























Some Predictions of the Club of Rome (1972)

- Gold would have been depleted about 1980
- Tin would have been exhausted in 1989
- Lead and Zinc would have been exhausted in the 1990s
- · We have just used our last bit of Copper
- ${\boldsymbol{\cdot}}$ We are about to use our last drop of Oil
- · Most mineral deposits would have been exhausted by now

FACTS

• We have not run out of anything yet

• Reserves of Copper, for example, at the end of the twentieth century are greater than they were at the beginning













com mane win need a me chine supply of	
365Kg of Lead	
345 Kg of Zinc	
680 Kg of Copper	
1633 Kg of Aluminium	
15 tonnes of Iron	
12 tonnes of Clay	
13 tonnes of Salt	
560 tonnes of Stone, Sand, Gravel and Cement	
ot of the high tech elements as he/she grows up	
source of energy: Could it be Nuclear Power?	
1	345 Kg of Zinc 680 Kg of Copper 1633 Kg of Aluminium 15 tonnes of Iron 12 tonnes of Clay 13 tonnes of Salt 560 tonnes of Stone, Sand, Gravel and Cement lot of the high tech elements as he/she grows up source of energy: Could it be Nuclear Power?





Country	Mineral	% Global Production
Austria	Magnesite	4%
Czech Republic	Diatomite	2%
	Feldspar	3%
	Kaolinite	3%
Finland	Mica (Flake)	20%
	Talc	7%

ignincant	European Mi	neral Production
Country	Mineral	% Global Production
France	Arsenic	1.5%
	Cobalt (New Caledonia)	3%
	Diatomite	4%
	Feldspar	4%
	Gypsum	4%
	Mica (Flake)	3%
	Nickel (New Caledonia)	10%
	Pumice	2.5%
	Salt	3%
	Silicon	3.5%

Country	Mineral	% Global Production
ermany	Barite	1%
	Diatomite	2.5%
	Feldspar	1%
	Gypsum	1.5%
	Kaolinite	10%
	Potash	5%
	Salt	7%

.g		
Country	Mineral	% Global Production
Greece	Nickel	1%
	Magnesite	3%
Ireland	Lead	1%
Italy	Diatomite	1%
	Feldspar	25%
	Gypsum	1%
	Pumice	25%
	Sulphur	1%
	Also the leading	producer of polished stone
Netherlands	Salt	2%

0	Minanal	
Country	Mineral	% Global Production
Norway	Ilmenite	7%
	Flake Mica	7%
	Silicon	3%
Poland	Copper	3%
	Feldspar	2%
	Gypsum	1%
	Lead	1%
	Salt	2%
	Silver	6.5%
	Sulphur	2%

Country	Mineral	% Global Production
Portugal	Tungsten	1%
Romania	Salt	1%
Slovakia	Magnesite	2%
Sweden	Iron	1.3%
	Lead	2%
UK	Kaolinite	6%
	Gypsum	2%
	Salt	3%

Country	Mineral	% Global Production
Spain	Diatomite	1.5%
	Feldspar	3.5%
	Fluorspar	3%
	Gypsum	10%
	Magnesite	3%
	Potash	1.5%
	Pumice	3%
	Salt	1%
	Silicon	1%
	Strontium	33%

Country	Mineral	% Global Production	Mineral	% Global Production
Russia	Antimony	3%	Flake Mica	30%
	Arsenic	2.5%	Sheet Mica	30%
	Asbestos	4.5%	Molybdenum	1%
	Bauxite	3.5%	Nickel	20%
	Cadmium	6%	Platinum	12%
	Cobalt	7.5%	Palladium	41%
	Copper	5%	Phosphate Rock	7%
	Industrial Diamonds	20%	Potash	12%
	Gem Diamonds	34.5%	Salt	1%
	Diatomite	4%	Silicon	10%
	Fluorspar	4%	Sulphur	10%
	Gypsum	1.5%	Tin	1.6%
	Iron	6%	Tungsten	4%
	Lithium	9%	Vanadium	27%
	Magnesite	7%	Vermiculite	5%









		CHINA – Iron	
<		Production 2007 (t)	% of Global Production
	Iron Ore	600,000,000	30%
	Pig Iron	419,000,000	38%
	Raw Steel	482,000,000	37%
	Major irc • Brazil – 360 • Australia – • India – 160 • Russia-110	on ore producers 0,000,000 (19%) 320,000,000 (17%) 0,000,000 (9%) mt (6%)	Ø.

		CHINA	A – Meta	als 🥤		
		Production 2007 (tonnes)	% of Global Production	Chinese Reserv <mark>es</mark> (tonnes)	% of Global Reserves	
	Antimony	110,000	82%	2,400,000	56%	
5	Arsenic	<mark>30</mark> ,000	50%	Not available		
\sim	Bismuth	3,000	53%	4 <mark>70,000</mark>	69%	
	Cadmium	3,400,000	17%	280,000,000	25%	ζ.
	Vanadium	RSA 23,500	39%	12,000,000	32%	
	, and a later of the later of t	China 18,500	32%	14,000,000	36%	
	Tungsten	77,000	87%	4,200,000	70%	
	Tin	130,000	43%	3,500,000	30% 🧹	
	Magnesium Metal	550,000	82%	Virtually unlimited		
	Mercury	1100	73%	Not known	5	A
	Lead	1,320,000	37%	36,000,000	21%	$\langle \rangle$
	Zinc	2,800,000	28%	92,000,000	19%	
	Molybdenum	46,000	25%	8,300,000	44%	

2	Production 2007 (tonnes)	% of Global Production	Chinese Reserves (tonnes)	% of Global Reserves	
Abrasives Fused Al Oxide	700,000	59%			
Barite	4,400,000	45% 55%	360,000,000	41%	
Fluorspar	2,750,000	52%	110,000,000	23%	يري ج
Graphite	720,000	70%	140,000,000	67%	•
Lime (CaO)	170,000,000	61%	V large globally		
Magnesite	1,350,000	31%	860,000,000	24% _	
Strontium	190,000	32%			
Talc	2,500,000	31%	V Large	1	
Phosphates	35,000,000	24%	13,000,000,000	26%	

	<i>(</i>	CHIN	IA – High	Tech I	Elements		
5	-		Production 2007 (tonnes)	% of Global Production	Chinese Reserves (tonnes)	% of Global Reserves	
Gallium Leading producer of world production at 80 tonnet					tonnes		
-		Germanium	Germanium China 27%, second to Canada 29% of 87 tonnes, 2004				
		Indium	250t	50%	10,000t	60%	
		Rare Earth Elements	120,000t	97%	89,000,000	59%	
		Silicon	2,900,000	58%	No figures a	vailable	
		Yttrium	8,800t	98%	240,000	40%	
		and a second sec					₹.

		Chir	na – Precio	us Meta	ls
			Production 2007	% Production	Global Production
\int	GOLD	RSA	270t	11%	5 4
		Australia	280t	11%	2500t
-		China	250t	10%	
		USA	240t	9%	
	SILVER	Peru	3400t	17%	
		Mexico	3000t	15%	20,500t
		China	2700t	14%	5 3
		and the			5





Rank	Nation	Total k tonnes of CO ₂	Emissions as % of Chinese CaCO breakdown
3	Russia	1,524,993	178
6 🗖	Germany	808,767	94
8 🍽	United Kingdom	587,261	68
10	Italy	449,948	52
15	France	373,693	44
17 🚨	Spain	330,497	39
21	Poland	307,238	36
30	Netherlands	142,061	17
34	Czech Republic	116,991	14
36 📕	Belgium	100,716	12
39	Greece	96,695	11
40	Romania	90,425	11
41	Norway	87,602	10
46	Austria	69,846	8
48 🛨	Finland	65,799	8
52 🚺	Portugal	58,906	7
53	Hungary	57,183	7
56 🖶	Sweden	53,033	6
57	Denmark	52,956	6
60	Bulgaria	42,558	5
61	Ireland	42,353	5
64	Switzerland	40,457	5
67 🗳	Slovakia	36,289	4
71	Azerbaijan	31,365	4

		1			
	CHINA – Coal				
China	2000	2004	2006		
Anthracite	175,727,200	220,000,000	267,000,000		
Bituminous Coal	780,669,000	1,690,000,0 <mark>00</mark>	2,052,000,000		
Lignite	42,773,600	50,000,000	61,000,000		
Total	999,169,800	1,960,000,000	2,380,000,000		
USA	2000	2004	2006		
Anthracite	4,148,000	1,540,000	1,374,000		
Bituminous Coal	520,974,000	495,870,000	512,189,000		
Sub-Bituminous	371,223,000	435,090,000	463,669,000		
Lignite	77,620,000	75,750,000	76,430,000		
Total	973,965,000	1,008,250,000	1,053,662,000		
and S			Source (BGS)		

















What is the collateral?

Normally not much more than options on exploration targets which may or may not have undergone some exploratory drilling. The legal status of those properties is critical as is an indication of the value of a mineable discovery.













Does this always happen? NO!!!

EAGE

The property is sometimes used as a Stock Market vehicle where the directors of the company publish unverifiable favourable results to attract the greedy and unwary investor who is looking for a quick return. This results in a rise in the share price and those that invested low will sell and make a profit. Mass selling results in a drop in share price and the original investor can repurchase the same volume of shares back and have cash to spare. Short trading is where an individual sells his shares and then makes public unfavourable remarks about the property to depress the share price at which point he re-purchases his original share volume at a lower price and makes money. This is all legal.

Investors beware!







































How can this risk be reduced?

EAGE

- 1. A full feasibility study must be undertaken
- 2. This should be followed by a full sensitivity analysis
- 3. There should also be an independent Due Diligence Study
- 4. There should also be in place factors of financial risk management and possibly risk sharing

However, if the basic Geological Investigation has not been undertaken in a completely thorough and professional manner, all of these studies are, at the best, meaningless, and at the worst misleading, because they add an air of security to an insecure situation. Errors in the Geology are multiplied and their effect magnified through the other investigations and their effects can be disastrous. In the end it all comes down to an as accurate as possible estimate of the mineral and rock in the ground. <u>In</u> this business investors are buying chunks of Geology and if they do not understand that Geology thoroughly the investment is foolhardy.







Production	logist	Ratio of ge to pro	eologists duction re	estimates esults	
	Geo	Tons of Ore	U ₃ O ₈ (%)	U ₃ O ₈ (lb)	
Results	1	154	335	514	
Tons of Ore – 9063	2	66	673	442	
U ₃ O ₈ - 0.26 %	3	58	442	255	
	4	88	638	560	
	5	133	608	808	
	6	27	642	176	
	7	106	562	598	
	8	38	569	215	





Geology of the Palabora Igneous Complex -2

Loolekop Body (1.4km x 0.8km)

The ultrabasic core consists of:

• Phoscorite (Foskorite) – an olivine apatite rock with magnetite and Phlogopite – $(K,H)_3Mg_3Al(SiO_4)_3$. In the weathered zone Pholgopite has altered to Hydrophlogopite and Vermiculite.

Banded Carbonatite: Magnesium Calcite, Magnetite, and Apatite

• Transgresive Carbonatite forced into the shattered core of the banded Carbonatite.

• These are the host rocks to the copper sulphides Apatite, Titaniferous Magnetite plus Uranothorianite $[(Th,U)O_2]$, and Baddeleyite (ZnO_2) .



Geology of the Palabora Igneous Complex -3

Loolekop Body (1.4km x 0.8km)

Occurrence of Metals:

• Copper bearing mineralising fluids migrated along fractures within the Carbonatites and deposited copper sulphides in several cycles.

• First cycle pre-dates the younger Carbonatite and is mainly Bornite.

• Second phase was Chalcopyrite in veinlets up to 1cm wide and less than one meter in length: these occur in zones up to 10m wide.

• Valleriite $[CuFeS_2]$ 1.57-1.70 $[Mg,Al,Fe(OH)_2]$ occurs in a broad shear zone crossing the body. It is a highly variable late stage mineral that occurs as replacement intergrowths and coatings along grain boundaries, cracks, and cleavage planes in the other copper sulphides and in the gangue minerals.





Information Required for the Resource Assessment

The basic estimate was to be made primarily on the copper content since this was the metal of main interest and the economics of the mine were essentially dependent on copper.

- Total tonnage of ore and waste with corresponding Cu grade
- How much ore would contain +5% P₂O₅.
- How much ore would contain +2% ${\rm TiO}_2$ in Magnetite.
- + How much ore would contain 1.0-1.99% TiO_2 in Magnetite.
- How much ore would contain 0-0.99% ${\rm TiO_2}$ in Magnetite.

Metallurgists needed to know the expected production of high and low phosphate ore and waste and annual high and low Titanium Magnetite from the copper ore in order to design the processing plants.

Information Required for the Resource Assessment

A full assessment would also have information on the following:

• The distribution, grade variation and average grade of Uranothorianite

- The distribution, grade variation and average grade of Baddeleyite
- The distribution and quality of the Vermiculite and Phlogopite

• The amount of Phoscorite that would be recovered as part of the mining operation because a neighbouring Phoscorite processing plant would except the material. This ceased to be waste rock but part of the mineral inventory of the mine.



Assessment Investigations -2 EAGE Geologists produced manually 13 sections and projected the data onto bench plans for the proposed mine. The volume of data became far too great to handle in this manner and pioneering computer programmes were written to produce the estimates and plans for the proposed mine. On the basis of all this data an open pit mine was proposed with surface dimensions of 1500m x 900m and to an initial depth of 360m though eventually the pit extended to a depth of 822m. An initial estimate gave 315Mt of ore averaging 0.69% Cu with a cut-off at 0.3% Cu. These design parameters were based on the geology, geotechnics, mining methods, mineral processing and economics. It took a team of Geologists and Engineers over 5 years to carry out this work







Non technical factors to be evaluated before a mineral resource can be considered as a mineral reserve.

Environmental: the degree of significance is dependent on locality

EAGE

- 1. Competition for land use: e.g.Farming
- 2. Conservation
- 3. Pollution
- 4. Environmental Impact of the operation.

Economic: In addition to all costs associated with exploitation

- 1. Government Regulations:- Taxes and/or subsidies
- 2. Location and availability of transport infrastructure
- 3. Land costs
- 4. Availability of water, power, skilled labour etc.
- 5. Economic forecasts for the mineral/metal
- 6. Price (Stability) and Market (no market = no ore body)











Some Concluding Points

• All calculations and subsequent evaluation is based on the understanding of the geology. If the geological model is wrong all that follows will be flawed. The basis of the geological model is good mapping, thorough and accurate core logging, accurate and careful sampling and an intelligent interpretation of the data.

• The mining engineer and the mineral processors require accurate information from the geologists in order to undertake their work accurately. In turn, all feasibility studies and economic assessment of the project will rely on the combined information produced by this multi-disciplinary professional team. It is on the basis of their results that hundreds of millions of dollars are invested.

• All codes for the reporting of reserves and resources require the people undertaking those estimates to be fully qualified and competent persons.



