



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Thesis for the Degree of Master of Engineering

Uncertainty Analysis and Visualization
of Open Pit Optimization Results
by Considering Variation in Mineral
Prices



by

Jieun Baek

Department of Energy Resources Engineering

The Graduate School

Pukyong National University

August 2017

Uncertainty Analysis and Visualization of Open Pit Optimization Results by Considering Variation in Mineral Prices

(광물 가격의 변동에 따른 노천광산
최적 경계의 불확실성 분석 및 가시화)

Advisor: Prof. Yosoon Choi

by
Jieun Baek

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Engineering

in Department of Energy Resources Engineering
The Graduate School
Pukyong National University

August 2017


Uncertainty Analysis and Visualization
of Open Pit Optimization Results
by Considering Variation in Mineral Prices


A dissertation


by

Jieun Baek

Approved by:


(Chairman) Jeong Gi Um


(Member) Wan Soo Ha


(Member) Yosoon Choi

August 2017

Uncertainty Analysis and Visualization of Open Pit Optimization Results by Considering Variation in Mineral Prices

Jieun Baek

Department of Energy Resources Engineering, The Graduate School,
Pukyong National University

Abstract

This study proposes a new method to quantitatively represent the uncertainty existing in open pit optimization results due to variations in mineral prices. After generating multiple mineral prices using Monte Carlo simulation with data on past mineral prices, a probability model that represents the uncertainty was developed by integrating multiple open pit optimization results derived from the mineral prices. The results of applying the proposed method to the copper-zinc deposits showed that significant uncertainty exists in open pit optimization results due to the variation in copper prices. In addition, the study was able to quantify the probability that each block that represents deposits is included within the open pit optimal boundary when copper and zinc prices increase or decrease from the current reference prices. Using

these probabilities, reserves of the deposits were estimated as a function of confidence level. When confidence level was set at 90% or higher, reserve was estimated to be about 76,000 tonnes, and when confidence level was set at 50% or higher, reserve was estimated to be about 2,550,000 tonnes. This suggests that the proposed method also has a potential as a tool for classifying the estimation results of ore reserve based on confidence level.

Keywords: Uncertainty, Open pit optimization, Monte Carlo simulation, Revenue factor, Ore reserve estimation




TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. Methods	5
2.1 Survey of past mineral prices and generation of cumulative relative frequency curves	7
2.2 Mineral price generation and revenue factor calculation using Monte Carlo simulation	9
2.3 BEV calculation and open pit optimal boundary analysis	11
2.4 Formation of probability model using overlay analysis	13
3. Study area and data	15
4. Results	17
4.1 Results of cumulative relative frequency curves of copper and zinc	17
4.2 Revenue factor of copper and zinc price calculation results using Monte Carlo simulation	21
4.3 BEV calculation and open pit optimal boundary analysis results	24
4.4 Results of probability model formation	28
4.5 Deposit reserve estimation as a function of confidence level	31


5. Discussion	34
6. Conclusion	36
References	38
Abstract(in Korean)	45



List of Figures

Fig. 2.1 Study process of uncertainty representation for pit optimization results using the proposed method.	6
Fig. 2.2 Example of probability model formation representing the uncertainty. (a) Binarized block model. (b) Probability model formation by overlay analysis. (c) Sectional view of probability model.	14
Fig. 3.1 Block model of copper–zinc deposits in the study area.	16
Fig. 4.1 Price fluctuation graph. (a) Average monthly copper prices. (b) Average monthly zinc prices.	18
Fig. 4.2 Cumulative relative frequency curves. (a) Copper prices. (b) Zinc prices.	20
Fig. 4.3 Results from Monte Carlo simulation. (a) Histogram of randomly extracted copper prices. (b) Histogram of randomly extracted zinc prices.	22
Fig. 4.4 Results from revenue factor calculation. (a) Histogram of revenue factors related to copper prices. (b) Histogram of revenue factors related to zinc price.	23
Fig. 4.5 Pit optimization results using the floating cone algorithm. (a) Result No. 34 (Revenue Factor(RF) of Cu = 0.86, RF of Zn = 0.79). (b) Result No. 25 (RF of Cu = 1.01. RF of Zn = 1.00). (c) Result No. 55 (RF of Cu = 1.17. RF of Zn = 0.91). (d) Result No. 11 (RF of Cu = 1.34, RF of Zn = 1.58). (e) Result No. 21 (RF of Cu =	

1.57. RF of Zn = 1.14).	27
Fig. 4.6 Probability model representing the uncertainty in the pit optimization results.	30
Fig. 4.7 Blocks representing ore reserve above optimal pit boundary. (a) Case 1: probability $\geq 90\%$. (b) Case 2: probability $\geq 80\%$. (c) Case 3: probability $\geq 70\%$	32
Fig. 4.8 Probability-tonnage-grade graph for ore reserve estimation	33
Fig. 5.1 Probability model representing the uncertainty in the pit optimization results. (a) Case 1: When considering the variation of copper prices only. (b) Case 2: When considering the variation of zinc prices only.	35



List of Tables

Table 4.1 Cumulative relative frequency of copper prices.	19
Table 4.2 Cumulative relative frequency of zinc prices.	19
Table 4.3 Economic parameters for calculating block's economic values	25



I . Introduction

Determination of optimal open pit boundary is extremely important in planning an open pit mine. This is because profitability may vary significantly depending on the determination of open pit boundary. Algorithms to solve the open pit optimization problem have been developed by many researchers. Lerchs and Grossmann (1965) developed an open pit optimization algorithm based on graph theory. In 1968, Johnson proposed the method to determine optimized pit boundary using network flow algorithm, which was verified by Picard (1976). David et al. (1974) developed the Korobov algorithm, and Lane (1988) introduced the concept of cut-off grade to the open pit optimization problem. Caccetta and Giannini (1988) presented a dynamic programming method to implement the Lerchs and Grossmann algorithm. Berlanga et al. (1989) developed the floating cone algorithm that can optimize open pit boundaries based on heuristic theory. Zhao and Kim (1992) modified the Lerchs and Grossmann algorithm to take into account the boundary of ore and waste. Dowd and Onur (1993) modified the Korobov algorithm to overcome its limitations, and Yamatomi et al. (1995) presented an improvement plan for the floating cone algorithm. Underwood and Tolwinski (1998) developed an improved network flow algorithm, and Hochbaum and Chen (2000) suggested the push-label algorithm by modifying the Lerchs and Grossmann algorithm. In addition, there have been many studies to solve the production scheduling optimization problems in open pit

mines (Gershon, 1983; Busnach et al., 1985; Gershon, 1987; Dendy and Schofield, 1994; Dendy and Schofield, 1995; Elevli, 1995; Tolwinski and Underwood, 1996; Caccetta and Hill, 2003; Kumral and Dowd, 2005; Ramazan, 2007; Boland et al., 2009; Bienstock and Zuckerberg, 2010; Bley et al., 2010; Souza et al., 2010; Cullenbine et al., 2011; Chicoisne et al., 2012; Epstein et al., 2012; Liu and Kozan, 2016).

Open pit optimization algorithms determine the scope of deposit development required to ensure profitability while meeting the requirements for mine development. In the determination, the Block Economic Value (BEV) calculated in a block unit is usually used as input data for the algorithm. BEV represents the revenue estimated by dividing the 3D ore body model created based on geological data into blocks, and then considering sales revenue and production cost for each block. The problem is that BEV determined as a single value contains significant uncertainty due to the variations in mineral prices, production costs, and exchange rates. Consequently, the products of the open pit optimization algorithms that use BEV as input data also inevitably contain uncertainty.

A number of methods to consider this uncertainty have been developed to date. Godoy (2003) developed a method to quantify the geological uncertainty in long-term production scheduling of open pit mines, and Menebde et al. (2004) treated the uncertainty in BEV using conditional simulation methods. Gabriel et al. (2006) developed a model to evaluate rates of return of mining projects by considering uncertainties such as mineral prices, production costs, and tax.

Golamnejad et al. (2006) considered the uncertainty in BEV using probability models. Dimitrakopoulos and Sabour (2007) proposed the Real Option Valuation (ROV) technique to evaluate mining projects by considering uncertainty of economic variables. Ramazan and Dimitrakopoulos (2007) provided a new integer programming formulation for stochastic optimization of long-term production scheduling by considering the uncertainty of geological variables. Boland et al. (2008) suggested a multistage stochastic programming approach to open pit mine production scheduling with uncertain geology. Akbari et al. (2008) performed open pit optimization considering uncertainty of mineral prices, and Albor and Dimitrakopoulos (2010) developed a method to simultaneously consider the uncertainties of multiple variables in push back design of open pit mines.

Sabour and Dimitrakopoulos (2011) developed the technique to generate multiple open pit optimization results considering uncertainty of economic and geological variables, and then prioritizing the results. Evatt et al. (2012) provided a method to estimate ore reserves under mineral price uncertainty, Lamghari and Dimitrakopoulos (2012) considered the uncertainty of metal contents in mine production scheduling problems by a diversified Tabu search approach. Asad and Dimitrakopoulos (2013) developed a parametric maximum flow algorithm for optimal open pit mine design under uncertain market conditions. Furthermore, Alonso-Ayuso et al. (2014) provided a method to optimize the copper extraction planning considering the uncertainty in future copper prices, and Kizilkale and Dimitrakopoulos (2014)

presented a distributed and dynamic programming framework to the mining production rate target tracking of multiple metal mines under financial uncertainty. However, no study has been conducted to quantitatively represent the uncertainty itself inevitably present in open pit optimization results using probability models or other methods.

Thus, the objective of this study is to present a method to quantitatively represent the uncertainty included in open pit optimization results due to variation in mineral prices. In this study, multiple mineral prices are generated using Monte Carlo simulation based on past mineral prices data, and open pit optimization is conducted iteratively using the generated prices. The study aims to generate a probability model to quantitatively represent the uncertainty due to variation in mineral prices by integrating multiple open pit optimization results generated by iterative calculation. This paper describes the method to represent the uncertainty in open pit optimization results due to variation in mineral prices, and presents the results of applying the method to copper-zinc deposits.

II. Methods

The method developed in this study to represent uncertainty in open pit optimization results due to variation in mineral prices consists of four steps (Fig. 2.1).






Fig. 2.1 Study process of uncertainty representation for pit optimization results using the proposed method.

2.1 Survey of past mineral prices and generation of cumulative relative frequency curves

To investigate the variations in mineral prices, data on mineral price of the past over a long period are collected, and statistics such as maximum values, minimum values, and the means of the collected data are obtained using statistical analysis. Using the results of statistical analysis, the class width required for creating cumulative relative frequency curves of mineral prices can be calculated (Eq. (1)). In general, the number of classes is set as between 10 and 20,

$$\text{Class width} = \frac{\text{Maximum value} - \text{Minimum value}}{\text{Number of classes}} \quad (1)$$

Once the class width is determined, the frequency of data included in each class is obtained by examining the collected data on mineral prices, and the relative frequency of each class is calculated by dividing the data frequency of each class by the total number of data (Eq. (2)). Cumulative relative frequency can be calculated using the relative frequency of each class (Eq. (3)).

$$F_i^r = \frac{f_i}{N} \quad (2)$$

$$F_n^c = \sum_{i=1}^n F_i^r \quad (3)$$

Here, F_i^r denotes the relative frequency of i-th class, f_i denotes the data frequency of i-th class, N denotes the total number of data, F_n^c denotes the cumulative relative frequency of n-th class.

In addition, the cumulative relative frequency curve can be generated by plotting the mineral prices on the x -axis and cumulative relative frequencies on the y -axis.



2.2 Mineral price generation and revenue factor calculation using Monte Carlo simulation

When using a cumulative relative frequency curve of past mineral prices generated in the previous step, n mineral prices can be generated based on Monte Carlo simulation as follows:

$$F(x) = P(X \leq x) \quad (4)$$

The function of cumulative relative frequency curve $F(x)$ gives the probability P that the mineral price X will be less than or equal to x . Because $F(x)$ obviously ranges from zero to one, we can look at this equation in the reverse direction to find the value of x for a given value of $F(x)$ as follows:

$$G(F(x)) = G(r) = x \quad (5)$$

Here, $G(F(x))$ is the inverse function, r is a random real number between zero and one.

In this study, n mineral prices are generated by generating n random real numbers between zero and one, and then assuming each generated real number as the y value of the cumulative relative frequency curve, and finding x values corresponding to the y values.

Next, using the generated n mineral prices, n revenue factors (RF) are

calculated (Eq. (6)). The revenue factor represents the ratio of the uncertain future mineral price (SP) to the current mineral price (CP). Because RF can indicate the increase or decrease of mineral price, the change in optimal open pit boundary as a result of mineral price can be analyzed using RF (Hall, 2004).

$$RF = \frac{SP}{CP} \quad (6)$$



2.3 BEV calculation and open pit optimal boundary analysis

In the proposed model, n BEVs are calculated for all blocks using the RF values calculated in the previous step (Eq. (7)-(9)):

$$BEV(ore) = T_o \times (g \times r \times (RF \times P - SC) - PC - MC) \quad (7)$$

$$BEV(waste) = T_w \times MC \quad (8)$$

$$BEV = BEV(ore) - BEV(waste) \quad (9)$$

Here, T_o denotes the mass of ore block (tonne), g denotes the grade of ore, r denotes recovery of ore, RF denotes revenue factor, P denotes the price of mineral (\$/tonne), SC denotes selling cost (\$/tonne), PC denotes processing cost (\$/tonne), MC denotes mining cost (\$/tonne), and T_w denotes the mass of waste block (tonne).

Once n BEV values for all blocks have been calculated, open pit optimal boundary can be determined by inputting the values in optimization algorithms such as the Lerchs - Grossmann algorithm, Korobov algorithm and floating cone algorithm. This study used the floating cone algorithm proposed by Berlanga et al. (1989). For each

block with a positive BEV value, the floating cone algorithm involves constructing a cone with sides oriented parallel to the pit slope angles, and then determining the value of the cone by summing the values of blocks enclosed within it. If the value of the cone is positive, all blocks within the cone are mined. This process starts from the uppermost level and moves downward searching for positive blocks. The process continues until no positive cones remain in the block model (Elahizeyni et al., 2011). An advantage of the floating cone algorithm is its speed of calculation (Magassouba, 2006). Therefore, it is useful when optimal boundary analysis needs to be performed many times, as in this study. Other open pit optimization algorithms can be used in this step, however the comparison of results from different optimization algorithms is beyond the scope of this study. Interested readers should refer to texts such as Hustrlid et al. (2013).

As n BEVs are calculated, the pit boundary optimization process is also conducted n times, and as a result, n optimization results are generated.

2.4 Formation of probability model using overlay analysis

In the final step, a probability model is developed by overlaying n open pit optimization results into one (Fig. 2.2). To that end, the results of open pit optimal boundary analysis are examined; 1.0 is assigned if a block exists within the optimal boundary, and 0.0 is assigned otherwise. This binarization is performed on n results of optimal boundary analysis. After completing binarization, a probability model is formed by averaging the values assigned to all blocks (Eq. (10)).

$$Z = \frac{1}{n} \times \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \quad (10)$$

Here, Z denotes the probability that a block exists within the open pit optimal boundary (0.0 - 1.0), and z_i denotes the binarized value assigned to the result of i -th open pit optimal boundary analysis. Z should be calculated for all blocks.




Fig. 2.2 Example of probability model formation representing the uncertainty. (a) Binarized block model. (b) Probability model formation by overlay analysis. (c) Sectional view of probability model.

III. Study area and data

The uncertainty representation method of open pit optimization results due to variation in mineral prices developed in this study was applied to copper-zinc deposits located in the OO region. The ore body was widely distributed in a plate form (Fig. 3.1). This region has the sea-level altitude of about 150 m, relatively flat terrain, and adequate infrastructure for mine development as there is a mining city in the vicinity.

The block model of ore body used in this study is 25m × 25m × 5m blocks. The number of blocks is 92 on the axis x (easting), 106 on the axis y (northing), and 74 on the axis z (elevation). Each block is classified into ore or waste and includes information on mass. In addition, ore blocks have grades of copper and zinc assigned to them. The mean grade is about 0.84% for copper, and about 0.21% for zinc.




Fig. 3.1 Block model of copper-zinc deposits in the study area.

IV. Results

4.1 Results of cumulative relative frequency curves of copper and zinc

To examine the variation in metal prices, the data on copper and zinc prices for about 10 years (January 2005 - April 2015) published by the London Metal Exchange (LME) were collected and analyzed (Fig. 4.1). The results showed that the mean copper price for the past 10 years is 6796 \$/tonne, the maximum price was 10,148 \$/tonne, and the minimum price was 2770 \$/tonne. In the case of zinc, the mean price for the past 10 years was 2109 \$/tonne, the maximum price was 4620 \$/tonne, and the minimum price was 1042 \$/tonne.

To plot a cumulative relative frequency curve, the number of classes for copper prices was set at 13, and class width was set at 600 \$/tonne based on Equation (1). In the same manner, the number of classes for zinc prices was set at 13, and class width was set at 300 \$/tonne. The results of calculating frequency of each class, relative frequency, and cumulative relative frequency using the copper and zinc prices for the past 10 years are shown in Table 4.1 (copper) and Table 4.2 (zinc). Figure 4.2 shows the cumulative relative frequency curves of copper and zinc prices for the past 10 years.





Fig. 4.1 Price fluctuation graph. (a) Average monthly copper prices. (b) Average monthly zinc prices.

Table 4.1 Cumulative relative frequency of copper prices.


Class interval (\$/tonne)	Frequency	Relative frequency	Cumulative relative frequency
2700 - 3300	92	0.0353	0.0353
3300 - 3900	181	0.0694	0.1047
3900 - 4500	91	0.0349	0.1396
4500 - 5100	125	0.0479	0.1876
5100 - 5700	84	0.0322	0.2198
5700 - 6300	144	0.0552	0.2750
6300 - 6900	340	0.1304	0.4054
6900 - 7500	590	0.2263	0.6318
7500 - 8100	442	0.1695	0.8013
8100 - 8700	290	0.1112	0.9125
8700 - 9300	121	0.0464	0.9590
9300 - 9900	95	0.0364	0.9954
9900 - 10500	12	0.0046	1.0000

Table 4.2 Cumulative relative frequency of zinc prices.

Class interval (\$/tonne)	Frequency	Relative frequency	Cumulative relative frequency
1000 - 1300	224	0.0859	0.0859
1300 - 1600	193	0.0740	0.1600
1600 - 1900	470	0.1803	0.3402
1900 - 2200	729	0.2796	0.6199
2200 - 2500	532	0.2041	0.8239
2500 - 2800	66	0.0253	0.8493
2800 - 3100	61	0.0234	0.8727
3100 - 3400	116	0.0445	0.9171
3400 - 3700	118	0.0453	0.9624
3700 - 4000	42	0.0161	0.9785
4000 - 4300	23	0.0088	0.9873
4300 - 4600	31	0.0119	0.9992
4600 - 4900	2	0.0008	1.0000



(a)



(b)

Fig. 4.2 Cumulative relative frequency curves. (a) Copper prices. (b) Zinc prices.

4.2 Revenue factor of copper and zinc price calculation results using Monte Carlo simulation

Using the cumulative relative frequency curves of copper and zinc prices shown in Figure 4.2, 100 copper prices and 100 zinc prices were generated using Monte Carlo simulation (Fig. 4.3). In the 100 copper prices generated by Monte Carlo simulation, the mean was 6591.13 \$/tonne, the maximum was 9486.18 \$/tonne, and the minimum was 3342.66 \$/tonne. In addition, in the 100 zinc prices generated, the mean was 1985.00 \$/tonne, the maximum was 3571.96 \$/tonne, and the minimum was 924.44 \$/tonne.

By entering the generated copper prices and zinc prices in Equation (6), RF was estimated. For the reference price for the minerals, the monthly average copper price of 6027.96 \$/tonne and monthly average zinc price of 2206.90 \$/tonne, published by LME for April 2015 when this study was conducted, were used. As the numbers of previously generated copper prices and zinc prices were 100 each, 100 RF values were also estimated for each. Figure 4.4 shows the estimated RFs of copper and zinc represented in the histogram.




Fig. 4.3 Results from Monte Carlo simulations. (a) Histogram of randomly extracted copper prices. (b) Histogram of randomly extracted zinc prices.




Fig. 4.4 Results from revenue factor calculation. (a) Histogram of revenue factors related to copper prices. (b) Histogram of revenue factors related to zinc prices.

4.3 BEV calculation and open pit optimal boundary analysis results

The BEV for the block model of the study area shown in Figure 3.1 was calculated using Equation (11), instead of Equation (7), because the study area has copper-zinc mixed deposits.

$$BEV(ore) = T_o \times [g_{cu} \times r_{cu} \times (\lambda_{cu} \times P_{cu} - SC) + g_{zn} \times r_{zn} \times (\lambda_{zn} \times P_{zn} - SC) - PC - MC] \quad (11)$$

Here, T_o denotes the mass of ore block (tonne), g_{cu} denotes the grade of copper ore (grade), g_{zn} denotes the grade of zinc (grade), r_{cu} denotes recovery of copper ore (recovery), r_{zn} denotes recovery of zinc ore (recovery), λ_{cu} denotes RF of copper, λ_{zn} denotes RF of zinc, P_{cu} denotes the price of copper mineral (\$/tonne), P_{zn} denotes the price of zinc mineral (\$/tonne), SC denotes selling costs of ore (\$/tonne), PC denotes of processing costs of ore (\$/tonne), and MC denotes mining costs of ore (\$/tonne). The factor values assumed in this study to calculate BEV are presented in Table 4.3. As 100 copper RFs and 100 zinc RFs were estimated, the BEV calculation of the block model of the study area was also conducted 100 times.


Table 4.3 Economic parameters for calculating blocks' economic values

Input parameters	Unit	Copper	Zinc
Price of metal (P)	\$/tonne	6027.96	2206.90
Recovery (r)	%	0.90	0.65
Selling cost (SC)	\$/tonne	120.00	120.00
Mining cost (MC)	\$/tonne	2.70	2.70
Processing cost (PC)	\$/tonne	40.08	40.08



The previously calculated block model's BEVs were entered into the floating cone algorithm for analyzing optimal pit boundaries, and it was assumed that the angle of the slope was 45° and that cutoff grade was 0.007%, incorporating copper prices. As 100 BEVs of block model were estimated for each, the boundary optimization with the floating cone algorithm was also conducted 100 times.

Figure 4.5 shows graphical representation of five open pit optimization results arbitrarily selected from 100 results. They demonstrate that when the RF of copper applied in BEV calculation increases, the open pit boundary increases gradually.






Fig. 4.5 Pit optimization results using the floating cone algorithm. (a) Result No. 34 (Revenue Factor(RF) of Cu = 0.86, RF of Zn = 0.79). (b) Result No. 25 (RF of Cu = 1.01. RF of Zn = 1.00). (c) Result No. 55 (RF of Cu = 1.17. RF of Zn = 0.91). (d) Result No. 11 (RF of Cu = 1.34, RF of Zn = 1.58). (e) Result No. 21 (RF of Cu = 1.57. RF of Zn = 1.14).

4.4 Results of probability model formation


A probability model was formed by overlaying 100 open pit optimization results of the study area into one according to the method described in Section 2.4. Figure 4.6 shows the plan view of the probability model. The optimal open pit boundaries estimated when the RFs of copper and zinc were 1.0 (i.e., when the mineral prices of April 2015) are shown by the black solid lines. Each block has a value between 0.0 and 1.0, and the value indicates the probability that the block is included in the optimal boundary of open pit.

When the uncertainty of the open pit optimization results due to the variation in mineral prices is large, many blocks with probabilities greater than 0.0 exist outside the open pit optimal boundary for the RF of 1.0, or many blocks with probabilities smaller than 1.0 exist inside the optimal boundary. On the other hand, when the uncertainty of open pit optimization results due to the variation in mineral prices is small, there are many blocks with probability of 1.0 inside the open pit optimal boundary for the RF of 1.0, and many blocks with probability of 0.0 outside the boundary.

The probability model showed that significant uncertainty exists in open pit optimization results considering the variation in copper and zinc prices in the past 10 years. It was found that when copper and zinc prices decrease from current reference prices, the probability that the open pit boundary for RF of 1.0, which is shown by the solid black line (Fig. 4.6), satisfies the optimal boundary is about 70% or higher for

Pit 1 and about 80% or higher for Pit 2. It is believed that when resetting the optimal open pit boundary based on only the blocks with probability higher than the aforementioned probabilities (e.g., 90% or higher), the size of the open pit will be smaller than that for RF of 1.0.

On the other hand, if copper and zinc prices increase from the current reference prices, it is possible that the optimal open pit boundary further expands from the solid black line, and Figure 4.6 shows the probabilities that the blocks are located within the open pit boundary. In the east of the study area, there is a possibility that an additional open pit can be formed if mineral prices increase; however, the probability is not high, at 20%.






Fig. 4.6 Probability model representing the uncertainty in the pit optimization results

4.5 Deposit reserve estimation as a function of confidence level

Figure 4.7 is a visual representation of the blocks that will be distributed within the open pit optimal boundary despite the variation in copper and zinc prices, using the probability model formation results. The results of graphic representation of the blocks to be distributed within the optimal boundary by applying three confidence levels (90% or higher, 80% or higher, and 70% or higher) showed that setting confidence level higher resulted in a smaller size of open pit, and setting confidence level lower resulted in a larger size of open pit.

After extracting the blocks to be distributed within the optimal boundary of the study area by applying various confidence levels, the ore reserve was estimated based on the extracted blocks, and the results are shown in Figure 4.8. It was found that when confidence level was set at 90% or higher, ore reserve was about 76,000 tonnes, the grade of copper was 1.53%, and the grade of zinc was 0.15%. On the other hand, when confidence level was set at 50%, ore reserve was about 2,550,000 tonnes, the grade of copper was 1.33%, and the grade of zinc was 0.15%. These indicate that when setting confidence level higher when extracting blocks within optimal boundary in the probability model, ore reserve estimates decrease. The mean grade of the blocks within optimal boundary varied somewhat depending on the confidence level of the probability model, but did not show any particular pattern.




Fig. 4.7 Blocks representing ore reserve above optimal pit boundary. (a) Case 1: probability $\geq 90\%$. (b) Case 2: probability $\geq 80\%$. (c) Case 3: probability $\geq 70\%$.




Fig. 4.8 Probability-tonnage-grade graph for ore reserve estimation

V. Discussion

Figure 5.1 is the plan view of the probability model formed by separating when considering variation in copper prices without considering variation in zinc prices, and when considering variation in zinc prices without considering variation in copper prices. The results of the probability model formations show that when considering variation in copper prices only, significant uncertainty exists in open pit optimization results, whereas when considering variation in zinc prices only, uncertainty is small in boundary optimization results. These results of probability model formations by separating the case of considering only the variation in copper prices and the case of considering only the variation in zinc prices suggest that, in the case of copper-zinc mixed deposits in the study area, variation in copper prices has greater impact on uncertainty of open pit optimization results than variation in zinc prices does.




Fig. 5.1 Probability model representing the uncertainty in the pit optimization results. (a) Case 1: When considering the variation of copper prices only. (b) Case 2: When considering the variation of zinc prices only.

VI. Conclusion

This study presented a method to quantitatively represent the uncertainty in open pit optimization results due to variation in mineral prices using a probability model. The results of applying the proposed method to the copper-zinc mixed deposits showed that significant uncertainty exists in open pit optimization results considering the variation in copper and zinc prices for the past 10 years. In addition, the study was able to quantify the probability that each block that represents deposits is included within the open pit optimal boundary when copper and zinc prices increase or decrease from the current reference prices. Using these probabilities, reserves of the deposits were estimated as a function of confidence level. When confidence level is set at 90% or higher, reserve was estimated to be about 76,000 tonnes, and when confidence level was set at 50% or higher, reserve was estimated to be about 2,550,000 tonnes. This suggests that the proposed method also has a potential for use in ore reserve estimation. The results of probability model formation by separating the cases of variation in copper prices only and in zinc prices only showed that the uncertainty in the results of open pit optimization in the study area was more influenced by the variation in copper prices than by that in zinc prices.

In this study, the uncertainty in open pit optimization results was represented by a probability model considering only the variations in mineral prices. However, the proposed method is expected to be applicable in a similar fashion, when variations in geological variables

as well as other economic variables such as production costs, exchange rates, and taxes are considered. In future work, it would be interesting to develop an extended method to simultaneously consider the uncertainties of multiple variables because it can change the results of uncertainty representation for open pit optimization.

The proposed method is applicable to a wide range of deposits for a general purpose, and may be used in combination with various open pit optimization algorithms. Therefore, it is expected to be a valuable tool to assist sound long-term development planning of open pit mines.



References

- Abdel Sabour, S.A. and Dimitrakopoulos, R., 2011, Incorporating Geological and Market Uncertainties and Operational Flexibility into Open Pit Mine Design, *Journal of Mining Science*, Vol. 47, pp. 191–201.
- Akbari, A.D., Osanloo M., Shirazi, M.A., 2008, Determination of Ultimate Pit Limits in Open Mines Using Real Option Approach, *IUST International Journal of Engineering Science*, Vol. 19, pp. 23–38.
- Albor, F. and Dimitrakopoulos, R., 2010, Algorithmic Approach to Pushback Design Based on Stochastic Programming: Method, Application and Comparisons, *Mining Technology*, Vol. 119, pp. 88–101.
- Alonso–Ayuso, A., Carvallo, F., Escuderto, L.F., Guignard, M., Pi, J., Puranmalka, R., Weintraub, A., 2014, Medium Range Optimization of Copper Extraction Planning Under Uncertainty in Future Copper Prices, *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 233, pp. 711–726.
- Asad, M.W.A. and Dimitrakopoulos, R., 2013, Implementing a Parametric Maximum Flow Algorithm for Optimal Open Pit Mine Design under Uncertain Supply and Demand, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 64, pp. 185–197.
- Berlanga, J.M., Cardona, R., Ibarra, M.A, 1989, Recursive Formulae for the Floating Cone Algorithm, *International Journal of Surface Mining*,

- Reclamation and Environment, Vol. 3, pp. 141–150.
- Bienstock, D. and Zuckerberg, M., 2010, Solving LP Relaxations of Large–Scale Precedence Constrained Problems, Proceedings of the 14th international conference on IPCO(Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimisation), Lausanne, Switzerland, 9–11 June, pp. 1–14.
- Bley, A., Boland, N., Fricke, C., Froyland, G., 2010, A Strengthened Formulation and Cutting Planes for the Open Pit Mine Production Scheduling Problem, Computers & Operations Research, Vol. 37, pp. 1641–1647.
- Boland, N., Dumitrescu, I., Foyland, G., Gleixner, M., 2009, LP–Based Disaggregation Approaches to Solving the Open Pit Mining Production Scheduling Problem with Block Processing Selectivity, Computers & Operations Research, Vol. 36, pp. 1064–1089.
- Boland, N., Dumitrescu, I., Froyland, G., 2008, A Multistage Stochastic Programming Approach to Open Pit Mine Production Scheduling with Uncertain Geology, Optimization Online, Available online: http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2008/10/2123.html (accessed on 24 October 2008).
- Busnach, E., Mehrez, A., Sinuany–Stern, Z., 1985, A Production Problem in Phosphate Mining, Journal of the Operational Research Society, Vol. 36, pp. 285–288.
- Caccetta, L. and Giannini, L.M., 1988, An application of Discrete Mathematics in the Design of an Open Pit Mine, Discrete Applied Mathematics, Vol. 21, pp. 1–19.

- Caccetta, L. and Hill, S.P., 2003, An Application of Branch and Cut to Open Pit Mine Scheduling, *Journal of Global Optimization*, Vol. 27, pp. 349–365.
- Chicoisne, R., Espinoza, D., Goycoolea, M., Moreno, E., Rubio, E., 2012, A New Algorithm for the Open–Pit Mine Scheduling Problem, *Operations Research*, Vol. 60, pp. 517–528.
- Cullenbine, C., Wood, R. K., Newman, A., 2011, A Sliding Time Window Heuristic for Open Pit Mine Block Sequencing, *Optimization Letters*, Vol. 5, pp. 365–377.
- David, M., Dowd, P.A., Korobov, S., 1974, Forecasting Departure from Planning in Open Pit Design and Grade Control, *Proceeding of the 12th International APCOM Symposium*, Golden, Colorado, USA, 8–12 April, pp. F131–F142.
- Dendy, B. and Schofield, D., 1994, Open–Pit Design and Scheduling by Use of Genetic Algorithms, *Transactions of the Institution of Mining and Metallurgy*, Vol. 103, pp. A21–A26.
- Dendy, B. and Schofield, D., 1995, The Use of Genetic Algorithms in Underground Mine Scheduling, *Proceeding of the 25th International APCOM Symposium*, Brisbane, Australia, 9–14 July, pp. 389–394.
- Dimitrakopoulos R. and Abdel Sabour, S.A., 2007, Evaluating Mine Plans under Uncertainty: Can the Real Options Make a Difference?, *Journal of Resources Policy*, Vol. 32, pp. 116–125.
- Dowd P.A. and Onur, A.H., 1993, Open–Pit Optimization – Part 1: Optimal Open Pit Design, *Transactions of the Institution of Mining and Metallurgy*, Vol. 102, pp. A95–A104.

- Elahizeyni, E., Kakaie, R., Yousefi, A., 2011, A new algorithm for optimum open pit design: Floating cone method III, *Journal of Mining & Environment*, Vol. 2, pp. 118–125.
- Elevli, B., 1995, Open Pit Mine Design and Extraction Sequencing by Use of OR and AI concepts, *International Journal of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Environment*, Vol. 9, pp. 149–153.
- Epstein, R., Goic, M., Weintraub, A., Catalán, J., Santibáñez, P., Cancino, R., Gaete, S., Aguayo, A., Caro, F., 2012, Optimizing Long-Term Production Plans in Underground and Open-Pit Copper Mines, *Operations Research*, Vol. 60, pp. 4–17.
- Evatt, G.W., Soltan, M.O., Johnson, P.V., 2012, Mineral Reserves Under Price Uncertainty, *Resources Policy*, Vol. 37, pp. 340–345.
- Gabriel, A., Costa Lima, Suslick, Saul B., 2006, Estimating the Volatility of Mining Projects Considering Price and Operating Cost Uncertainties, *Journal of Resources Policy*, Vol. 31, pp. 86–94.
- Gershon, M., 1987, Heuristic Approaches for Mine Planning and Production Scheduling, *International Journal of Mining and Geological Engineering*, Vol. 5, pp. 1–13.
- Gershon, M.E., 1983, Mine Scheduling Optimization with Mixed Integer Programming, *Minerals Engineering*, Vol. 35, pp. 351–354.
- Godoy, M., 2003, The Effective Management of Geological Risk in Long-Term Production Scheduling of Open Pit Mines, Ph.D thesis, University of Queensland, Australia, pp. 1–256.
- Golamnejad, J., Osanloo, M., Karimi, B., 2006, A Chance-Constrained Programming Approach for Open Pit Long-Term Production

- Scheduling in Stochastic Environments, The Journal of South African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Vol. 106, pp. 105–114.
- Hall, G., 2004, Multi-Mine Better than Multiple Mines, Orebody Modelling and Strategic Mining Planning Symposium, Perth, Australia, 22–24 November, pp. 1–14.
- Hochbaum, D.S. and Chen, A., 2000, Performance Analysis and Best Implementations of Old and New Algorithms for the Open-Pit Mining Problem, Operations Research, Vol. 48, pp. 894–914.
- Huhtala, W., Kuchta, M., Martin, R., 2013, Open Pit Mine Planning and Design Volume1 – Fundamentals, 3rd ed., CRC Press : Leiden, Netherlands, pp. 409–501.
- Kizilkale, A.C. and Dimitrakopoulos, R., 2014, Optimizing Mining Rates under Financial Uncertainty in Global Mining Complexes, International Journal of Production Economics, Vol. 158, pp. 359–365.
- Kumral, M. and Dowd, P. A., 2005, A Simulated Annealing Approach to Mine Production Scheduling, The Journal of the Operational Research Society, Vol. 56, pp. 922–930.
- Lamghari, A. and Dimitrakopoulos, R., 2012, A Diversified Tabu Search Approach for the Open-Pit Mine Production Scheduling Problem with Metal Uncertainty, European Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 222, pp. 642–652.
- Lane, K.F., 1988, The Economic Definition of Ore : Cutoff Grade in Theory and Practice, 1st ed., Mining Journal Books Limited : London, pp. 1–147.

- Lerchs, H. and Grossmann, L., 1965, Optimum Design of Open-Pit Mines, Canadian Mining and Metallurgical Bulletin, Vol. 58, pp. 47–54.
- Liu, S. Q. and Kozan, E., 2016, New Graph-Based Algorithms to Efficiently Solve Large Scale Open Pit Mining Optimisation Problems, Expert Systems With Applications, Vol. 43, pp. 59–65.
- Magassouba, M., 2006, OK Block Model versus MIK Block Model: Optimization of the Profit Cut-off at the Northern Nevada Pit, USA, Master thesis, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.
- Menabde, M., Foyland, G., Stone, P., Yeates, G., 2004, Mining Schedule Optimisation for Conditionally Simulated Orebodies, Proceeding of the International Symposium on Orebody Modelling and Strategic Mine Planning: Uncertainty and Risk Management, Perth, WA, 22–24 November, pp. 347–352.
- Picard, J.C., 1976, Maximal Closure of a Graph and Applications to Combinatorial Problems, Journal of Management Science, Vol. 22, pp. 1268–1272.
- Ramazan, S., 2007, The New Fundamental Tree Algorithm for Production Scheduling of Open Pit Mines, European Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 177, pp. 1153–1166.
- Ramazan, S. and Dimitrakopoulos, R., 2007, Stochastic Optimization of Long Term Production Scheduling for Open Pit Mines with a New Integer Programming Formulation, The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Vol. 14, pp. 385–392.
- Souza, M.J.F., Coelho, I.M., Ribas, S., Santos, H.G., 2010,

- Merschmann, L.H.C. A Hybrid Heuristic Algorithm for the Open-Pit Mining Operational Planning Problem, European Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 207, pp. 1041–1051.
- Tolwinski, B. and Underwood, R., 1996, A Scheduling Algorithm for Open Pit Mines, IMA Journal of Management Mathematics, Vol. 7, pp. 247–270.
- Underwood, R. and Tolwinski, B., 1998, A Mathematical Programming Viewpoint for Solving the Ultimate Pit Problem, European Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 107, pp. 96–107.
- Yamatomi, J., Mogi, G., Akaike, A., Yamaguchi, U., 1995, Selective Extraction Dynamic Cone Algorithm for Three-Dimensional Open Pit Designs, Proceeding of the 25th International APCOM Symposium, Brisbane, Australia, 9–14 July, pp. 264–274.
- Zhao, Y. and Kim, Y.C., 1992, A New Ultimate Pit Limit Design Algorithm. Proceeding of the International 23rd APCOM Symposium, Tucson, Arizona, USA, 7–11 April, pp. 423–434.

광물 가격의 변동에 따른 노천광산 최적 경계의 불확실성 분석 및 가시화

백지은

부경대학교 대학원 에너지자원공학과

요 약

본 연구에서는 광물 가격의 변동으로 인해 노천채광장 경계 최적화 결과에 나타나는 불확실성을 정량적으로 표현할 수 있는 방법을 제시하였다. 과거 광물 가격에 대한 자료들을 기반으로 몬테카를로 시뮬레이션을 통해 다수의 광물 가격들을 생성한 후, 이들로부터 도출된 다수의 노천채광장 경계 최적화 결과들을 하나로 통합하여 불확실성을 나타내는 확률모델을 형성하였다. 제시된 방법을 구리·아연 복합광상에 적용한 결과 지난 10년간 구리와 아연 가격의 변동성을 고려할 때 연구지역 노천채광장 경계 최적화 결과에 큰 불확실성이 존재한다는 것을 확인할 수 있었다. 또한, 구리와 아연 가격이 현재의 기준 가격보다 상승하거나 하락할 경우 광상을 나타내는 각각의 블록들이 노천채광장의 최적 경계 안에 포함될 확률을 정량화할 수 있었다. 이러한 확률 값들을 이용하여 신뢰수준에 따른 광상의 reserve를 추정하였다. 신뢰 수준을 90%로 설정할 때 reserve는 약 76,000톤으로 추정되며, 신뢰 수준을 50% 이상으로 설정할 경우에는 reserve가 약 2,550,000톤으로 추정되었다. 이를 통해 본 연구에서 제안한

방법이 등급에 따른 광상의 reserve 추정 시에도 활용될 수 있는 가능성을 확인할 수 있었다.

주요어: 불확실성, 노천채광장 경계 최적화, Monte Carlo 시뮬레이션, 수익 지수, 매장량 추정

