The paper offers some thoughts on the linkages between Reconciliation and Operational Excellence.

**Reconciliation and Operational Excellence (OpEx)**

The author takes the view that a close, credible Actual and Predicted match all along the mining value chain provides compelling evidence that the operation has realised true Operational Excellence.

However, the OpEx status should apply only to an operation capable of sustaining over time a high level of achievement in terms of production, performance, risk management and reconciliation.

In practice, a strong continuous improvement culture and commitment to performance must pervade the whole operation for the OpEx status to be successfully sustained.

**Planning vs. Production Processes**

Reconciliation creates a common space where planning and production processes come face to face, share experiences and actively interplay.

1. An Actual vs. Predicted gap follows from a problem with planning or a problem with the execution of the plan and quite commonly from a combination of both!

2. Reconciliation is not only a well-recognised *lagging indicator* of performance but also a gap management mechanism whereby root causes are identified and the gap reduced over time through a combination of incremental improvements, optimisation and process re-engineering.

**CTP → CTS¹ Cause-Effect Relationships**

The aim of a *cause-effect analysis of performance* is to identify the factors / parameters having the greatest impact on process performance. Such CTP → CTS cause-effect relationships may explain (part of) an Actual vs. Predicted gap.

*Leading indicators* derived from CTP → CTS relationships would pick up an opening gap and trigger countermeasures that eliminate the cause of the gap or prevent the gap from running out of control.

**Geology (G) Mining (M) and Plant (P) should operate as a single entity**

Over the years, the G M and P departments have come to actively collaborate at the feasibility stage.

At the production stage, G M and P rely on each other’s performance to achieve their own goals. Why then do they often show a siloed behaviour which not only puts at risk credible reconciliation but also, and more importantly, potentially prevents the whole operation from performing better?

Where a problem starts is often not where the performance gap surfaces e.g. poor orebody knowledge can lead to increased dilution and oversize, and sub-optimal stockpiling, which then upset the plant and reduces metal recovery. G M P operating as a team should make the identification of meaningful leading indicators a lot easier.

**Internal and External “Customers” of Reconciliation**

Internal customers include the G M P entity, site management and corporate who all benefit from good reconciliation practices, each with their own focus, priorities and expectations.

External customers include shareholders, potential investors and financial institutions who are increasingly requesting more accurate reporting on operational performance and Resources-Reserves.

The paper makes reference to the AMIRA P-754 project and goes on to emphasize that *end-to-end* reconciliation should become an aspect of good corporate governance.

---

¹ CTP: Critical to Process, CTS: Critical to Satisfaction

Copyright © 2014 Omega Geo-Consulting Pty Ltd
PO Box 7646 - Cloisters Square - WA 6850 - Australia - +61 8 9367 8770 - www.OmegaGeo.com – August 2014