

Old soils, new targets: Reassessing historic soil surveys with Ultra-Fine+® in a machine-learned landscape context

Anicia Henne¹, Ryan Noble¹, Dave Cole², Morgan Williams¹, Fang Huang¹ and Alfredo López Alfageme³

¹CSIRO Mineral Resources, ARRC Building, 26 Dick Perry Avenue, Kensington, WA 6151, Australia

²CSIRO's Data61, Research Way, Clayton, VIC 3168, Australia

³CSIRO Chile International Centre of Excellence, Avda Apoquindo 4700 piso 9, Las Condes, Santiago, Chile

INTRODUCTION

Greenfields mineral exploration in covered terrain is often hindered by a failure to detect, understand, and evaluate near-surface geochemical anomalies. This is due to several challenges including in the detection of relevant trace metals in cover (e.g., due to dilution or differential concentration), the availability of sufficient information (e.g., additional pathfinder elements and soil properties), and an understanding of landscape context to enable exploration based on informed decision-making processes.

Between 2012 and 2018, the UltraFine+® method was designed specifically to address the challenges of detecting a suite of 52 elements in shallow transported cover (Noble *et al.* 2020a) by Australia's National Science Agency, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). Over the past three years the CSIRO, with the support of many industry sponsors and Australian State and Territory geological surveys, developed a machine learning workflow to create landscape context for these results. Here we highlight some of the main developments of this approach to assist future research and development in soil geochemical analysis and interpretation.

Surface geochemical signatures of mobile metals relating to mineralisation below (or within) cover are often diluted and close to, or below, analytical detection limits (Anand *et al.* 2016) and improvement in soil sample analysis has commonly focussed on lowering detection limits by developing more sensitive extraction methods or partial extractions on bulk samples (e.g., Chao 1984; Bajc 1998; Gray *et al.* 1999). The UltraFine+® method focusses on extracting the clay-sized fraction (<2 µm; Noble *et al.* 2020a) from a standard soil sample which hosts the bulk of useful indicator elements, as these are preferentially adsorbed on clay-sized particles and other "scavenging" phases with large surface areas (e.g., organic compounds and various oxides/oxyhydroxides; Hall 1998). By removing the majority of the coarse-grained "barren" (usually silica-dominated) portion of a soil sample, the geochemical signal of mobile trace metals is increased, effectively enhancing measured abundances by up to 100 – 250 % of elements such as Au, Cu and Zn (Noble *et al.* 2018).

Regardless of the advanced method of extraction, significant value can be added by improving the interpretation of surface geochemical surveys in landscape context. In mineral exploration, the composition of the sampled regolith material, its position within the landscape, its genetic relationship to the bedrock hosting potential mineralisation (in situ vs. transported cover) and the depth of this cover (Anand *et al.* 2016) can affect the way metals move through the environment and impact how we interpret the data. However, these aspects are not always appropriately considered during surface exploration. Recently, the CSIRO has developed a machine learning workflow referred to as "Next Gen Analytics", to delineate landscape context for surface geochemical survey results. This approach uses exclusively publicly-available spatial features derived from remotely sensed data with the goal to normalise geochemical concentrations by landscape type. This enables the comparison of samples across vast regions with varying landscapes in greenfields exploration settings.

Here we examine historically collected samples from a greenfields soil survey over 3600 km² in Western Australia collected in 1999, and illustrate some key advances that UltraFine+® delivered in 2018, and the Next Gen Analytics approach delivered in 2023 (Fig. 1). The comparison shows the benefits of improved sensitivity of gold and other elements for analyses (Fig. 1B) with the addition of multielement interpretation and the ability to highlight geochemical anomalies within different landscape types (Fig. 1C). Importantly, Next Gen Analytics identifies anomalies in transported cover types where the measured elemental abundances are commonly lower compared to the whole survey, but anomalous relative to soils collected in similar landscape settings (Fig. 1C). While landscape/regolith/landform maps are available for many regions in Australia, these are often produced at coarse resolutions, are derived from aerial photography and, in some cases, supplemented by limited on-the-ground observations, and do not take depth of cover into consideration. Above all, they are prone to human inconsistencies in interpretation. Using machine learning to derive landscapes from remotely sensed spatial features allows this approach to be employed in most regions, even where traditional map products are not available or only available at a coarse resolution (as is often the case when explorers advance into true greenfields settings).

oreas 
certified reference materials

LEADING THE CHARGE

With over 100 battery metal ore CRMs in our range and plans to extend this offering to over 150 CRMs by 2024, it's time to fully charge your QC programs with premium OREAS CRMs. Available worldwide. **Find everything you need at [oreas.com](https://www.oreas.com)**

AVAILABLE WORLDWIDE

All OREAS CRM metal concentrations are representative of global mine production and exploration targets.

Commodity	Current No. CRMs	Coming Soon No. CRMs
LITHIUM	5	
NICKEL	22	6
GRAPHITE	4	
COBALT	17	6
COPPER	52	32
MANGANESE	7	
TIN	3	3
RARE EARTHS	6	2
VANADIUM		2

WE CELEBRATE



 48-HOUR SHIPPING

WORLDWIDE [oreas.com](https://www.oreas.com) | NORTH AMERICA [oreas.ca](https://www.oreas.ca)

EXPLORE

Newsletter No. 198

March 2023

Editor:

Beth McClenaghan (bethmcclenaghan@sympatico.ca)

Business Manager:

Steve Cook, explorenewsletter@gmail.com

Back Issues: AAG Website (www.appliedgeochemists.org)

EXPLORE is published quarterly by the Association of Applied Geochemists, P.O. Box 26099, 72 Robertson Road, Ottawa, ON Canada K2H 9R0.

EXPLORE is a trademark of the Association of Applied Geochemists.

Type and layout of EXPLORE: Vivian Heggie, Thornton, CO (303) 288-6540; vjmheggie@comcast.net

EXPLORE Newsletter Advertising Rates (Effective Jan. 2021)

ANNUAL CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP	USD	CAD
Full year	\$2,500	\$3,275
<i>Includes: Access to AAG membership list Company logo on front cover 20% off advertising rates</i>		

ADVERTISING RATES – PER ISSUE (QUARTERLY)	USD	CAD
Full page 241h x 190w mm (9.5h x 7.5w in)	\$1,350	\$1,775
Half page 241h x 89w mm (9.5h x 3.5w in) or 124h x 190w mm (4¾h x 7.5w in)	\$750	\$980
1/3 page 241h x 51w mm (9.5h x 2w in) or 178h x 89w mm (7h x 3.5w in)	\$600	\$785
1/4 page 124h x 89w mm (4¾h x 3.5w in) or 241h x 41w mm (9.5h x 1¾w in)	\$425	\$555
1/8 page 60h x 89w mm (2¾h x 3.5w in)	\$75	\$100

Please direct advertising inquiries to:
Steve Cook (explorenewsletter@gmail.com)

Notes from the Editor

Welcome to the first **EXPLORE** issue of 2023. This issue features an article describing the reassessment of historic soil surveys using UltraFine+® in a machine-learned landscape context and was written by Anicia Henne, Ryan Noble, Dave Cole, Morgan Williams, Fang Huang, and Alfredo López Alfageme. Also, check out the biographies and photographs of our new AAG Councillors for 2023-2024.

EXPLORE thanks all those who contributed to the writing and/or editing of this issue including: Elizabeth Ambrose, Steve Amor, Al Arsenault, John Carranza, David Leng, Paul Morris, Jessey Rice, and Dave Smith.

Beth McClenaghan
Editor

Steve Cook,
Business Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Old soils, new targets: Reassessing historic soil surveys with UltraFine+® in a machine-learned landscape context.....	1
Notes from the Editor.....	3
President's Report.....	4
AAG Councillors, 2023-2024.....	22
Back to the Future: Airborne Geology and Many Related Topics.....	24
Recently Published in Elements.....	24
New Release: Surficial geology of northern Canada.....	25
Calendar of Events.....	25

ADVERTISERS

Activation Laboratories Ltd.....	4
ALS Global.....	26
Bruno Lemièrè.....	10
Bureau Veritas Minerals.....	23
CDN Resource Laboratories.....	9
Evident-Olympus.....	7
Lab West.....	22
MSA Labs.....	27
OREAS Certified Reference Materials.....	2
Overburden Drilling Management.....	4
SGS.....	3

Geochemistry Testing

Trusted.
Independent.
Committed.

Unparalleled analytical support, where and when you need it

Our network of commercial, mobile and mine-site laboratories provides consistency across an unparalleled number of countries and mining camps. Our one team approach incorporates a global network of experienced managers and highly skilled assayers, utilizing state-of-the-art equipment to provide you with accurate analysis at fast turnaround times.

We are available where and when you need us.

NAM.NATURALRESOURCES@SGS.COM
WWW.SGS.CA/MINING

SGS

Paid Advertisement



President's Report

The start of 2023 brings us five AAG Council members who will serve two-year terms from January 2023 to December 2024. They are: Paul Morris (2nd term), Ryan Noble (2nd term), Pim van Geffen (2nd term), Ray Lett (1st term), and Aaron Baensch (1st term). I would like to thank Paul, Ryan and Pim for standing for another two-year term on Council, and Ray and Aaron for agreeing to serve a new term on Council. For Ryan and Paul, this will be their fourth time on Council, as well as having served as past Presidents of the AAG. For Pim, this will be his second time on Council. For Ray, this will be his third time on Council, the previous times were in 1998–1999 and 2015–2017, as well as having served as past Secretary of the AAG.


For Aaron, this will be his first time on Council. The important work of running the AAG is done by the Council and its various committees. I encourage Fellows to nominate for the period 2024–2025, and Ordinary members to upgrade to Fellow status so that they can stand for Council and help determine the future direction of the AAG.

As our Members and Fellows may or may not be aware, our AAG website lists links to geochemical atlases (<https://www.appliedgeochemists.org/resources/geochemical-atlases>). These are maps or databases that provide regional coverage for a given media type (soil, sediment, groundwater, rocks, etc.) at a broad scale. They often cover a whole country or a larger region. They may be designed for the needs of mineral exploration, agriculture, land planning or risk management, but in most cases, they may also be used for other purposes. They are most useful for interpreting geochemical anomalies as well as for identifying local pollution. I would like to acknowledge two recent additions to our collection, namely Geochemical Atlas of Sweden and Geochemical Atlas of Cyprus, and I would like to thank Dr Martiya Sadeghi (Geological Survey of Sweden) and Dr Andreas Zissimos (Geological Survey Department, Cyprus) for letting us publish the links to respective geochemical atlases of their country on our AAG website.

Available now for download by anyone from our AAG Publications webpage (<https://www.appliedgeochemists.org/publications>) is the Barringer book “Back to the Future: Airborne Geochemistry and Many Related Topics” by P.M.D. Bradshaw, which was published by the AAG in 2015. This book documents the many advances in geochemical theory, as well as the ground, airborne and remote sensing techniques plus analytical methods that were conceived and developed under the leadership of Dr. Anthony (Tony) Barringer. I encourage our Members and Fellows to forward this information, as well as that of “Writing Geochemical Reports”, to non-AAG members who are likely to benefit from these publications.

After the successful 29th IAGS (International Applied Geochemistry Symposium) in Viña del Mar, Chile, last October 23–28, 2022, we are now awaiting from the proponents the final proposal for the 30th IAGS to be held in Adelaide, Australia, in 2024. The provisional local organizing committee is currently discussing their proposal with Dave Cohen (Chair, AAG Symposia Committee) and Yulia Uvarova (AAG Vice President).

John Carranza
President



A global company with local full laboratory presence for over 30 years.

Complete Assay and Geochemical Services,
Mineralogy, Metallurgy, Environmental,
On-site Laboratories and more.

actlabs.com



**Heavy Mineral
Extractions**



**Geochron and Indicator Minerals
from Rocks and Sediments**

Clean liberation of mineral grains by
Electric-Pulse Disaggregation (EPD)

Overburden Drilling Management
www.odm.ca odm@storm.ca
(613) 226-1771



Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 1




Fig. 1: Key developments in soil sample analysis and interpretation over the past two decades on the example of Au in the Kingston project area in Western Australia. The same soil samples were analysed in 2000 and in 2018, and later interpreted in machine learning derived landscape context in 2023. Mt Eureka, the only mined Au occurrence within the survey area, is indicated with a green star. (A) Gold results analysed by the Geological Survey of Western Australia in 2000 (Pye et al., 2000) via a traditional soil sample analytical fire assay fusion method from <2 mm to > 0.45 mm sieved soil that was milled to a nominal <75 µm size. Only 111 samples out of 302 returned Au above the detection limit with the traditional soil analysis method. Of these, 93 samples were at the detection limit (1 ppb) and only 18 samples showed appreciable Au concentrations. (B) Gold analytical results of the same 302 archived soil samples via the UltraFine+® analytical method in 2018 (Noble et al. 2020b). The same samples returned detectable Au in most samples with the Ultra-Fine+® method – 38 samples were below the detection limit (0.5 ppb), and 2 samples were at the detection limit. (C) Gold outliers identified in the 2018 UltraFine+® dataset, where outliers are derived for each proxy landscape type with the Next Gen Analytics machine learning workflow (see details in text below). Two new potential targets have been identified in transported cover which show relatively low concentrations (4.6 and 4.8 ppb Au) compared to the highest values (up to 8.6 ppb).

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 5

Study Site – Kingston

Our case study covers the southern half of the Kingston 1:250,000 topographic map sheet in the Northern Goldfields of Western Australia. The area straddles the north-eastern edge of the highly prospective Yilgarn Craton (dominated by granites and greenstones) and extends into the Earahedy Basin (dominated by shales interbedded with iron formation of the Frere Formation; Fig. 2). Surface geochemical exploration within this area has largely focused on orogenic Au and komatiite-hosted Ni mineralisation, both hosted within the greenstone belts (<https://minedex.dmirs.wa.gov.au/web/home>) and, to date, only the Mount Eureka Au mine has been developed within the area (Fig. 2). The small deposit produced 941 t of ore from 1932 – 1937, with quartz-vein associated mineralisation hosted in silicified talc-carbonate schist within mafic greenstone (Pye *et al.* 2000). In recent years, industry has shown interest in VMS-style Cu-Zn deposits within the region (<https://www.roxresources.com.au/projects/mt-fisher-gold-project/>).




Fig. 2: Location of case study site, samples collected by the GSWA in 1999 and reanalysed via the UltraFine+[®] method in 2017, and simplified geology of part of the Kingston map sheet (after Martin *et al.* 2014). Tenement distribution indicates current (as of 20 February 2023) exploration activities within the area are focused on greenstone and sedimentary units. Recorded mineral occurrences are concentrated within the ultramafic and mafic greenstone units.

The bedrock in the area is largely concealed by transported cover over almost 85 % of the area with few exposed or residual weathered regolith materials (Pye *et al.* 2000; Fig. 3A). The transported cover is dominated by broad sheetwash plains and valleys incised by channels, sandplain and colluvial materials with minor lacustrine (playas), alluvial and eolian deposits (Fig. 3B). The cover materials have been characterised in detail in a study by the Geological Survey of Western Australia (GSWA) in 1999 noting remnants of major drainage systems that are either calcrete-dominated or characterised by dunes and alluvial channels associated with playa-lake systems (Pye *et al.* 2000). In the same study, the GSWA also analysed almost 1000 samples across the Kingston map sheet which were archived at the GSWA's core storage facility and subsequently made available for reanalysis via the UltraFine+[®] analytical method (published in Noble *et al.* 2020a). The availability of these analytical results from a variety of different regolith materials, in conjunction with the detailed regolith mapping carried out by the GSWA, made the Kingston map sheet a useful location to trial and improve the Ultra-Fine+[®] method as well as the Next Gen Analytics approach.

continued on page 8



Vanta™ Portable XRF

Obtain rapid, repeatable results using rugged elemental analyzers.

Rugged

Drop tested

IP54/IP55 rated for dust and water resistance

Wide operating temperature range (-10 °C to 50 °C or 14 °F to 122 °F)

Trusted

Axon Technology™ for accurate, repeatable results

Thousands of Vanta analyzers in use around the world

Supported

Global technical support and service

3-year comprehensive warranty

To learn more about Vanta portable XRF, visit Olympus-IMS.com/Vanta.

OLYMPUS®

Evident, the Evident logo, Vanta, and Axon Technology are trademarks of Evident Corporation or its subsidiaries.

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 6




Fig. 3: Regolith maps over the Kingston area. (A) Regolith geology regimes map (de Souza Kovacs and Jakica 2021) based on the RED scheme of Anand *et al.* (1993) where regolith landform units are classified into three major regimes (residual, erosional and depositional) relating to their composition and landscape position. (B) Simplified regolith landform map (Jakica *et al.* 2020) which expands the RED regimes into more detail regarding dominant mechanisms of formation or parent material.

2000 – Historic soil sampling survey and regolith mapping

The GSWA collected almost 1000 regolith samples from stream sediments, sheetwash/soil, lake sediments and sandplain materials in the Kingston map sheet as part of an extensive regional study in 1999. These samples were sieved to < 2 mm to >0.45 mm, pulverised and analysed using seven different analytical methods to derive 49 geochemical and physicochemical parameters including major and trace elements, pH, and conductivity. The methods and analytical results are documented in Pye *et al.* (2000). The GSWA also provided a regolith map, laboriously generated by combining information from topographic data, black-and-white aerial photographs (dated 1974 and 1993), Landsat Thematic Mapper images (dated 1994), previous geological maps (Bunting 1980, 1986; Myers and Hocking 1998) as well as geochemical regolith survey results and field observations (one per 16 km²) collected by six geologists and six field assistants using two helicopters. Airborne radiometric and magnetic data were also consulted (Pye *et al.* 2000). The resulting map is available in McGuinness and Pye (2000).

The work of the GSWA characterised regolith materials as well as indicated the abundance of metals of interest on the Kingston map sheet (Pye *et al.* 2000). Given the analysed size fraction was >0.45 mm, it was expected that the results would show lower concentrations than analyses via UltraFine+. Indeed, for Au, 94% of the data was at or below the detection limit (1 ppb). Only 18 of the 302 samples returned Au above the detection limit with the traditional soil analysis method. Where detected, concentrations were generally low (Au ≤4 ppb) with the highest values recorded in cover over mafic and ultramafic (greenstone) rocks (Fig. 1A). Some higher values of Bi and As were observed near the most westerly greenstone belt that hosts the Mt Eureka mine, while most Ag concentrations were below the detection limit (0.1 ppm). Higher values of Ni, Pb and Zn were also observed in proximity to greenstone belts within the area, while higher Cu values were only observed near or over the most westerly greenstone belt that hosts the Mt Eureka mine.

continued on page 10



targeted

Producing Certified Reference Materials for
the Mining & Exploration Industry

Find out more at www.cdnlabs.com

COMMITTED TO EXCELLENCE



Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 8

The work by Pye *et al.* (2000) indicates that regolith chemistry in the Kingston map sheet is at least partly controlled by underlying bedrock geochemistry, differentiating regolith that overlays greenstone and granitic bedrock. However, Pye *et al.* (2000) also note the control of regolith type on geochemistry in soil samples, such as a general depletion of many analytes in lake sediments with low clay content (inferred from major element analysis), as well as the prevalence of SiO₂ in sandplain materials and the potential effect of dilution of other analytes by eolian-derived quartz sands that may contribute material to otherwise locally-derived sandplain materials. They indicate that both bedrock and regolith type exert controls on bulk geochemistry, and it is therefore important to assess geochemical analyses within this context.

While the regolith materials map derived from this work (MacGuinness and Pye 2000) is detailed, compiling the map required multiple soil analyses, extended on-the-ground labour and an in-depth understanding of regolith processes. Pye *et al.* (2000), also note that discrepancies arose when regolith codes were assigned from field observations compared to those assigned from maps compiled from remotely sensed data.


2018 – Old soils re-assayed with UltraFine+®

In 2017, 302 archived sheetwash and sandplain samples, initially collected by the GSWA, were reanalysed via the UltraFine+® soil analytical method (MAR-04) at LabWest Pty Ltd, Perth, Australia. This method was developed by the CSIRO in collaboration with a commercial laboratory and sponsored by nine industry and state government partners (Noble *et al.* 2018), and was designed to capture the mobile element concentration in cover. The complete UltraFine+® method is based on separating the ultrafine (<2 µm) size fraction via suspension in de-ionised water and a dispersant followed by centrifugation, and uses a microwave-assisted aqua regia digestion in a closed Teflon tube to derive a multi-element suite using ICP-MS and ICP-OES. The full method is described in detail in Noble *et al.* (2020a). However, detection limits have since been improved, and additional elements I, Br and Pd have been added to the standard analysis suite since its publication (<https://www.labwest.net/ultrafine-dl/>). Additional rare earth elements (REE) are also available for some commercial analytical packages.

The effect of various small size fractions on elemental analysis results in mineral exploration has been investigated, among others, by Scott and van Riel (1999), Morris (2013), Anand *et al.* (2014), Arne and MacFarlane (2014), Baker (2015) and Sader *et al.* (2018), and included test work on Au concentrations in different size fractions of sand dune samples, which indicated that most of the Au was contained in the <2 µm size fraction (Noble *et al.* 2013). Based on this work, the UltraFine+® soil analytical method was developed to separate the <2 µm “ultrafine” soil fraction for multielement analysis, effectively concentrating the phases of interest followed by an aggressive digestion (Noble *et al.* 2020a, 2020b). The improved recovery of mobile elements from the ultrafine fraction results in higher absolute measured concentrations on average, effectively reducing the number of results below the detection limit. This improves the resolution of concentrations near the detection limit, which enables the delineation of subtle geochemical enrichments for these elements (e.g., Au; Fig. 1A, B). The detection of these subtle variations is particularly relevant for exploration through transported cover. As an example, the exploration relevant elements Au, As, Cu, Ni, Pb and Zn in the Kingston survey show a higher median abundance in the UltraFine+® results compared to the previous survey results via mixed-acid digestion and fire assay (Fig. 4).

It is important to note that the ultrafine method does not increase concentrations or lower detection limits below other current analytical methods, but rather removes the diluting effect of trace element-poor phases in the bulk sample. The different approach to sampling and analysing is designed to capture more of the mobile phases derived via dispersal mechanisms in regolith (shallow, <30 m, the mobile phase in transported as well as weathered *in situ*) materials, while more immobile or resistate elements are likely better recovered by standard digestions such as four-acid (Henne *et al.* 2022). It

is therefore not surprising that the greatest overall measured abundances are not always recovered with the UltraFine+® method (e.g., in the case of gold nuggets or, in this study, As, Ni and Pb; Fig. 4B, D, E). However, the UltraFine+® results show smaller interquartile ranges which increases confidence that the method consistently measures phases relating to the same geological processes (the clay fraction). This indicates that the resulting outlier definition is more dependable in a regolith material context than the more variable analyses via standard soil analytical methods (compare red and green box plots in Fig. 4).



Bruno Lemière, Ph.D
**Mining and Environmental
 Geochemist**

Field and site instrumentation
 and monitoring
 Laboratory engineering

Data analysis
 Know-how transfer
brunole45@orange.fr

28 av. Général Leclerc - 82300 Caussade - France - +33 6 95902134
 Operating also from New York, Montreal, Brussels or London

continued on page 11

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 10




Fig. 4: Comparison of exploration relevant pathfinder element analyses between the historic soil analyses and the UltraFine+® analyses. Boxplots include values below the detection limit (replaced by half the respective detection limit); excluding the median; $n=302$. The 2000 survey results via mixed acid-digestion (except for Au which was analysed via fire assay) are displayed in red and the 2018 results from re-analysis via UltraFine+® are displayed in green. (A) Au in ppb, detection limits GSWA 2000 = 1 ppb, UltraFine+® 2018 = 0.5 ppb. (B) Ni in ppm, all values above the detection limits. (C) Cu ppm, detection limits GSWA 2000 = 1 ppm (all values above the detection limit for UltraFine+® 2018). (D) As in ppm, detection limits GSWA 2000 = 0.4 ppm (all values above the detection limit for UltraFine+® 2018). (E) Pb in ppm, all values above the detection limits. (F) Zn in ppm, all values above the detection limits.

2023 Next Gen Analytics – Adding Machine Learning to delineate landscape context for surface geochemistry

Over the period of 2020 to 2023, the CSIRO developed an unsupervised machine learning workflow to generate proxies for landscape types from spatial feature layers to provide context for surface geochemical data interpretation. The complete Next Gen Analytics workflow includes a variety of outputs such as principal component analysis, exploration indices, dispersion and source direction and outputs for non-geochemical soil property data. Here, we only present parts of this workflow (Fig. 5) and highlight the outputs of one landscape model and the resulting geochemical outliers in landscape context. An overview of the complete Next Gen Analytics data package and several How-to guides can be accessed via <https://research.csiro.au/ultrafine/>.

Methods

The spatial feature layers that were used in the landscape model presented here for the Kingston case study included

continued on page 12

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 11




Fig. 5: Simplified Next Gen Analytics machine learning workflow with key components applied to the Kingston case study to demonstrate the main outputs (proxy landscape maps and outliers by landscape type for each analysed element). The boxplots resulting from this workflow break down the soil sample dataset into groups according to a machine-learned landscape cluster. See text for more details.

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 12

a Digital Elevation Model (Copernicus GLO-30), Multi-resolution Valley Bottom Flatness (MrVBF; a proxy of depth of cover developed by Gallant *et al.* 2012), Radiometric K (%), Th (ppm) and U (ppm) (Poudjom Djomani and Minty 2019a-c) and regolith band ratios derived, after a method by Gozzard (2005), from Sentinel-2 multispectral imagery (Geoscience Australia's barest earth product; Wilford and Roberts 2021). The spatial feature layers were resampled to a common 100 m² grid and the roads within the area were masked (and appear as white lines in outputs). The dimensionality reduction algorithm Uniform Manifold Projection and Approximation (UMAP; McInnes *et al.* 2018) was used to project the pixel (grid cell) data into a three-dimensional latent space. After which, a multi-step clustering process was used to assign a proxy landscape type to each data point (i.e., pixel). First, a random subset of 20,000 pixels was used to fit an agglomerative clustering model (scikit-learn implementation in Python; Pedregosa *et al.* 2011). Next, these same samples and their cluster IDs were used to train a random forest classifier. Finally, this classifier was used to predict cluster IDs for all pixels across the model area. Pixels were classified into eight clusters based on similar spatial feature properties, to provide comparable complexity to the eight units on the existing state-wide Simplified Regolith Landform map (Fig. 3B). Pixels in each cluster were assigned a colour based on the ordinal rank of the mean MrVBF for each cluster.

The resulting proxy landscape map was used to group geochemical data according to the landscape cluster corresponding to each soil sample location. Elemental outliers were then calculated for each of these clusters, after a log-transformation. Results below detection limits were first replaced by half the detection limit. Here, outliers are defined as values that are greater than 1.5•IQR beyond the first and third quartiles (where IQR is the interquartile range, Q3 – Q1).

Landscape model

Understanding the relationships between material provenance, weathering and dispersion processes as well as general landform characteristics and material properties is a complex undertaking and can hinder successful greenfields exploration in areas where comprehensive datasets, field knowledge, general expertise, or time are limited. There are three different approaches to terrain classification (summarised in Gozzard (2005)) – landscape criteria (based on physical attributes; e.g., association of geology, soils etc.), genetic (based on underlying causal factors; e.g., RED scheme – residual, erosional, depositional), and parametric (quantitative, classification based on selected attributes; e.g., based on spatial feature layers). The latter is often lauded as being an approach unbiased by humans. However, while the Next Gen Analytics models are intended to have little direct human input (e.g., we do not include available geological or regolith maps), there is an inherent human bias in the parametric approach, due to assumptions relating to appropriate input data. Our input spatial feature layers were chosen based on an understanding of genetic and landscape criteria models and how these may affect soil sample characteristics in relation to metal mobility in the near surface (<30 cm depth). The main considerations for input layers were (a) indication of parent/source material (radiometric data), (b) general landscape position (DEM), (c) the depth of transported cover (MrVBF), and (d) regolith material type (Sentinel-2 derived regolith band ratios), mainly relating to clay and iron oxide content.

There are many other spatial feature layers (both remotely sensed and human-interpreted) which may be useful depending on site and commodity specific exploration needs. However, the Next Gen Analytics workflow was designed for first-pass, greenfields exploration with little knowledge of a given area. In addition, we exclusively use publicly available data, to enable application anywhere on the Australian continent with a resolution of 30 m. The workflow identifies clusters of pixels with similar feature properties without explicit consideration for the geographical location, geochemistry, or soil properties at each point, and without further human influence. It is important to note that the model output shown here (Fig. 6A) has not been adjusted to fit the ideal number of different landscape clusters, but was limited to eight clusters to demonstrate the concept in comparison to the available simplified regolith map (Fig. 6B).

The machine learning-derived landscape map is not amenable to description using concise nomenclature that would fit neatly into available regolith classification schemes. Hence, we simply refer to them here as numbered landscape clusters and their designated colour. This may present an initial challenge for human interpretation. However, it also presents an opportunity, as it allows for classification based on measurable properties of the regolith material rather than forcing a generalised landscape type into a rigid classification scheme. The clusters are not internally homogeneous (may consist of, e.g., sandplain in one area and grade into alluvial materials in other parts) but they do have recurrent characteristics that reflect the spatial feature input layers. The spatial feature layer with the greater relative variance has the most influence. This is in line with the model assumption that, where a deviation in, e.g., depth of cover, is large, this will influence the ability of a given element to migrate into surface materials. On the other hand, where a region is relatively uniform in depth of cover, but the material has vastly different regolith band ratio signals (related to clay and iron oxide content) this should be considered as to its effect on metal mobility. A brief overview of likely materials and main features observed for each cluster are noted in parentheses in the legend in Fig. 6A, and is derived in consultation with input feature layers and available surface geology and regolith maps as we did not complete on-the-ground validation for this specific site.

Comparing the eight machine learned landscape clusters (Fig. 6A) to the eight regolith landforms on the publicly available map (Fig. 6B) indicates that the machine learning approach has defined clusters with similar spatial distributions to regolith landforms in the available map product. For example, landscape cluster 5 (light blue; Fig. 6A) has a similar distri-

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 13




Fig. 6: Comparison of human characterisation and machine-learned characterisation of regolith over the Kingston area. (A) Simplified regolith landform map (de Souza Kovacs and Jakica 2021) derived via human interpretation. (B) Machine learned proxy-landform map based on remotely sensed spatial features. The clusters are not amenable to nomenclature that directly aligns with existing regolith classification schemes. We indicate in brackets some main features observed for each landscape cluster.

bution to what is mapped as sandplain in the available regolith landform map in the vicinity of the Yilgarn Craton granites (Fig. 6B). This is not surprising given lithological controls relating to greenstone and granitic bedrock on regolith materials are evident in surface geochemical results, which are reflected in the spatial feature layers (e.g., radiometric data) and therefore affect the machine learned landscapes. However, major differences can be observed. This is partly due to the 100 m resolution and the lack of smoothing in the machine learned approach, and partly due to the choice of input layers. For example, in the centre-left of the project area where one unit is mapped as sandplain material in the simplified regolith landform product (light yellow; Fig. 7B), the machine learning approach has assigned two clusters in this setting (light blue and light yellow in Fig. 7A). While both of these clusters likely do indicate sandplain material, the more traditional regolith landform map does not take into account the change in depth of cover (from the relatively deeper light grey to the relatively shallower grey of the MrVBF; Fig. 7D), nor the material composition related to clay and iron oxide content (relatively more blue vs. relatively more yellow colours in Fig. 7C). Topographic (DEM, Fig. 7E) and radiometric (Fig. 7F) information was consulted in the human-interpreted landform map and is well represented in both outputs. However, the change in regolith composition, in this case, does not relate to K, Th and U (radiometric data) but iron oxide and clay content (Sentinel-2 derived regolith band ratios).

In the case of the Kingston map sheet, a host of information on landform and regolith materials has been collected from remotely sensed and physical observations. However, there are many areas where no or very limited regolith landform, surface geology or regolith material maps exist, and the Next Gen Analytics approach is a cost-effective and rapid method to generate a first-pass landscape map for greenfields exploration. In addition, no physical observations are required, and the resolution is usually 30 m. Pye *et al.* (2000) also noted introduced human errors which may have skewed their geochemical statistics, such as samples that were thought to have been collected over greenstones but were instead likely to have been located over granites. The machine learning workflow aims to reduce the influence of human bias and error and provides a more consistent and objective landscape model.

continued on page 15

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 14




Fig. 7: Comparison of machine learned model to regolith landform map and the parameters used to generate the model. While we would consider a landscape model with more clusters as more appropriate for the Kingston area owing to its size (Fig. 5); the usefulness of a model needs to be considered in terms of the exploration context and its application. This includes which features are likely to influence geochemical soil analytical results and the number of samples in each landscape type (for statistical outlier calculation, we consider the minimum number to be 50 samples per cluster). It is important to note when assessing geochemical data, that we group the regolith into classes of similar materials to be able to understand whether an elevated geochemical result in a surface soil is anomalous (and, therefore, potentially related to bedrock geology via dispersal mechanisms or supergene enrichment in the cover itself) or simply a variation in background material composition.

Outliers by landscape type

The goal of the Next Gen Analytics landscape modelling demonstrated above is to normalise geochemical concentrations by landscape, so samples can be compared across large areas with varying landscapes. For this purpose, statistical outliers are calculated for each analysed element based on their assigned landscape cluster (coloured boxes in Fig. 8B). By separating samples by landscape, we can assess them in separate sub-populations. For example, if we consider the distribution of Cu concentrations over the Kingston area (Fig. 8A) we might conclude that the largest values are observed near, or close to, the greenstone belts (similar to observations by Pye *et al.* 2000 on historic geochemical results). When identifying traditional outliers from the whole sample population (displayed as white triangles associated with the white box on the left-hand side in Fig. 8B) this interpretation is confirmed with one outlier located over each greenstone belt (Fig. 8C). However, this approach does not consider whether elevated metal concentrations are recorded in samples that were collected in residual or transported landscape settings. If mineralisation is present, the mobile element signature might

continued on page 16

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 15




Fig. 8: Different ways of interpreting the same soil survey on the example of Cu. (A) Cu concentrations in ppm displayed based on natural breaks in the data. All data displayed was analysed via UltraFine+®. (B) Boxplots of the whole population (white box) broken down into sub-populations (coloured boxes) based on landscape clusters. (C) Location of whole population outliers. (D) Location of additional outliers coloured by sub-population. Note that the whole population outliers are still represented when viewed by sub-population.

continued on page 17

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 16




Fig. 9: Comparison of Ni outliers identified from the whole population compared to those identified in sub-populations. All data displayed was analysed via UltraFine+. (A) Boxplots of the whole population (white box) broken down into sub-populations (coloured boxes) based on landscape clusters. (B) Location of whole population Ni outliers. (C) Location of additional Ni outliers coloured by sub-population.

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 17

have a much weaker geochemical signal in samples collected in transported (depositional) landscape settings compared to residual settings. Therefore, when the whole sample population is broken down by different landscape settings (coloured boxes in Fig. 8B), each sub-population can be assessed individually, highlighting potential anomalies within different landscape settings.

In general, the Cu outliers (triangles) below the dashed line (Fig. 8B) are often considered unremarkable (background concentration values) if evaluated as part of the whole population. However, when evaluated based on landscape context, there are two additional Cu outliers in the cluster 7 sub-population in depositional settings (sandplain and sheetwash, royal blue box in Fig. 8B and royal blue outliers in Fig. 8D). The single Cu outlier in the light brown population on the other hand, is located in residual or shallow cover and is, as expected, well represented by outliers in the overall sample population (compare white box/triangles with light brown triangle above the dashed line in Fig. 8B). Outliers in the royal blue sub-population extend one of the potential targets in the whole population and an additional potential target is identified in the yellow sub-population (Fig. 8D).

In an area where exploration has largely focussed on locations over known greenstone belts, which have generally elevated background elemental signatures (e.g., Ni, Pb and Zn; Pye *et al.* 2000) interpreting assays by landscape type can supply additional information to upgrade or downgrade traditional targets (Fig. 9). Similar to observations in the historic data, whole population outliers for Ni over the Kingston area are spatially associated with greenstone belts (white triangles in Fig. 9A and B). Most of these potential targets are confirmed when the data is assessed by sub-population providing more confidence as to their anomalous character. However, one outlier is “downgraded” (no longer an outlier in its sub-population; Fig. 9B) while other outliers are now evident in sub-populations sampled in sandplain materials (Fig. 9C).

This approach is intended as a first-pass geochemical data interpretation in greenfields settings with mixed cover. It is highly encouraged that, once an area for follow-up exploration is identified, all available landscape/landform information including field observations and human interpretation as well as geochemical and other soil property results (e.g., sizing, spectral mineralogy and pH) be reviewed. Dependent on availability and target commodity, the Next Gen Analytics approach can also be adjusted to include different spatial features. Where soil sample density permits, it is always recommended to adjust the number of clusters to fit the degree of landscape complexity.

Future developments


The UltraFine+[®] soil analytical method is commercially available and has to date been used by over 160 companies in Australia and has already expanded into a handful of international settings. Comparison of assay results to historic samples has shown improvements of effective detection limits as well as more repeatable and therefore more reliable results of a range of exploration relevant mobile phases in shallow cover. The Next Gen Analytics approach is currently an R&D project product, which is not yet commercially available. However, it has been tested on over 40 sites in Australia and early test work in New Zealand shows promising approaches for international settings.

The full Next Gen Analytics workflow currently reads in exclusively UltraFine+[®] data. This is in part due to how the projects supporting the development have evolved, as well as its commonly greater mobile element sensitivity compared to other common methods, as fewer data points below the detection limit enables more sound statistical data interpretation. UltraFine+[®] also provides additional soil properties relating to particle size, pH and mineralogy which is part of the Next Gen Analytics data package. This R&D data package provides three different landscape models with 4, 8 and 12 landscape clusters for each site. This provides a standardised output that can be used for first-pass interpretation to indicate how much influence landscapes may have on statistical outlier calculations. Each data package for a given site contains CSV, GeoTIFF, PNG and shapefiles of outliers by (as well as independent of) landscape type, soil property data, exploration indices, principal component analysis of geochemical data, and DEM-derived source and dispersion directions. The data package also includes the Digital Sample Observer; an HTML-based prototype dashboard still under development that allows the explorer to easily view and interrogate all available products within the data package (Fig. 10).

Using machine learning-derived landscape models to interpret soil geochemical data by landscape type does not replace the need for in-depth regolith knowledge of an exploration area, but rather it provides a low-cost and low-impact tool in early stages of greenfields exploration to minimise time and effort while maximising outputs, ideally preventing overlooking targets and walking away from potentially prospective ground.

Future research will focus on refining the approach to address limitations such as the influence of built-up areas, densely wooded areas, and sample density. Ideally, this machine learning approach will be targeted towards a specific exploration area and commodity, and will benefit from tailored input layers, depending on specific exploration questions with a view to extending our knowledge of, and incorporating, local dispersion mechanisms. This may include a range of different or additional feature layers, such as other geophysics (magnetics, electromagnetics), and/or high-resolution company-owned data. The workflow will also be adjusted to other international settings (e.g., temperate and glacial terrains) addressing challenges in availability of regolith and landscape maps across the globe, as well as tailoring to different commodities and incorporating locally available spatial feature layers. Ideally, machine learning approaches for landscape context will be incorporated in earlier exploration stages such as during prospectivity reconnaissance and sample cam-

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page18



paigned design. All of these aspects are currently being investigated, and research over the coming decades will undoubtedly increase confidence in these models, introducing them as a standard output during the exploration process.

Fig. 10: Screenshot of the Digital Sample Observer for the Kingston project area. Top row (from left to right): Reduced spatial feature layer data in 2-dimensional space, RGB coloured (the more similar the colour of pixels, the more similar the spatial feature properties for these pixels) and the resulting three landscape models with 4, 8 and 12 landscape classes. Middle row (from left to right): Reduced spatial feature layer data in 3-dimensional space followed by surface geology, regolith geology and satellite imagery for comparison to the models. Bottom row (from left to right): Spatial feature layers (radiometric data, Sentinel-2 derived regolith band ratios, DEM and MrVBF) used to derive the landscape models. Data toggles on the right-hand-side allow for viewing outliers by or independent of landscape type, as well as all other data products, in landscape context.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the **EXPLORE** editors and reviewers, Beth McClenaghan and Paul Morris. The research to develop the UltraFine+[®] method and the Next Gen Analytics was supported by a broader project team including Tania Ibrahimi, Ian Lau, Bobby Pejic, Jessica Stromberg, Neil Francis, Tenten Pinchand and Ravi Anand. The research team received financial support from many government and industry bodies, including the Minerals Research Institute of Western Australia, Geological Survey of Queensland, Geological Survey of South Australia, Geological Survey of New South Wales, Northern Territory Geological Survey, Geological Survey of Western Australia, Kalamazoo Resources, MCA Nominees, Icen Gold, Siren Gold, Dreadnought

Old Soils, New Targets: ... *continued from page 19*

Resources, De Grey Mining, Carnavale Resources, Fortescue Metals Group, Newmont, Northern Star Resources, Kairos Minerals, Emmerson Resources, Independence Group, Western Gold Resources, Capricorn Metals, Hexagon Energy Materials, Monger Gold, Strategic Energy Resources, Barton Gold, Ozz Resources, Anax Metals, Lodestar Minerals, Anglo Gold Ashanti, Antipa Minerals, Encounter Resources, First Quantum Minerals, Gold Road Resources and Southern Gold. In-kind support for the project was provided by CSIRO and LabWest.

While there is no direct financial interest in the results presented in this article, CSIRO, as the employer of the authors, owns UltraFine+® and this is licenced to LabWest as the current commercial provider. The CSIRO (not the authors) receives a financial royalty for this licence and subsequent UltraFine+® analyses.

References

- Anand, R.R., Aspandiar, M.F. and Noble, R.R.P. 2016. A review of metal transfer mechanisms through transported cover with emphasis on the vadose zone within the Australian regolith. *Ore Geology Reviews*, 73, 394-416.
- Anand, R., Lintern, M., Noble, R., Aspandiar, M., Macfarlane, C., Hough, R., Stewart, A., Wakelin, S., Townley, B. and Reid, N. 2014. Geochemical Dispersion Through Transported Cover in Regolith-Dominated Terrains - Towards an Understanding of Process. *Society of Economic Geology Special Publication*, 18, 97-126.
- Anand, R.R., Churchward, H.M., Smith, R.E., Smith, K., Gozzard, J.R., Craig, M.A. and Munday, T.J. 1993. Classification and atlas of regolith landform mapping units, Exploration perspectives for the Yilgarn Craton, Australia. CSIRO Division of Exploration and Mining, Restricted Report 440R (unpublished).
- Arne, D. and MacFarlane, B. 2014. Reproducibility of gold analyses in stream sediment samples from the White Gold District and Dawson Range, Yukon Territory, Canada. *EXPLORE*, 164, 1–10, https://www.appliedgeochemists.org/images/Explore/Explore_Number_164_Sept_2014.pdf
- Bajc, A.F. 1998. A comparative analysis of enzyme leach and mobile metal ion selective extractions; case studies from glaciated terrain, northern Ontario. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, 61, 113–148.
- Baker, P.M. 2015. Advances in reconnaissance sampling and geochemical analysis are creating new exploration opportunities in previously sampled terranes. In: *Proceedings of the 27th International Applied Geochemistry Symposium 2015*. Association of Applied Geochemists, Ontario, Canada, 11.
- Bunting, J.A. 1980. Kingston, W.A.: Western Australia Geological Survey, 1:250 000 Geological Series Explanatory Notes, 16p.
- Bunting, J.A. 1986. Geology of the eastern part of the Nabberu Basin, Western Australia. *Western Australia Geological Survey, Bulletin 131*, 130p.
- Chao, T.T. 1984. Use of partial dissolution techniques in geochemical exploration. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, 20, 101–135.
- de Souza Kovacs, N. and Jakica, S. 2021. 1:100 000 regolith geology regimes of Western Australia. Geological Survey of Western Australia, digital data layer.
- Gallant, J., Dowling, T. and Austin, J. 2012. Multi-resolution Valley Bottom Flatness (MrVBF). v3. CSIRO. Data Collection. <https://doi.org/10.4225/08/5701C885AB4FE>
- Gozzard, J.R. 2005. Part 3: Regolith-landform mapping using remotely sensed imagery. In: *International Geochemical Exploration Symposium 2005 Workshop 1.3, Regolith mapping, workshop notes: Perth, Western Australia, IGES 2005*, 73p.
- Gray, D.J., Wildman, J.E. and Longman, G.D. 1999. Selective and partial extraction analyses of transported overburden for gold exploration in the Yilgarn Craton, Western Australia. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, 67, 51–66.
- Hall, G.E.M. 1998. Analytical perspective on trace element species of interest in exploration. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, 61 (1–3), 1-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-6742\(97\)00046-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-6742(97)00046-0)
- Henne, A., Noble, R.R.P., Huang, F., Cole, D., Williams, M., Ibrahim, T. and Lau, I. 2022. UltraFine+® Next Gen Analytics - Northern Territory Geological Survey - MacDonnell Ranges. CSIRO, Australia. <https://doi.org/10.25919/hvzk-9x75>
- Jakica, S., de Souza Kovacs, N., Hogen-Esch, J. and Granado, I.M.T. 2020. 1:500 000 State regolith geology of Western Australia — compilation methodologies. Geological Survey of Western Australia, Record 2020/10, 22p.
- MacGuinness, S.S. and Pye, K.S. 2000. Regolith materials, Kingston, W.A. sheet SG 51-10. In: Pye, K.J., Morris, P.A. and MacGuinness, S.A. *Geochemical Mapping of the Kingston 1:250 000 Sheet*. Western Australia Geological Survey, 1:250 000 Regolith Geochemistry Series Explanatory Notes Plate 2. Department of Minerals and Energy, Perth, WA, Australia.
- Martin, D.McB., Hocking, R.M., Riganti, A. and Tyler, I.M. 2014. 1:500 000 State interpreted bedrock geology of Western Australia, 2014, digital data layer. Geological Survey of Western Australia, <www.dmp.wa.gov.au/geoview>.
- McInnes, L., Healy, J. and Melville, J. 2018. Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. arXiv:1802.03426
- Morris, P.A. 2013. Fine fraction regolith chemistry from the East Wongatha area, Western Australia: tracing bedrock and mineralization through thick cover. *Geochemistry: Exploration, Environment, Analysis*, 13, 21–40 <https://doi.org/10.1144/geochem2012-141>

Old Soils, New Targets: ... continued from page 20

- Myers, J. S. and Hocking, R.M. 1998. Geological map of Western Australia 1:2 500 000 (13th edition). Western Australian Geological Survey.
- Noble, R., Cavaliere, M., Morris, P., Pinchand, T. and Hough, R. 2013. Determination of micro and nanoparticulate fraction gold in regolith. *EXPLORE*, 159, 1-13.
- Noble, R., Lau, I., Anand, R. and Pinchand, T. 2018. MRIWA Report No. 462: Multi-scaled near surface exploration using ultrafine soils. Geological Survey of Western Australia, Report 190, 99 p.
- Noble, R.R.P., Lau, I.C., Anand, R.R. and Pinchand, G.T. 2020a. Refining fine fraction soil extraction methods and analysis for mineral exploration. *Geochemistry; Exploration, Environment, Analysis*, 20, 113-128. <https://doi.org/10.1144/geochem2019-008>
- Noble, R., Morris, P., Anand, R., Lau, I. and Pinchand, T. 2020b. Application of ultrafine fraction soil extraction and analysis for mineral exploration. *Geochemistry: Exploration, Environment, Analysis*, 20, 129-154. <https://doi.org/10.1144/geochem2019-009>
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D., Brucher, M., Perrot, M. and Duchesnay, É. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12, 2825–2830.
- Poudjom Djomani, Y. and Minty, B.R.S. 2019a. Radiometric Grid of Australia (Radmap) v4 2019 filtered pct potassium grid. Geoscience Australia, Canberra. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26186/5dd48d628f4f6>
- Poudjom Djomani, Y. and Minty, B.R.S. 2019b. Radiometric Grid of Australia (Radmap) v4 2019 filtered ppm thorium. Geoscience Australia, Canberra. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26186/5dd48e3eb6367>
- Poudjom Djomani, Y. and Minty, B.R.S. 2019c. Radiometric Grid of Australia (Radmap) v4 2019 filtered ppm uranium. Geoscience Australia, Canberra. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26186/5dd48ee78c980>
- Pye, K.J., Morris, P.A. and McGuinness, S.A. 2000. Geochemical Mapping of the Kingston 1:250 000 Sheet. Western Australia Geological Survey, 1:250 000 Regolith Geochemistry Series Explanatory Notes. Department of Minerals and Energy, Perth, WA, Australia.
- Sader, J., Benn, C., Zhivkov, N., Jeleva, T. and Anderson, R. 2018. Soil clay fraction geochemistry for surficial exploration: a case study from the Tethyan Belt. In: RFG 2018 – Resources for Future Generations Conference Proceedings, Vancouver, Canada. Society of Economic Geologists, Littleton, CO, Abstract 2469.
- Scott, K.M. and van Riel, B. 1999. The Goornong South gold deposit and its implications for exploration beneath cover in Central Victoria, Australia. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, 67, 83–96, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-6742\(99\)00048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-6742(99)00048-5)
- Wilford, J. and Roberts, D. 2021. Sentinel-2 Barest Earth imagery for soil and lithological mapping. Geoscience Australia, Canberra. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11636/146125>



EXPLORE Publication Schedule

Quarterly newsletters are published in
March, June, September, December

• **Deadlines** for submission of articles or advertisements:

March newsletter: January 15 June newsletter: April 15 September newsletter: July 15 December newsletter: October 15

- **Manuscripts** should be double-spaced and submitted in digital format using Microsoft® WORD. Articles should be between 2000 and 3000 words. Do **not** embed figures or tables in the text file.
- **Figures and/or photos** (colour or black and white) should be submitted as separate high resolution (2000 dpi or higher) tiff, jpeg or PDF files.
- **Tables** should be submitted as separate digital files in Microsoft® EXCEL format.
- All scientific/technical articles will be reviewed. Contributions may be edited for clarity or brevity.
- Formats for headings, abbreviations, scientific notations, references and figures must follow the Guide to Authors for *Geochemistry: Exploration, Environment, Analysis* (GEEA) that are posted on the GEEA website at:
<https://www.geolsoc.org.uk/geea-authorinfo>
- An **abstract** of about 250 words must also be submitted that summarizes the content of their article. This abstract will be published in the journal ELEMENTS on the 'AAG News' page.

Submissions should be sent to the Editor of **EXPLORE**:

Beth McClenaghan
Geological Survey of Canada
601 Booth Street
Ottawa, ON, CANADA K1A 0E8
Email: bethmcclenaghan@sympatico.ca

SUPPORT YOUR ORGANIZATION

ADVERTISE

AAG Councillors, 2023-2024

Aaron Baensch




Aaron is a diversified geoscientist and technologist with 25 years international experience, spanning technology development and research, global business development and strategy, mining operations and mineral exploration. He is also a strong advocate and promoter of sustainability, diversity and STEM pathways for the next generations entering the resources industry. Aaron's passion is centered around deep engagement and collaboration with the Mining Equipment, Technology and Services (METS) and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) and research sectors, for the delivery of Mining Industry 4.0 across the entire mine life cycle and value chain. This draws on his experience in material characterization, sensors, IIoT, analytics, robotics and automation, combined with over a decade of operational experience. This aligns well with the emerging landscape of decarbonization, digital transformation, automation and the future of work in the resources industry.

Aaron is currently employed by Eurasian Resources Group (ERG) as the Head of Smart Exploration Technologies, concentrating on new opportunities in Saudi Arabia. Prior to this, he spent 15 years focusing on a wide range of mining and exploration technologies, including the adaption of systems used by NASA on the Mars Curiosity Rover.

He was also an embedded researcher and project manager at MinEx CRC and the Deep Exploration Technologies CRC, where he was a co-inventor of the Lab-At-Rig® system. Aaron spent his first decade working in a variety of management, operational and exploration roles across a range of gold, nickel and copper projects.


Professionally, Aaron is a proud graduate of the Western Australian School of Mines, Kalgoorlie (WASM) and holds a Bachelor of Science in Mineral Exploration and Mining Geology with 1st Class Honours. He is also a Registered Professional Geoscientist (AIG - RPGeo #10255 for Mining and Geochemistry) as well as a Fellow of the AusIMM, AIG, SEG and AAG. Aaron is also a qualified snowboard instructor and you can find him hitting up the slopes during the winter in the USA, Canada, NZ and Australia, as well as 4WD-ing, boating and fishing with his family & friends throughout the warmer months.

LABWEST



**IMPORT CERTIFICATE
IN PLACE**
Easy to airfreight 200g samples


Low DL analysis of 2 µm clay fraction



Au Std 25g Aqua Regia — vs **UltraFine** —

- Small 200g sample
- Nugget effect eliminated
- 50 Elements including Au
- REEs also available
- Extended CSIRO data package also available


LabWest.net/UltraFine



Contact Blake Stacey for an orientation study
B.stacey@labwest.net

Ray Lett

Ray obtained a B.Sc. University of London, UK, in 1968, an M.Sc. University of Leicester, UK in 1970, and a Ph.D. from the University of British Columbia in 1979. He is a geochemical consultant and university sessional lecturer in geochemistry and economic geology at the University of Victoria, Canada. He was a laboratory supervisor and senior geochemist for the British Columbia Geological Survey between 1990-2010. Prior to that he was a geochemist for Barringer Research/Magenta from 1980 to 1990 and an exploration geochemist/geologist for Amax Exploration/Fox Geological/BP Minerals in Vancouver, BC between 1970 and 1979. Ray served as AAG Secretary 1980 to 1985; as a Councillor: 1990 - 1992, 1999-2000, 2006-2009, 2015-2017; member of the AAG Education Committee 2010-2022 and the Strategy Committee (2016-2017). Ray retired from the BC Geological Survey after 20 years with government as a geochemist and now spends his time consulting, teaching (part time) undergraduate university courses in geochemistry and economic geology and serving on various geoscience committees. As a geochemist for over 50 years he has been fortunate to have had outstanding mentors



continued on page 23

AAG Councillors, 2023-2024... *continued from page 22*

e.g. Clifford James, Kay Fletcher so he feels that it vital for us all to encourage new generations of students to consider a career in geochemistry.

Paul Morris

Dr. Paul Morris was university educated in New Zealand at Otago University and Victoria University (Wellington), followed by stints at the University of Sydney, and Shimane University in western Japan. In 2018, he retired from a 30-year career at the Geological Survey of Western Australia, where he was Chief Geochemist for 22 years. He joined AAG (then AEG) in 1999 and has been a Fellow since 2002. During his AAG membership, he has held various positions including Councillor, Symposium Coordinator, president, Chair of the Awards and Medals Committee and the Education Committee, and is currently Chair of the New Membership Committee. He provides regular editorial assistance to the Association's newsletter, **EXPLORE**.



Ryan Noble

Dr. Ryan Noble is a Senior Principal Research Scientist and the Group Leader of Predictive Mineral Systems Science with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) in Perth, Western Australia. He has been with CSIRO for 17 years working on geochemical research with application to the exploration industry. Ryan has a BSc and MSc in Soil Science from the University of Tennessee and a PhD in Applied Geology from Curtin University. Ryan has worked on numerous regolith and groundwater geochemistry projects related to gold, base metal, Ni and U mineral exploration. More recently he has been researching clay-sized fraction chemistry and spectral mineralogy using machine learning to put the results into landscape contexts. He is a Past-President and a Fellow of the Association of Applied Geochemists. Currently, Ryan serves on the Editorial Board for GEEA and as a Board member of the Australian Geoscience Council and the Elements journal. He is the current Chair of Australian Earth Science

Education (AusEarthEd). Building on his earlier activities in the AAG, Ryan is keen to continue his involvement to strengthen the AAG and the benefits to its members.

Pim van Geffen

Dr. Pim van Geffen is Technical Director Geochemistry & Geometallurgy at CSA Global, an ERM Group Company. He is a professional geoscientist with 18 years' experience in mineral exploration and mining across the globe. He is a leader in the fields of geochemistry and geometallurgy and is passionate about innovation and improved business practices in the sector. From exploration to operations, closure, and remediation, he focuses on material characterization and process optimization throughout the mining value chain. He sees tremendous value in underutilized



geoscientific data for characterizing ore and waste, minimize operational risk, and maximize return. Pim has delivered many public and private short courses and conference contributions on geochemical data analysis and its geometallurgical applications. He is a Fellow of the Association of Applied Geochemists.



**ANALYTICAL
LABORATORY
SERVICES**

FOR THE EXPLORATION &
MINING INDUSTRIES

- Assaying & Geochemical Analysis
- Mine Site Laboratories
- Spectral Services
- Environmental Services




**BUREAU
VERITAS**

<http://www.bvna.com/mining-laboratory-services>

bvminfo@bureauveritas.com

Back to the Future: Airborne Geochemistry and Many Related Topics

Available now for download by anyone from our AAG Publications webpage (<https://www.appliedgeochemists.org/publications>) is the Barringer book “Back to the Future: Airborne Geochemistry and Many Related Topics” by P.M.D. Bradshaw, which was published by the AAG in 2015. This book documents the many advances in geochemical theory, as well as the ground, airborne and remote sensing techniques plus analytical methods that were conceived and developed under the leadership of Dr. Anthony (Tony) Barringer. Please forward this information and web link, as well the link for “Writing Geochemical Reports”, to non-AAG members who are likely to benefit from these publications.




Elements Report: March 2023

Within the three months since the last ELEMENTS report published in **EXPLORE** in December 2022, the following two issues of ELEMENTS have been published.

August 2022, volume 18, no. 4, Cascadia Subduction Zone

The articles in this issue describe current understanding of the combined tectonic and magmatic systems in the Cascadia subduction zone, which runs along the west coast of North America from Canada to northern California. There are four AAG news items in this ELEMENTS issue. The first three items introduce (1) AAG President 2022–2023: John Carranza, (2) AAG Vice President 2022–2023: Yulia Uvarova, and (3) New AAG Regional Councillor for Northern Africa: Silas Sunday Dada. The fourth item is an abstract of an article that appeared in issue 193 (December 2021) of the EXPLORE Newsletter, namely “Breathing New Life into Old Assay Data Using Machine Learning Methods” by Tom Meuzelaar, Morgan Warren, Alice Alex, Pablo Núñez Fernández.



October 2022, volume 18, no. 5, Cement and Concrete: From the Romans to Mars

The articles in this issue discuss cement and concrete (its past, present, future), historic concrete science, the rise of portland cements, alternative non-Portland binders, polarization-fluorescence microscopy in the study of aggregates and concrete, and sustainable sourcing of raw materials for construction. The single AAG news items in this issue introduces the AAG Councillors for 2022–2023, namely Thomas Bissig, Jamil Sader, Alexander Seyfarth, Cliff Stanley, Renguang Zuo, and Dennis Arne.

Reminder: AAG members can access past issues of Elements at <http://elementsmagazine.org/member-login/> using their e-mail address and member ID.


John Carranza
ELEMENTS Coordinator



New Release: Surficial geology of northern Canada

The Geological Survey of Canada (GSC) has just released Bulletin 611 that summarizes major contributions on the surficial geology of northern Canada made by the GEM Program in the last decade. It provides an updated understanding of the nature, distribution, and history of surficial deposits and ice flow patterns in Canada's North. This new knowledge is key to understanding and interpreting regional till geochemical and indicator mineral datasets for mineral exploration. Chapter 2 provides an overview of surficial geochemistry regional surveys and case studies across northern Canada for: i) till geochemistry and indicator minerals, iii) lake sediment geochemistry, and iii) stream sediment geochemistry and indicator minerals. The entire bulletin, including accompanying links to GEM publications, is publicly available to download at : <https://geoscan.nrcan.gc.ca/starweb/geoscan/servlet.starweb?path=geoscan/download.web&search1=R=331418>

Beth McClenaghan
Geological Survey of Canada



CALENDAR OF EVENTS

International, national, and regional meetings of interest to colleagues working in exploration, environmental and other areas of applied geochemistry. These events also appear on the AAG web page at: www.appliedgeochemists.org.

The status of the meetings was confirmed on March 1st 2023, but users of the listing are strongly advised to carry out their own research as to the validity of an announcement.

Please let us know of your events by sending details to:
Steve Amor, Email: steve.amor2007@gmail.com

or

Elizabeth Ambrose, Email: eambrose0048@rogers.com

2023

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 19-23 MARCH | Minerals, Metals & Materials Society Annual Meeting & Exhibition. San Diego CA USA. Website: www.tms.org/AnnualMeeting/TMS2023 |
| 10-14 APRIL | Geociencias 2023 - X Earth Science Convention. Havana Cuba. Website: www.cubaciencias-dela tierra.com |
| 13-15 APRIL | 6th International Conference on Geoinformatics and Data Analysis. Marseille France. Website: www.icgda.org |
| 23-28 APRIL | EGU General Assembly 2023. Vienna Austria. Website: tinyurl.com/4b3cfvva |
| 25-27 APRIL | International Conference on Geographical Information Systems Theory, Applications and Management. Prague Czech Republic. Website: www.gistam.org |
| 30 APRIL – 3 MAY | CIM Convention. Montreal QC Canada. Website: convention.cim.org |
| 21-23 MAY | 11th World Conference on Sampling and Blending. Johannesburg South Africa. Website: tinyurl.com/2p8n2dts |
| 23-26 MAY | XVI International Estuarine Biogeochemistry Symposium. Šibenik Croatia. Website: tinyurl.com/mryxy5mb |
| 24-27 MAY | GAC-MAC Joint Annual Meeting. Sudbury ON Canada. Website: gac.ca/events/gac-mac-annual-meeting |


continued on page 26



CALENDAR OF EVENTS... *continued from page 25*

18-23 JUNE	Catchment Science: Interactions of Hydrology, Biology and Geochemistry (Gordon Research Conference). Andover NH USA. Website: tinyurl.com/3ep4uf2e
18-23 JUNE	Interior of the Earth (Gordon Research Conference). South Hadley MA USA. Website: tinyurl.com/7jf7wkvt
19-22 JUNE	SIAM Conference on Mathematical & Computational Issues in the Geosciences. Bergen Norway. Website: tinyurl.com/4eesycan
26-27 JUNE	International Workshop on the Characterisation and Quantification of Lithium. Paris France. Website: cqlmns.sciencesconf.org
2-6 JULY	38th International Conference on Geochemistry and Health. Athens Greece. Website: segh.net/welcome-to-segh-2023
3-7 JULY	2023 International Platinum Symposium. Cardiff UK. Website: tinyurl.com/2wcshfeh
9-14 JULY	Goldschmidt 2023. Lyon France. Website: tinyurl.com/32zcw7es
10-13 JULY	10th Annual International Conference on Geology & Earth Science. Athens Greece. Website: www.atiner.gr/geology
14-20 JULY	21st INQUA Conference. Rome Italy. Website: inquaroma2023.org
16-21 JULY	Chemical Oceanography (Gordon Research Conference): Chemical Tracers in the Sea. Manchester NH USA. Website: tinyurl.com/mu7ybfz6
23-27 JULY	Microscopy and Microanalysis 2023. Minneapolis MN USA. Website: www.microscopy.org/MandM/2023
25-27 JULY	6th International Archean Symposium. Perth WA Australia. Website: 6ias.org
28 JULY	Target 2023: Innovating now for our future. Perth WA Australia. Website: www.aig.org.au/events/target-2023
30 JULY – 4 AUGUST	Atmospheric Chemistry Gordon Research Conference. Newry ME USA. Website: tinyurl.com/4jsfuvnb

continued on page 27



ALS method code ME-MS89L™

Exploration for trace level lithium and rare earth elements



right solutions.
right partner.

Lithium hosted in pegmatites and jadarite can occur with economic grades of rare earths and other trace metals such as cesium and boron. ALS's innovations in ICP-MS technology coupled with a sodium peroxide fusion provide a package suitable for lithium and accessory commodities.

Method	Analyte	Detection Level (ppm)
sodium peroxide fusion	Li	2
	B*	8
	Cs	0.1
	Dy	0.03
	Ho	0.01
	Nb	0.8
	Ta	0.04

*a selection of analytes reported by ME-MS89L™.
Boron can only be reported as an add-on to ME-MS89L™.



CALENDAR OF EVENTS... *continued from page 26*

5-12 AUGUST	22nd Annual Conference of the International Association for Mathematical Geosciences. Trondheim Norway. Website: www.iamgconferences.org/iamg2023
9-11 AUGUST	13th International Conference on Environmental Pollution and Remediation. London UK. Website: icepr.org
18-22 AUGUST	Water-Rock Interaction WRI-17/ Applied Isotope Geochemistry AIG-14. Myago Japan. Website: www.wri17.com
26-29 AUGUST	SEG 2023 Conference: Resourcing the Green Transition. London, England. Website: tinyurl.com/2p8b7mue
28 AUGUST – 1 SEPTEMBER	8th World Multidisciplinary Earth Sciences Symposium. Prague Czech Republic. Website: mess-earth.org
28 AUGUST – 1 SEPTEMBER	17th Biennial Meeting of the Society for Geology Applied to Mineral Deposits. Zurich Switzerland. Website: sga2023.ch
11-15 SEPTEMBER	IWA World Water Congress & Exhibition 2023. Beijing China. Website: www.worldwatercongress.com
13-15 SEPTEMBER	Mongolia Mining 2023. Ulaanbaatar Mongolia. Website: mongolia-mining.com
26-29 SEPTEMBER	29th Colloquium of African Geology. Windhoek Namibia. Website: tinyurl.com/2s4hpydx
15-18 OCTOBER	GSA Connects 2023. Pittsburgh PA USA. Website: community.geosociety.org/gsa2023
22-27 OCTOBER	2nd Joint Symposium of the International Societies for Environmental Biogeochemistry & Subsurface Microbiology. Banff AB Canada. Website: iseb-issm2023.org
31 OCTOBER - 2 NOVEMBER	14th Fennoscandian Exploration and Mining conference. Levi Finland. Website: femconference.fi
26 NOVEMBER – 1 DEC	XVI Congreso Geológico Chileno (Chilean Geological Congress). Santiago Chile. Website: congresogeologicochileno.cl
27-30 NOVEMBER	Mediterranean Geosciences Union Annual Meeting. Istanbul Turkey. Website: medgu.org
28 NOVEMBER - 1 DECEMBER	28th International Mining Congress and Exhibition of Turkey (IMCET 2023). Belek Turkey. Website: tinyurl.com/4z2cvzy8

2024

14-19 JANUARY	Gordon Research Conference: Geobiology: Past, Present and Future. Galveston TX USA. Website: www.grc.org/geobiology-conference/2024
8-12 JULY	12th International Kimberlite Conference. Yellowknife NT Canada. Website: 12ikc.ca
21-26 JULY	International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant. Cape Town South Africa. Website: tinyurl.com/mw37tdh4
24-30 AUGUST	35th International Geographical Congress. Dublin Ireland. Website: igc2024dublin.org
25-31 AUGUST	37th International Geological Congress. Busan, Republic of Korea. Website: www.igc2024korea.org



Introducing Canada's first PhotonAssay unit,
the revolutionary technology delivering assay
results in just hours.



To find out more contact:
customer.service@msalabs.com

EXPLORE articles now listed on AAG website

The AAG website now includes a master listing of all science articles published since 1987, the first issue of our Association's newsletter. A new link has been added to the **EXPLORE** home page to download a spreadsheet listing all the scientific articles published in the **EXPLORE** newsletter between 1987 and 2023. You will find this under Publications/**EXPLORE**

<https://www.appliedgeochemists.org/explore-newsletter/explore-issues>



THE ASSOCIATION OF APPLIED GEOCHEMISTS

P.O. Box 26099, 72 Robertson Road, Ottawa, Ontario K2H 9R0 CANADA • Telephone (613) 828-0199
www.appliedgeochemists.org

OFFICERS

January - December 2023

President, John Carranza
 Department of Geology
 University of the Free State
 205 Nelson Mandela Drive
 Park West, Bloemfontein
 SOUTH AFRICA 9301
ejmcarranza@gmail.com

Secretary, David B. Smith
 U.S. Geological Survey
 Box 25046, MS 973
 Denver, CO 80225, USA
 TEL: (303) 236-1849
dbsmith13@gmail.com

Vice-President, Yulia Uvarova
 CSIRO
 26 Dick Perry Ave.
 Kensington W.A., AUSTRALIA 6151
yulia.uvarova@csiro.au

Treasurer, Gwendy E.M. Hall
 110 Aaron Merrick Drive
 Merrickville, ON K0G 1N0 CANADA
 TEL: +1-613-269-7980
gwendyhall@gmail.com

Past-President, Dennis Arne
 Yackandandah, Vic,
 AUSTRALIA 3749
Arne.dennis@gmail.com

AAG COMMITTEES

New Membership
 Paul Morris,
xrficpms@outlook.com

Awards and Medals
 Dennis Arne
Arne.dennis@gmail.com
 Chris Benn
 Pertti Sarala
 Theo Davies
 Yulia Uvarova

Education
 David Murphy, *chair*
davidmkmurphy@gmail.com
 Erick Weiland,
erickweiland@terra-technology.com
 Eric Grunsky, egrunsky@gmail.com
 James Kidder, james.kidder@outlook.com
 Ray Lett, raylett@shaw.ca

Symposia
 David Cohen, d.cohen@unsw.edu.au

AAG COORDINATORS

AAG Student Paper Prize
 David Cohen,
d.cohen@unsw.edu.au

AAG Website
Webmaster:
 Elizabeth Ambrose,
eambrose0048@rogers.com

Geoscience Councils
 David Cohen,
d.cohen@unsw.edu.au

GEEA
 Scott Wood,
scott.wood@ndsu.edu

EXPLORE
 Beth McClenaghan,
bethmcclenaghan@sympatico.ca
 Steve Cook,
explorenewsletter@gmail.com

ELEMENTS
 John Carranza
ejmcarranza@gmail.com

AAG Regional Councillors
 Yulia Uvarova
yulia.uvarova@csiro.au

COUNCILLORS

2022-2023

Thomas Bissig
tbissig@gmail.com
 Jamil Sader
jamilsader@yahoo.com
 Alexander Seyfarth
Alexander.Seyfarth@sgs.com
 Cliff Stanley
Cliff.stanley@acadiu.ca
 Renguang Zuo
zrguang@cug.edu.cn
 Dennis Arne (*ex-officio*)
Arne.dennis@gmail.com

2023-2024

Aaron Baensch
aaron_baensch@hotmail.com
 Ray Lett
Raylett@shaw.ca
 Paul Morris,
xrficpms@outlook.com
 Ryan Noble,
ryan.noble@csiro.au
 Pim van Geffen
Pim.VanGeffen@csaglobal.com

REGIONAL COUNCILLORS

Brazil
 João Larizzatti
joao.larizzatti@cprm.gov.br
Chile
 Brian Townley
btownley@ing.uchile.cl
China
 Xuequiu Wang
wangxuequiu@igge.cn

Northern Europe
 Pertti Sarala
pertti.sarala@oulu.fi
Southern Europe
 Benedetto De Vivo
bdevivo@unina.it
Southeast Asia
 Iftikar Malik
malik.iftikhar@gmail.com

Northern Africa
 Silas Sunday Dada
sdada@aol.edu.ng
Southern Africa
 Theo Davies
theo.clavellpr3@gmail.com
UK and Republic of Ireland
 Kate Knights
kknights@hotmail.com

AAG BUSINESS MANAGER

Al Arseneault

P.O. Box 26099, 72 Robertson Road, Ottawa, ON K2H 9R0 CANADA
 TEL: (613) 828-0199 FAX: (613) 828-9288,
office@appliedgeochemists.org