT-LOI experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and SCT Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	112
Figure 82. SCT-P experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and SCT Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	112
Figure 83. Average LOI versus RL for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	113
Figure 84. Average LOI versus Northing for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	113
Figure 85. Histogram of blast hole lengths within the study area.....	115
Figure 86. Location of blast holes used for comparison with simulations.....	115
Figure 87. Plan of resource definition drill holes and the SMU block model.....	117
Figure 88. Mean Fe for simulations, blast hole and resource estimates. The simulations have been sorted from lowest to highest Fe grade.....	119
Figure 89. Mean P for simulations, blast hole and resource estimates. The simulations have been sorted from lowest to highest P grade.....	119
Figure 90. Mean SiO ₂ for simulations, blast hole and resource estimates. The simulations have been sorted from lowest to highest SiO ₂ grade.....	120
Figure 91. Mean Al ₂ O ₃ for simulations, blast hole and resource estimates. The simulations have been sorted from lowest to highest Al ₂ O ₃ grade.....	120
Figure 92. Mean LOI for simulations, blast hole and resource estimates. The simulations have been sorted from lowest to highest LOI grade.....	121
Figure 93. Photographs of clay pods within CID (Stone et al. 2002).....	122

Figure 94. Scatterplot of Fe versus SiO ₂ with the clay rich population highlighted as red squares.	123
Figure 95. Experimental variogram of SiO ₂ for all drill hole data (top left), CID (top right) and clay pods (bottom). The azimuth of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D-90.	124
Figure 96. Experimental variogram and model of Al ₂ O ₃ for the CID with clay pods removed. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	125
Figure 97. Average Al ₂ O ₃ concentration across the boundary between clay pods and CID. The mean is represented by the black line while the blue squares represent the number of samples.	126
Figure 98. Average SiO ₂ concentration across the boundary between clay pods and CID. The mean is represented by the black line while the blue squares represent the number of samples.	126
Figure 99. Clay pod experimental Indicator Variogram One. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N12 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	129
Figure 100. Clay pod Indicator Simulation One.	130
Figure 101. Clay pod experimental Indicator Variogram Two. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N12 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	130
Figure 102. Clay pod Indicator Simulation Two.	131
Figure 103. Clay pod experimental Indicator Variogram Three. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N12 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	131
Figure 104. Clay pod Indicator Simulation Three.	132
Figure 105. Clay pod experimental Indicator Variogram Four. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N12 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	132
Figure 106. Clay pod Indicator Simulation Four.	133
Figure 107. Clay pod experimental Indicator Variogram Five. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N12 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated a D90.	133
Figure 108. Clay pod Indicator Simulation Five.	134
Figure 109. Clay pod experimental Indicator Variogram six. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N12 and N90 while the vertical variogram is annotated as D90.	134
Figure 110. Clay pod Indicator Simulation Six.	135
Figure 111. Experimental variograms and models of selected Gaussian transformed assay variables within the CID (no clay pods). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	137
Figure 112. Histogram of weighted Fe for drill hole data and Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.	139
Figure 113. Scatterplots of Fe versus SiO ₂ for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency: CID and clay pods combined.	140
Figure 114. Scatterplots of Fe versus Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency: CID and clay pods combined.	140
Figure 115. Scatterplots of SiO ₂ versus Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency: CID and clay pods combined.	141
Figure 116. Scatterplots of P versus LOI for drill hole data (left) and Co-Simulation One (right). Points are coloured on frequency: CID and clay pods combined.	141
Figure 117. LOI experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured): Clay pods. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	142
Figure 118. LOI experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured): CID. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	142
Figure 119. LOI versus SiO ₂ experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured): CID. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	143
Figure 120. Al ₂ O ₃ versus P experimental cross-variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured): CID. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.	143
Figure 121. Average LOI versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.	144

Figure 122. Average LOI versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.	144
Figure 123. Plan view of co-simulated Fe at 525 RL.	149
Figure 124. Plan view of Fe at 525 RL for MAF Simulation One.	150
Figure 125. Plan view of Fe at 525 RL for SCT Simulation One.	150
Figure 126. Plan view of co-simulated Fe at 525 RL: CID and clay pods combined.	151
Figure 127. Mean trace element concentrations versus Northing for 2m composites: M3 and C4 Domain within the Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	162
Figure 128. Mean concentrations of LOI, SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for 2m composites: M3 and C4 Domain within the Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	162
Figure 129. Mean concentrations of Fe and TiO ₂ versus Easting for 2m composites: M3 and C4 Domain within the Vardom Two Orientation Domain.	163
Figure 130. Mean trace element concentrations versus Northing for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	164
Figure 131. Mean concentrations of LOI, SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for 2m composites Final M3 Domain.	164
Figure 132. Mean concentrations of Fe and TiO ₂ versus Northing for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	165
Figure 133. Mean trace element concentrations versus Easting for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	165
Figure 134. Mean concentrations of LOI, SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ versus Easting for 2m composites Final M3 Domain.	166
Figure 135. Mean concentrations of Fe and TiO ₂ versus Easting for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	166
Figure 136. Mean trace element concentrations versus RL for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	167
Figure 137. Mean concentrations of LOI, SiO ₂ and Al ₂ O ₃ versus RL for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	167
Figure 138. Mean concentrations of Fe and TiO ₂ versus RL for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	168
Figure 139. Correlation coefficients versus Northing for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	168
Figure 140. Correlation coefficients versus Easting for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	169
Figure 141. Correlation coefficients versus RL for 2m composites: Final M3 Domain.	169
Figure 142. Scatterplot of selected Gaussian transformed variables for samples separated by 0m. Points are coloured on frequency.	170
Figure 143. Omnidirectional H-Scatterplots of Gaussian transformed Fe, P, SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ and LOI for points separated by 7.5-12.5m.	171
Figure 144. Fe ratio of square root of variogram to madogram: Horizontal variograms. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90.	172
Figure 145. P ratio of square root of variogram to madogram: Horizontal variograms. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90.	172
Figure 146. SiO ₂ ratio of square root of variogram to madogram: Horizontal variograms. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90.	173
Figure 147. Al ₂ O ₃ ratio of square root of variogram to madogram: Horizontal variograms. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90.	173
Figure 148. LOI Downhole ratio of square root of variogram to madogram: Horizontal variograms. The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90.	174
Figure 149. Directional experimental variograms and variogram models for Fe (left) and P (right). D-90 = vertical, N0 = North, N90 = East.	175
Figure 150. Directional experimental variograms and variogram models for SiO ₂ (left) and Al ₂ O ₃ (right). D-90 = vertical, N0 to N150 = variograms in the horizontal plane.	176
Figure 151. Directional experimental variograms and variogram models for LOI. D-90 = vertical, N0 to N150 = variograms in the horizontal plane.	176
Figure 152. Histogram of weighted P for drill hole data and Co-Simulation One.	185
Figure 153. Histogram of weighted SiO ₂ for drill hole data and Co-Simulation One.	185
Figure 154. Histogram of weighted Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data and Co-Simulation One.	186
Figure 155. Histogram of weighted LOI for drill hole data and Co-Simulation One.	186

Figure 156. SiO ₂ experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	187
Figure 157. SiO ₂ versus Fe experimental cross-variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	187
Figure 158. Al ₂ O ₂ versus Fe experimental cross-variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	188
Figure 159. Al ₂ O ₃ versus SiO ₂ experimental cross-variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	188
Figure 160. Al ₂ O ₃ experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	189
Figure 161. LOI experimental variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	189
Figure 162. LOI versus P experimental cross-variograms of drill hole data (black) and Co-Simulation One (coloured). The azimuths of the horizontal variograms are annotated as N0 and N90 while the vertical variograms are annotated as D90.....	190
Figure 163. Average Fe versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	191
Figure 164. Average P versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	191
Figure 165. Average SiO ₂ versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	192
Figure 166. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	192
Figure 167. Average Fe versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	193
Figure 168. Average P versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	193
Figure 169. Average SiO ₂ versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	194
Figure 170. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	194
Figure 171. Average Fe versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	195
Figure 172. Average SiO ₂ versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	195
Figure 173. Average Fe versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	196
Figure 174. Average LOI versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	196
Figure 175. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data.....	197
Figure 176. Histogram of weighted P for drill hole data and MAF Simulation One.....	206
Figure 177. Histogram of weighted SiO ₂ for drill hole data and MAF Simulation One.....	207
Figure 178. Histogram of weighted Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data and MAF Simulation One.....	207
Figure 179. Histogram of weighted LOI for drill hole data and MAF Simulation One.....	207
Figure 180. Average P versus Northing for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	208
Figure 181. Average SiO ₂ versus Northing for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	208
Figure 182. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	209
Figure 183. Average P versus Easting for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	209
Figure 184. Average SiO ₂ versus Easting for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	210
Figure 185. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Easting for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	210
Figure 186. Average P versus RL for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	211
Figure 187. Average SiO ₂ versus RL for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	211
Figure 188. Average LOI versus Northing for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	212
Figure 189. Average Fe versus Easting for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	212
Figure 190. Average Fe versus RL for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	213
Figure 191. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus RL for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	213
Figure 192. Average LOI versus Easting for MAF simulations and drill hole data.....	214
Figure 193. Univariate statistics for Al ₂ O ₃ of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.....	222
Figure 194. Histogram of weighted P for drill hole data and SCT Simulation One.....	223
Figure 195. Histogram of weighted SiO ₂ for drill hole data and SCT Simulation One.....	224
Figure 196. Histogram of weighted Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data and SCT Simulation One.....	224
Figure 197. Histogram of weighted LOI for drill hole data and SCT Simulation One.....	225
Figure 198. Average Fe versus Northing for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	226
Figure 199. Average P versus Northing for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	226

Figure 200. Average P versus Northing for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	227
Figure 201. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Northing for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	227
Figure 202. Average Fe versus Easting for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	228
Figure 203. Average SiO ₂ versus Easting for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	228
Figure 204. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Easting for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	229
Figure 205. Average Fe versus RL for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	229
Figure 206. Average SiO ₂ versus RL for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	230
Figure 207. Average P versus Easting for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	230
Figure 208. Average P versus RL for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	231
Figure 209. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus RL for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	231
Figure 210. Average LOI versus Easting for SCT simulations and drill hole data.....	232
Figure 211. Histogram of weighted P for drill hole data and Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.....	233
Figure 212. Histogram of weighted SiO ₂ for drill hole data and Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.....	233
Figure 213. Histogram of weighted Al ₂ O ₃ for drill hole data and Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.....	234
Figure 214. Histogram of weighted LOI for drill hole data and Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.....	234
Figure 215. Average Fe versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	235
Figure 216. Average P versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	235
Figure 217. Average SiO ₂ versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	236
Figure 218. Average Fe versus Northing for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	236
Figure 219. Average Fe versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	237
Figure 220. Average P versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	237
Figure 221. Average SiO ₂ versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	238
Figure 222. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	238
Figure 223. Average Fe versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	239
Figure 224. Average P versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	239
Figure 225. Average SiO ₂ versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	240
Figure 226. Average Al ₂ O ₃ versus RL for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	240
Figure 227. Average LOI versus Easting for co-simulations and drill hole data: CID and clay pods combined.....	241

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Description of abbreviations.	25
Table 2. Domain codes with indicative chemistry (Whitehouse, pers. comm., 2007).	42
Table 3. Univariate statistics for two-metre composites in Population Three.	48
Table 4. Correlation coefficients of variables for two-metre composites in Population Three. Correlation coefficients < -0.4 or > 0.4 are coloured.	48
Table 5. Ranking of each variables ability to discriminate between domains.	50
Table 6. Domain classification matrix from Discriminant Analysis (Case Three, Table 5). Domain codes are explained in Table 2 and further details on the Discriminant Analysis are included in Appendix 2.	50
Table 7. Univariate statistics of the Final M3 Domain.	57
Table 8. Correlation coefficients for the Final M3 Domain. Correlation coefficients < -0.4 or > 0.4 are coloured.	60
Table 9. Clustered and declustered means for various declustering cell sizes.	75
Table 10. Variogram model parameters for directional variograms.	76
Table 11. Block model dimensions used for QKNA.	77
Table 12. Simulation grid parameters.	82
Table 13. Variance-Covariance Matrix for variogram models of Gaussian transformed Fe, P, SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ and LOI.	85
Table 14. Average Gaussian univariate statistics of 20 co-simulations.	87
Table 15. Average univariate statistics of 20 co-simulations.	88
Table 16. Average correlation coefficients of 20 Co-Simulations.	88
Table 17. Variogram model parameters for MAF.	95
Table 18. Average Gaussian univariate statistics of 20 MAF simulations.	97
Table 19. Average univariate statistics of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	97
Table 20. Average correlation coefficients of the 20 MAF simulations.	98
Table 21. Experimental variogram model parameters for SCT.	106
Table 22. Experimental variogram and cross-variograms model parameters for SCT.	106
Table 23. Average Gaussian univariate statistics of 20 SCT simulations.	108
Table 24. Average univariate statistics of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.	108
Table 25. Average correlation coefficients of the 20 SCT simulations.	109
Table 26. Univariate statistics of blast hole assays.	116
Table 27. Correlation coefficients of blast hole assays. Correlation coefficients above 0.4 are highlighted in red.	116
Table 28. Univariate statistics of clay pods.	123
Table 29. Univariate statistics of CID with clay pods removed.	124
Table 30. Indicator variogram parameters for clay pod simulation.	128
Table 31. Variogram and cross-variogram model parameters of Gaussian transformed Fe, P, SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ and LOI: CID with no clay pods. The model is horizontal and strikes towards 348°.	136
Table 32. Variogram and cross-variogram model parameters of Gaussian transformed Fe, P, SiO ₂ , Al ₂ O ₃ and LOI: Clay pods. The model is horizontal and strikes towards 348°.	136
Table 33. Gaussian univariate statistics for Co-Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined. ...	138
Table 34. Univariate statistics for Co-Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.	138
Table 35. Correlation coefficients of Co-Simulation One: CID and clay pods combined.	139
Table 36. Semi-quantitative ranking of the key performance measures of the various simulation methods. A 5 indicates excellent performance while a 1 is unsatisfactory performance.	146
Table 37. Ratio (%) between declustered drill hole and variance and the simulation means and variances for all assay variables.	147
Table 38. Ratio (%) between declustered drill hole means and variance and the simulation means and variances for all assay variables: MAF simulations.	147
Table 39. Case Three Discriminant Function summary.	161
Table 40. Classification functions for Case Three Discriminant Analysis.	161
Table 41. Summary of stepwise analysis for Case Three Discriminant Analysis.	161
Table 42. Gaussian univariate statistics for Fe of 20 co-simulations.	177
Table 43. Gaussian univariate statistics for P of 20 co-simulations.	178
Table 44. Gaussian univariate statistics for SiO ₂ of 20 co-simulations.	179
Table 45. Gaussian univariate statistics for Al ₂ O ₃ of 20 co-simulations.	180

Table 46. Gaussian univariate statistics for LOI of 20 co-simulations.	181
Table 47. Univariate statistics for Fe of 20 co-simulations.	182
Table 48. Univariate statistics for P of 20 co-simulations.	182
Table 49. Univariate statistics for SiO ₂ of 20 co-simulations.	183
Table 50. Univariate statistics for Al ₂ O ₃ of 20 co-simulations.	183
Table 51. Univariate statistics for LOI of 20 co-simulations.	184
Table 52. Univariate statistics for assay total of 20 co-simulations.	184
Table 53. Gaussian univariate statistics for MAF1 of 20 simulations.	198
Table 54. Gaussian univariate statistics for MAF2 of 20 simulations.	199
Table 55. Gaussian univariate statistics for MAF3 of 20 simulations.	200
Table 56. Gaussian univariate statistics for MAF4 of 20 simulations.	201
Table 57. Gaussian univariate statistics for MAF5 of 20 simulations.	202
Table 58. Univariate statistics for Fe of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	203
Table 59. Univariate statistics for P of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	204
Table 60. Univariate statistics for SiO ₂ of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	204
Table 61. Univariate statistics for Al ₂ O ₃ of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	205
Table 62. Univariate statistics for LOI of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	205
Table 63. Univariate statistics for Total Assay of 20 back-transformed MAF simulations.	206
Table 64. Gaussian univariate statistics for SCT-Fe of 20 simulations.	215
Table 65. Gaussian univariate statistics for SCT-P of 20 simulations.	216
Table 66. Gaussian univariate statistics for SCT-SiO ₂ of 20 simulations.	217
Table 67. Gaussian univariate statistics for SCT-Al ₂ O ₃ of 20 simulations.	218
Table 68. Gaussian univariate statistics for SCT-LOI of 20 simulations.	219
Table 69. Univariate statistics for Fe of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.	220
Table 70. Univariate statistics for P of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.	221
Table 71. Univariate statistics for SiO ₂ of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.	221
Table 72. Univariate statistics for LOI of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.	222
Table 73. Univariate statistics for Total assay of 20 back-transformed SCT simulations.	223

ABSTRACT

Conditional Simulation of correlated assay variables is a subject of significant recent and current development. The objective of this thesis is to evaluate the available approaches in this area for mining applications. BHP Billiton's (BHPB) Yandi Channel Iron Deposit (Yandi CID) in Western Australia was selected for these tests.

The Yandi CID is 150 km by road North of the town of Newman in the Pilbara region. This channel iron deposit (CID) infills the meandering tertiary palaeochannels of Marillana Creek, which are 450m - 750m wide and approximately 100m deep in the centre. The deposits outcrop as a series of low mesas beside the present day creeks and were divided into three areas (Western, Central and Eastern) within which individual mesas are numbered. A North-South trending part of the channel (mesas C4, and part of C5) is the focus of this study. Drilling of the C4 and C5 mesas is on grids varying from 25m x 50m to 100m x 100m.

Although the Yandi CID is mined for iron ore, the concentrations of the contaminants Al_2O_3 , SiO_2 and P_2O_5 are economically critical. The Loss on Ignition (LOI), while not strictly speaking a contaminant, is also an important product characteristic for iron ore customers. The correlations between the assay variables and their relative abundances vary from sample to sample. For resource modelling, individual samples were grouped together into domains of similar geological and geochemical character. The 'Main Ore Zone' of the Yandi CID was the domain selected for study in this thesis. Detailed univariate, bivariate and multivariate analyses were used to characterise this domain before proceeding to the simulation study.

The Conditional Simulation methods evaluated in this thesis are all Gaussian-based and they include Conditional Co-Simulation using the Linear Model of Co-Regionalisation and two other, alternative multivariate simulation methods, which use Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors or the Stepwise Conditional Transform to de-correlate assay variables before performing independent Conditional Simulation. Twenty simulations were generated for each of these simulation methods. It was found that Conditional Co-Simulation best reproduced the characteristics (histograms, variogram, scatterplots etc) of the declustered drill hole data. Whilst simulation using Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors generally produced acceptable results, the method did not adequately reproduce the variance of the assay variables. The univariate statistics, histograms and experimental variograms were acceptable for simulations generated from the Stepwise Conditional Transform. Bivariate statistics, cross-variograms and scatterplot reproduction for the Stepwise Conditional Transform were unacceptable. This method produced inferior results because there were insufficient samples to obtain a reliable transform of the third assay variable in the transformation sequence.

None of the above mentioned simulation methods provides good reproduction of all the scatterplots. This is due to the presence of clay pods, which cause some scatterplots to display two trends. These clay pods contain higher percentages of SiO_2 and Al_2O_3 than the surrounding material (known as CID). The clay pods are generally smaller than the drill-grid dimensions and thus their locations are generally unknown. The locations of the clay pods were simulated via Indicator Conditional Simulation. Condition Co-Simulation was then performed separately for the clay pods and the CID. This significantly improved the reproduction of the correlation coefficients, the scatterplots and visually the simulation was more geologically realistic. This Indicator Conditional Simulation of clay pods followed by Conditional Co-Simulation of assay variables is the recommended approach for simulation at the Yandi CID.

DECLARATION

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

Signed:

Chris De-Vitry

Date:

12/02/2010

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my supervisors Peter Dowd (Principal), Gary Glonek (Co-supervisor) and John Vann (Co-supervisor) for their advice, guidance and review of this thesis. Paul Whitehouse of BHP Billiton provided the data for this thesis and useful information regarding deposit geology. BHP Billiton is thanked for allowing me to study the Yandi CID. The staff of Quantitative Group also provided stimulating discussion on numerous topics. Quantitative Group are also thanked for supporting my studies. [Chapter 3](#) of this thesis is substantially based on a paper written by De-Vitry, Vann and Arvidson (2007). The co-authors are thanked for their contribution.

Liz Cousins (Postgraduate Coordinator) was encouraging and helpful in assisting me through to the completion of this thesis. Jackie Phillips (Peter Dowd's personnel assistant) was also helpful in organising various meetings at the University of Adelaide.

Minesight™ provided their software for use in my studies free of charge. Clayton Deutsch and Oy Leuangthong from the University of Alberta and Roussos Dimitrakopoulos from the University of Queensland provided advice and FORTRAN code for implementing the Stepwise Conditional Transform and Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors. Cameron Boyle from Rio Tinto also provided useful discussion regarding Min/Max Autocorrelation Factors. Golder Associates provided software for contact analysis.

Finally, Claudia De-Vitry and two anonymous persons are thanked for reviewing drafts of this thesis.