

# History Matching Production and 4D Seismic Data and Application to the Norne Field

#### IOR Norway 2019

Rolf J. Lorentzen<sup>1</sup>, Tuhin Bhakta<sup>1</sup>, Dario Grana<sup>2</sup>, Xiaodong Luo<sup>1</sup>, Randi Valestrand<sup>1</sup>, Geir Nævdal<sup>1</sup>, Ivar Sandø<sup>1</sup>

1: NORCE / The National IOR Centre, 2: University of Wyoming

# 

## Ensemble-based history matching



# Ensemble-based history matching



- Provides uncertainty quantification for the reservoir model
  - > Improved decision making
  - > Better reservoir management
- Established for history matching of production data
  - > First application to reservoir models: Nævdal et. al, 2002, SPE 75235
  - > Methodology is applied world-wide, and is commercialized
  - > Norne field: Evensen & Eikrem, 2018; Chen & Oliver, 2014, SPE-164902-PA
- Use of 4D seismic data is an important task for the IOR center
  - > Problem with handling of large data sets (terabytes or petabytes)
  - > Quantification of measurement noise is difficult

#### Iterative ensemble smoother





Sunway Taihulight, China, 1.3 PB Mem (top500.org)

$$egin{aligned} m_j^{i+1} &= m_j^i + \mathcal{K}^i \cdot \Delta d_j^i, \ \mathcal{K}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m imes N_d}, \ \Delta d_j^i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_d imes 1} \end{aligned}$$

#### Iterative ensemble smoother

 $m_{j}^{i+1} = m_{j}^{i} + K^{i} \cdot \Delta d_{j}^{i},$   $K^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{m} \times N_{d}}, \ \Delta d_{j}^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{d} \times 1}$   $\downarrow \text{SVD}$   $m_{j}^{i+1} = m_{j}^{i} + (A^{i} \cdot B^{i}) \cdot (C^{i} \cdot \Delta d_{j}^{i}),$ 

$$A^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{m} \times N}, \ B^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \ C^{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$$





Sunway Taihulight, China, 1.3 PB Mem (top500.org)

## Image compression and denoising



Noisy Image

Denoised Image



Ideas from image compression and denoising utilized for reduction of data size and measurement uncertainty quantification. (Luo et. al, 2017, SPE-180025-PA)



### Image compression and denoising





#### Inclusion of 4D seismic data



# Correlation-based adaptive localization





More information: Luo et. al, 2018, SPE-185936-PA.

# Norne field

- Oil & gas field in Norwegian sector
- 5 formations
- $\bullet\,$  Hydrocarbon column approx. 135  ${\rm m}$
- Original oil-in-place: 160 million  $\rm Sm^3$
- Most of the sandstones are good reservoir rocks
- Wells: 9 injectors, 27 producers
- Production history: Nov. 1997-2006
- 4 seismic surveys (2001, 2003, 2004, 2006)
- $3 \times 9 \text{ km}$



- Grid size: 46 x 112 x 22
- Active cells: 44927



# History matching the Norne field



- Initial ensemble generated using Gaussian random fields
- Updates porosity, permeability, net-to-gross, transmissibility multipliers, relative permeability, initial oil-water contact,...
- Clay content defined as 1 minus "net-to-gross"
- Data scaled based on initial data match
- Seismic data inverted for acoustic impedance at four points in time
- Iterative ensemble smoother, RLM-MAC, used (Luo et. al, 2015, SPE-176023-PA)





**Production data mismatch** 

The National IOR Centre







IFE , S















Final

Initial



Mean gas saturation (*top*) and pressure (*bottom*) at year 1997 (*left*) and 2006 (*right*).

# Summary / Conclusions



- A workflow for history matching real production and seismic data is presented
- Methodology demonstrated on the Norne field
- Clay content and other petrophysical parameters updated
- Data match improved for both production and seismic data
- Updated static fields are geologically credible
- Used for reservoir management and uncertainty quantification
- Simulation of infill wells, EOR strategies and monitoring of EOR operations
- Lorentzen et. al, 2018, ECMOR XVI, earthdoc.org; and submitted to Computational Geosciences (sequential updating)
- Lorentzen et. al, 2019, SPE Journal, DOI: https://doi.org/10.2118/194205-PA (synthetic data)
- $\bullet \ https://github.com/rolfjl/Norne-Initial-Ensemble$







# Acknowledgments



The National

- The Research Council of Norway and the industry partners, ConocoPhillips Skandinavia AS, Aker BP ASA, Eni Norge AS, Total E&P Norge AS, Equinor ASA, Neptune Energy Norge AS, Lundin Norway AS, Halliburton AS, Schlumberger Norge AS, Wintershall Norge AS, and DEA Norge AS, of The National IOR Centre of Norway for main financial support.
- Eni, Petrobras, and Total, as well as the Research Council of Norway (PETROMAKS2), for financial support through the project "4D Seismic History Matching".
- Equinor (operator of Norne field) and its license partners ENI and Petoro for the release of the Norne data.
- IOR Center for Integrated Operations at NTNU for cooperation and coordination of the Norne Cases.
- Schlumberger and CGG for providing academic software licenses to ECLIPSE and HampsonRussell, respectively.



The observation operator  ${\mathcal G}$  comprises several steps summarized as:

1. running the reservoir simulator using  $m_j$  to compute dynamic variables (pressure and saturation)



- 1. running the reservoir simulator using  $m_j$  to compute dynamic variables (pressure and saturation)
- 2. running the petro-elastic model to compute the acoustic impedance,  $z_{p,j}$ , at all survey times



- 1. running the reservoir simulator using  $m_j$  to compute dynamic variables (pressure and saturation)
- 2. running the petro-elastic model to compute the acoustic impedance,  $z_{p,j}$ , at all survey times
- 3. compute differences and average over formation layers to get  $\overline{\Delta z}_{p,j}$



- 1. running the reservoir simulator using  $m_j$  to compute dynamic variables (pressure and saturation)
- 2. running the petro-elastic model to compute the acoustic impedance,  $z_{p,j}$ , at all survey times
- 3. compute differences and average over formation layers to get  $\overline{\Delta z}_{p,j}$
- 4. applying the discrete wavelet transform to get wavelet coefficients



The Nationa

- 1. running the reservoir simulator using  $m_j$  to compute dynamic variables (pressure and saturation)
- 2. running the petro-elastic model to compute the acoustic impedance,  $z_{p,j}$ , at all survey times
- 3. compute differences and average over formation layers to get  $\overline{\Delta z}_{p,j}$
- 4. applying the discrete wavelet transform to get wavelet coefficients
- 5. using the leading indices  $\mathcal{I}$  to get  $d_j$



# Seismic data inversion and transformation

- Time shift correction: Alfonzo et. al, 2017
- Linearized Bayesian approach: Buland and Omre, 2003
- Time to depth conversion: Provided Norne velocity model
- Upscaling: Petrel software
- Difference and averaging:  $\overline{\Delta z}_p^o$



# 

# Petro-elastic model

- Estimate mineral bulk and shear moduli:  $[K_s, G_s] \leftarrow \text{Hashin} - \text{Shtrikman}(K_{\text{quartz}}, G_{\text{quartz}}, K_{\text{clay}}, G_{\text{clay}}, V_{\text{clay}})$
- Dry rock bulk and shear moduli (empirical):  $[K_{dry}, G_{dry}] \leftarrow f(p, p_{ini}, \phi)$
- Fluid substitution:
  - $[\mathit{K}_{\mathrm{sat}}, \mathit{G}_{\mathrm{sat}}] \gets \mathrm{Gassmann}(\mathit{K}_{\mathrm{dry}}, \mathit{G}_{\mathrm{dry}}, \mathit{K}_{s}, \mathit{s}_{o}, \mathit{s}_{g}, \mathit{s}_{w})$
- P-wave velocity and rock density:  $[v_p, \rho_{sat}] \leftarrow Mavko(K_{sat}, G_{sat})$  $z_p = v_p \times \rho_{sat}$



