Research Group in Reservoir Simulation and Management

Case Study for Field Development and Management - Selection of Production Strategy based on UNISIM-II-D

Production strategy selection considers WAG injection and 100% gas recycling

Antonio Alberto Souza Santos

João Carlos von Hohendorff Filho

Manuel Gomes Correia

Guilherme Daniel Avansi

Ana Teresa Ferreira da Silva Gaspar

Susana Margarida da Graça Santos

Denis José Schiozer

Campinas, August 10, 2023

Changes from the previous version

This section is dedicated to change's control of the benchmark proposal document.

The table below describes the main changes in this proposal document for the UNISIM-II-D benchmark case.

Table of changes from version: June 20, 2018

ID	TOPIC	DESCRIPTION
1.	Front Page (study proposal)	1. **Added subtitle**: "Production strategy selection considers WAG injection and 100% gas recycling". Now the study includes the possibility of injecting WAG and recycling gas to select a production strategy that is better suited to current challenges.
2.	Introduction	2. **Added new premises**: a new set of premises have been added to consider gas injection and WAG injection as recovery mechanisms in addition to water flooding, creating new challenges related to gas management strategies.
3.	Premises	3. **Added a text**: to better explain about well schedule.
4.	Deterministic approach (Economic scenario)	4. **Added a text**: with clarification about drilling and completion of horizontal well.
5.	Deterministic approach (Economic scenario)	**5.** **Added costs**: included **GAS INJECTION COSTS**, in table 7: Deterministic economic scenario (most likely).
6.	Probabilistic approach (Economic scenario)	6. **Modified costs**: **GAS PRICE** change (to have more realistic "Pessimistic" and "Optimistic" economic scenarios).
7.	Probabilistic approach (Economic scenario)	**7.** **Added costs**: included **GAS INJECTION COSTS**, in table 12: Optimistic and Pessimistic economic scenario.
8.	Copyright	8. **Added COPYRIGHT statement**: information about use of data, content and purpose.

Summary

1. Introduction

The aim of this document is to present a reservoir case study to be submitted to decision analysis to define an oil exploitation strategy for field development, entitled **UNISIM-II-D**, where D stands for development phase. In this new release of the **UNISIM-II-D** benchmark, a new set of premises have been added to consider gas injection and water alternating gas injection as recovery mechanisms in addition to water flooding, creating new challenges related to gas management strategies.

The simulation model (Figure 1) was built based on the reference model **UNISIM-II-R,** developed by Correia et al. (2015), a synthetic naturally fractured carbonate reservoir with features found in Brazilian pre-salt fields, such as high-permeability thin layers, commonly known as super-k. Reservoir depth varies between 5,000 m and 5,500 m from sea level, initial pressure is 560 Kgf/cm^2 (54.917 kPa), temperature is 59°C, oil viscosity is 1.14 cP (28° API), and the associated gas has a CO_2 content of 8.24% (deterministic case).

The case study has 516 days (t_d) of initial production data of one (1) vertical production well (Wildcat). The exploitation strategy is to be set between t_d and the maximum final date (t_{final}). Different recovery methods and gas management strategies can be considered such as water injection, water and gas injection, water-alternating-gas (WAG), WAG-CO_2, gas recycling at varying rates, and CO_2 injection from external sources.

The reservoir is represented in one static model with two fluid models of different fidelity:

- **UNISIM-II-D-BO**, where BO stands for black-oil simulation model,
- **UNISIM-II-D-CO**, where CO stands for compositional simulation model.

The static model of both cases is the same and they differ only in the fluid model. It is a dual-permeability simulation model that has a corner-point grid with 46 x 69 x 30 cells measuring, on average, 100 x 100 x 8 m (total 65,000 active cells). The fluid model of **UNISIM-II-D-BO** is represented by a PVT table, while the fluid model of **UNISIM-II-D-CO** is represented by a Peng-Robinson Equation of State (EOS) with seven pseudo-components. The choice of which simulation model to use depends on study objectives.

The data required for reservoir simulation using IMEX (black-oil) and GEM (compositional) commercial simulators from CMG and the case study description are available for download via a web page by interested third parties, such as universities and research centers (https://www.unisim.cepetro.unicamp.br/benchmarks/unisim-ii/). The system of measurement used in this proposal are the MODSI of IMEX and SI system of GEM.



Figure 1: Porosity map (layer 11) for the base case with the location of the Wildcat well.

The objective of the study is to propose a production strategy (reservoir development and management with or without integration with production facilities, depending on study objective) considering two reservoir approaches:

1) Deterministic, without uncertainties;
2) Probabilistic, with reservoir, economic and operational uncertainties.

For studies without integration with production system, the transition between past-future must be done adequately (honoring history data). It is necessary to indicate how the production system was considered (premises for simplification in bottom-hole boundary conditions).

E-mail for questions, comments, suggestions and problems:
unisim-benchmark@cepetro.unicamp.br.

2. Problem Description - Field Development and Management

2.1 Decision variables

The decision variables for exploitation strategy selection are listed below. Please note that, depending study objective, some of these variables may not apply to your work.

- Number of wells;
- Well type (producer or injector);
- Well technology (conventional or intelligent);
- Well direction (vertical or horizontal);
- Wells placement (I, J, K);
- Wells schedule (opening sequence of each well);
- Well monitoring variables (e.g., pressure, rates, water cut, shut-in date);
- Injection strategy;
- Gas management strategy;
- Platform system capacities, namely flow-rate constraints for:
  - liquid processing (Cp_L);
  - oil processing (Cp_O);
  - gas processing (Cp_G);
  - gas injection (Ci_G);
  - water processing (Cp_W);
  - water injection (Ci_W).
- Platform location (L_P);
- Well and gathering systems:
  - Riser diameter (d_R);
  - Production/injection line diameter (d_L);
  - Production/injection column diameter (d_C);
  - Gas lift rate (q_{GI});
  - Gas lift valve position (h_{GL}).

Wells operating conditions must consider production system configurations. If operation incurs costs these must be considered in the cash flow. Information about production system configurations are described in Appendix-I (file: Appendix-I_AdditionalInformation_ProductionSystem.pdf).

For a similar execution of this project between participants, any additional costs should be communicated by email (unisim-benchmark@cepetro.unicamp.br). The values and information will be available at benchmark's webpage to all groups working on this project.

2.2 Important Events

This section lists the main events of the proposal, including field production and cash flow events.

Time (day)	Date (MMM/DD/YYYY)	Event – Field Timeline Description
0	SEP/30/2016	1. Simulation initial date
0	SEP/30/2016	2. Production starting time
516	FEB/28/2018	3. End of production history (t_d)
517	MAR/01/2018	4. Starting date of production forecast
517	MAR/01/2018	5. Beginning of well drilling operation
547	APR/01/2018	6. Beginning of well completion operation
1247	FEB/29/2020	7. Beginning of production system installation
1247	FEB/29/2020	8. 1st well connection (well-platform)
10957	SEP/30/2046	9. Simulation final time (simulation may end earlier but not later)
10957	SEP/30/2046	10. Maximum date for field abandonment

Table 1 : UNISIM-II-D timeline events – field production.

Time (day)	Date (MMM/DD/YYYY)	Event – Cash Flow Timeline Description
516	FEB/28/2018	1. Reference date for analysis (for updating cash flow) REFERENCE (Present Date)
547	MAR/31/2018	2. Investments on 1st well drilling
577	APR/30/2018	3. Investments on 1st well completion
1247	FEB/29/2020	4. Investments on platform and facilities
1247	FEB/29/2020	5. Investments on 1st well connection (well-platform)
10957	SEP/30/2046	6. Maximum Incidence date - field abandonment cost

Table 2 : UNISIM-II-D timeline events – cash flow.

2.3 Premises

The decision analysis process is based on the premises:

- Liquid and gas production rates and BHP of the Wildcat well (history data):
    - "UNISIM-II-D_HistoryData_td.zip" file
    - Production data history generated on UNISIM-II-R containing noise
- If the Wildcat is used in the exploitation strategy, only the well-platform connection cost must be considered; this is, because drilling and completion costs have already been accounted for before the date of analysis (i.e., in the history period)
- Characteristics of producers and injectors:
    - Vertical or horizontal wells, regarding grid orientation (I, J, K)
    - Conventional or intelligent completion
    - Injection wells can be water injectors, gas injectors or WAG injectors
- Minimum time interval between each well drilling: 30 days[1]

[1] We assume that two rigs are operating simultaneously, one dedicated to drilling and completion, while the other is dedicated to well connection.

- Minimum time interval between each well completion: 30 days[1]
- Well connection schedule: minimum of 30 days[1]
- One dedicated vessel will work on drilling and completion
- One dedicated vessel will work on connection
- Minimum time interval between each well conversion: 30 days
- Minimum time interval between each well recompletion: 30 days
- Minimum distance between wells: 1 block (around 100 m)
- Minimum distance between wellheads: 500m
- Maximum horizontal well length: 1000 m
- Minimum horizontal well length: 100 m
- Vertical well length: free
- Maximum capacity for well-platform connection: 32 wells
    - For strategies with more wells, additional platforms should be considered
- Field abandonment event must be carried out on the shut-in date of the last well in operation

Table 3 presents well operational conditions using standalone reservoir simulations, when adopted simplified production system configurations. Table 4 and Table 5 present the equipment data and operating conditions for production forecasts. Note that, for studies considering integration between reservoir and production systems, Appendix I should be used instead of Tables 4 and 5.

Type	Well Producer	Well Injector	Unit	Simulation model
Water rate	--	Max 5,000	m^3/day	BO and CO
Gas rate	--	Max 2,000,000	m^3/day	BO and CO
Liquid rate	Max 3,000	--	m^3/day	BO and CO
BHP	Min 275	Max 480	Kgf/cm^2	BO
BHP	Min 26968	Max 47072	kPa	CO

Table 3: Well operational conditions.

Type	Well	Unit
Radius	0.108	m
Geofac(2)	0.37	--
Wfrac(3)	1	--
Skin(4)	0	--

Table 4: Well data.

(1) Modified SI system of IMEX and Field SI system of GEM. (2) Geometric factor. (3) Angular well fraction. (4) Well skin factor.

Type	Platform Production	Platform Injection	Unit $x10^3$
Max Water rate	120	240	bbl/day(1)
Max Liquid rate	180	--	bbl/day(1)
Max Oil rate	180	--	bbl/day(1)
Max Gas rate	8000	8000	m^3/day

Table 5: Platform data and operational conditions.

2.4 Deterministic approach

2.4.1 Objective Functions

We recommend the following objective functions for the deterministic approach (one reservoir simulation model and one economic scenario), but others may be considered:

- Net present value (NPV);
- Cumulative oil production (Np);
- Cumulative gas production (Gp);
- Cumulative water production (Wp);
- Cumulative water injection (Wi);
- Cumulative gas injection (Gi) (if applicable)
- Recovery factor (RF).

We categorize the objective functions as follows, with suggestions (other objective functions may be considered, depending on study objective):

1. Field
    a. Main: NPV, Np, RF;
    b. Secondary: Gp, Wp, Wi, Gi, Pavg (reservoir average pressure);
2. Well
    a. Producers: oil rate, gas rate, water rate, bottom-hole pressure, and economic indicator;
    b. Injector: injected water (gas) rate, bottom-hole pressure, and economic indicator.

2.4.2 Economic Scenario

Equation 1 shows how to calculate investments on platforms. This equation is based on data presented by Hayashi (2006) with some changes to incorporate additional parameters and to reflect inflation.

$$Inv_{plat} = 417 + 3.15 \times Cp_l + 12.2 \times Cp_o + 3.15 \times Cp_w + 3.15 \times Ci_w + 9.61 \times Cp_g + 0.1 \times n_w \qquad \textbf{Equation 1}$$

given that:

Inv_{plat}	:	investment on platform	(x10**6** USD)
Cp_L	:	liquid processing capacity	(x10**3** m³/day)
Cp_o	:	oil processing capacity	(x10**3** m³/day)
Cp_w	:	water processing capacity	(x10**3** m³/day)
Ci_w	:	water injection capacity	(x10**3** m³/day)
Cp_g	:	gas processing capacity	(x10**6** m³/day)
n_w	:	number of well slots	

The 1st term of Equation 1 (417) is a constant representing a fixed cost. Equation 1 does not consider a term for gas injection capacity as this proposal assumes that gas injection operations use the same facilities of gas production. In case of injection of fresh CO_2, the cost of additional infrastructure is imbedded into the cost of CO_2, presented later.

The objective function given by Equation 2 is the Net Present Value (NPV) indicator, defined as the sum of the inflows and outflows of the cash flows, discounted at a given date.

$$NPV = \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \frac{NCF_j}{(1+i)^{t_j}} \qquad \textbf{Equation 2}$$

given that:

NCF_j	:	Net cash flow at period j
j	:	time period
N_t	:	total number of time periods
i	:	discount rate
t_j	:	time period j (average time of the period) related to the date of analysis

In this project, the net cash flow for each period is calculated using the following simplified equation based on the Brazilian R&T fiscal regime (Equation 3):

$$NCF = \left[(R - Roy - ST - OC) * (1 - T)\right] - Inv - AC$$ **Equation 3**

given that:

NCF	:	Net cash flow
R	:	Gross revenues from oil and gas selling
Roy	:	Total amount paid in royalties (charged over gross revenue)
ST	:	Total amount paid in Social Taxes (special taxes on gross revenues)
CO	:	Operational production costs (associated with the oil and water production and water injection)
T	:	Corporate tax rate
Inv	:	Investments on equipment and facilities (platform, production and injection wells, network systems, pipelines etc.)
AC	:	Abandonment cost

Table 6 presents fiscal assumptions and Table 7 the deterministic most-likely economic scenario when adopted simplified production system configurations.

Variable	Value
Corporate tax rate	34%
Social tax rate - charged over gross revenue	9.25%
Royalties rate - charged over gross revenue	10%

Table 6: Fiscal assumptions.

Variable/Parameter	Value	Unit
Oil price	257.9	USD/m^3
Gas price (for use with gas trading approach)	0.026	USD/m^3
Oil production cost	48.57	USD/m^3
Gas production cost	0.013	USD/m^3
Water production cost	4.86	USD/m^3
Water injection cost	4.86	USD/m^3
Gas injection cost (recycled)	0.014	USD/m^3
Gas injection cost (CO_2 from external source)	0.036	USD/m^3
Drilling and completion of horizontal well, consisting of two terms:		
• fixed cost, and	73.75	10^6 USD
• variable cost (depending on length)	0.032	10^6 USD/m
Connection of horizontal well (well-platform)	13.30	10^6 USD
Drilling of vertical well	23.40	10^6 USD
Completion of vertical well	26.94	10^6 USD
Connection of vertical well (well-platform)	13.30	10^6 USD
Additional investment for each WAG injector	1.63	10^6 USD

Variable/Parameter	Value	Unit
Recompletion of horizontal well	11.02	10^6 USD
Recompletion of vertical well	10.97	10^6 USD
Well conversion	11.02	10^6 USD
1st Inflow Control Valve (ICV) (for each well)	1.00	10^6 USD
2nd or more ICV (for each well)	0.30	10^6 USD/ICV
Platform	(Equation 1)	10^6 USD
Abandonment cost(1)	8.2%	--
Annual discount rate	9%	--

Table 7: Deterministic economic scenario (most likely).

(1) We assume the abandonment cost as a percentage of investment in drilling and completion.

2.5 Probabilistic Approach

2.5.1 Objective Functions

In the probabilistic approach (a set of reservoir simulation models and economic scenarios), the expected value of the deterministic objective functions is used. The expected value of a discrete random variable X, E[X], is given by the sum of the value X of each scenario weighted by its respective probability. Equation 4 determines the expected value of NPV, commonly referred to as expected monetary value (EMV).

$$EMV = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \cdot NPV_i \qquad \textbf{Equation 4}$$

given that:

EMV	:	expected monetary value
p_i	:	probability of occurrence of scenario i
NPV_i	:	Net Present Value of scenario i
n	:	total number of scenarios

The expected value alone may be insufficient because it does not capture the magnitude of potential losses and gains. Thus, it can be combined with indicators of downside risk and upside potential (Santos et al., 2017).

In a similar approach to that of the deterministic analysis, we categorize the probabilistic objective functions as follows:

1. Field
    a. Main: EMV, measures of risk, E[Np], E[Rf];
    b. Secondary: E[Gp], E[Wp], E[Wi], E[Gi], Pavg;
2. Well
    a. Producers: oil rate, gas rate, water rate and economic indicators;
    b. Injector: injected water rate, injected gas rate and economic indicator.

The objective functions listed above are suggestions and other may be considered in the analyses.

2.5.2 Uncertainties

The probability levels for the discrete attributes of the reservoir, economic and operational uncertainties are provided in the next topics.

2.5.3 Reservoir Attributes

An uncertainty modeling was conducted to generate equiprobable geostatistical realizations (referred here as images) to be integrated into this decision analysis project. In addition, other uncertainties are considered. The set of reservoir attributes include:

- A set of images of petrophysical characteristics (matrix and fracture porosities, matrix and fracture permeabilities, fracture spacing, net-to-gross thickness ratio, and rock type); other realizations can be generated for future application;
- Kr: water relative permeability;
- Cpor: rock compressibility;
- PVT: pressure-volume-temperature table (black-oil model only);
- PB: bubble point pressure (black-oil model only);
- ZOIL: initial fluid composition (compositional model only).

Table 8 summarizes the input uncertain properties (images) for reservoir simulation, considering the geological uncertain attributes described in Correia et al. (2015). The dynamic uncertainties considered are the relative permeability and fluid properties (PVT data in the black-oil model, and initial fluid composition in the compositional model). For reservoir simulation purposes, the static properties must be tied together in each realization as they are dependent attributes. The relative permeability is independent of static behavior, and, consequently, could be randomly combined with static properties.

Uncertainty Reservoir Property for Simulation (input data)	UNISIM-II (nomenclature for include files)
Matrix Porosity	POR
Fracture Porosity	PFR
Matrix Permeability	KX; KY; KZ
Fracture Permeability	KFX; KFY; KF
Fracture Spacing	SGX; SGY; SGZ
Net to Gross	NG
Rock Type	rtype
Relative Permeability	Kr
PVT (black-oil model only)	PVT
Initial fluid composition (compositional model only)	ZOIL

Table 8. Input uncertainty data for reservoir simulation.

Table 9 and Table 10 show the uncertain levels and probabilities of static and dynamic attributes. Static properties are equiprobable, meaning that each image has equal probability of occurrence. Relative permeability and fluid properties are defined by three probability levels. Defining the probability of each level is a difficult task and can be subjective, and in this project, we take Level 0 as the most likely to occur. PB level is directly linked to PVT level, i.e., PB0 is tied to PVT0 and so on.

Attribute	Levels (Probability)		
	-1	**0**	**+1**
Img	500 petrophysical images (equiprobable)		
Kr	KR-1 (0.3)	KR0 (0.4)	KR1 (0.3)
PVT (black-oil model only)	PVT-1 (0.3)	PVT0 (0.4)	PVT1 (0.3)
ZOIL (compositional model only)	ZOIL-1 (0.3)	ZOIL0 (0.4)	ZOIL1 (0.3)

Table 9. Uncertainty levels and probabilities of static and dynamic attributes.

Attribute	PDF* [cm²/kgf (10⁻⁶)]	PDF* [1/kPa (10⁻⁶)]
Cpor	$\begin{cases} 0, & x \leq 10 \\ \frac{x-10}{1849}, & 10 < x \leq 53 \\ \frac{96-x}{1849}, & 53 < x \leq 96 \\ 0, & x > 96 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0, & x \leq 10 \\ \frac{x-0.1020}{18.8546}, & 10 < x \leq 53 \\ \frac{0.9789-x}{18.8546}, & 53 < x \leq 96 \\ 0, & x > 96 \end{cases}$

Table 10: Uncertainty levels of the continuous geological attributes (MODSI units and SI units).

* Probability Density Function

2.5.4 Economic Scenario

Uncertainty in oil price takes the Probability Density Function showed in Table 11 and is modeled by a triangular distribution.

Attribute	Unit	PDF*
Oil price	USD/m³	$\begin{cases} 0, & x \leq 10 \\ \frac{x-10}{800}, & 10 < x \leq 30 \\ \frac{90-x}{2400}, & 30 < x \leq 90 \\ 0, & x > 90 \end{cases}$

Table 11: Uncertainty levels for oil price in the economic scenarios.

* Probability Density Function

In addition to the most-likely scenario, the optimistic and pessimistic economic scenarios are shown in Table 12, when adopted simplified production system configurations. Probabilities of occurrence considered for the pessimistic, the most-likely and the optimistic scenarios are 25%, 50% and 25%, respectively.

Variable/Parameter	Optimistic	Pessimistic	Unit
Oil price	412.0	151.8	USD/m³
Gas price (for use with gas trading approach)	0.041	0.016	USD/m³
Oil production cost	82.41	30.37	USD/m³
Gas production cost	0.016	0.006	USD/m³
Water production cost	7.76	2.86	USD/m³
Water injection cost	7.76	2.86	USD/m³
Gas injection cost (recycled)	0.02	0.0082	USD/m³
Gas injection cost (CO_2 from external source)	0.0514	0. 021	USD/m³
Drilling and completion of horizontal well, consisting of: • fixed cost, and • variable cost (depending on length)	 117.84 0.05	 43.42 0.02	 10⁶ USD 10⁶ USD/m
Connection of horizontal well (well-platform)	21.25	7.83	10⁶ USD
Drilling of vertical well	37.39	13.78	10⁶ USD
Completion of vertical well	43.04	15.86	10⁶ USD

Variable/Parameter	Optimistic	Pessimistic	Unit
Connection of vertical well (well-platform)	21.25	7.83	10^6 USD
Additional investment for each WAG injectors	2.03	1.43	10^6 USD
Recompletion of horizontal well	17.61	6.49	10^6 USD
Recompletion of vertical well	17.53	6.46	10^6 USD
Well conversion	17.61	6.49	10^6 USD
1st Inflow Control Valve (ICV) (for each well)	1.60	0.59	10^6 USD
2nd or more ICV (for each well)	0.48	0.18	10^6 USD/ICV
Platform: (Equation 1)	1.25 x	0.8 x	10^6 USD
Abandonment cost(1)	8.2%	8.2%	--
Annual discount rate	9%	9%	--

Table 12: Optimistic and Pessimistic Economic Scenario.

(1) We assume the abandonment cost as a percentage of investment in drilling and completion.

2.5.5 *Other Uncertainties*

Uncertainties for operational and well productivity attributes are also considered as shown in Table 13.

- SA: System availability, applied to platform, groups, producers, and injectors (Note that the IMEX/GEM keyword ON-TIME can be used);
- dWi: Uncertainties related to well productivity (formation damage, chemical dissolution etc) applied as a well index multiplier.

Attribute	Type	Levels (Probabilities)		
		0 (0.34)	**+1** (0.33)	**-1** (0.33)
SA	Platform	0.95	1.00	0.90
	Group	0.96	1.00	0.91
	Producer	0.96	1.00	0.91
	Injector	0.98	1.00	0.92
dWi		1.0	1.4	0.7

Table 13: Uncertainty levels and probabilities for technical attributes.

2.5.6 *Managing Uncertainty*

Participants are encouraged to assess the effects of uncertainty and to find actions to manage it, either to mitigate risks or exploit upsides. Actions to manage uncertainty include (1) acquiring additional information to reduce reservoir uncertainty, (2) defining a flexible production system that allows system modifications as uncertainties unfold over time, and (3) defining a robust production strategy able to cope with uncertainty without requiring system modifications after production has started. Because these actions incur additional investments and costs, and potentially delay production, their values must be quantified using the Expected Value of Information (EVoI), Flexibility (EVoF), and Robustness (EVoR) analyses. These actions should be recommended only in cases of positive EVoI, EVoF, and EVoR.

In the first action, decision makers defer the development decision while new information is acquired. They aim to change the current knowledge of uncertain reservoir attributes so that decisions can be improved. The term “information” is typically used in a broad sense and commonly refers to acquiring data, namely seismic surveys, well testing, and drilling appraisal wells. The term also covers performing technical studies, hiring consultants, and performing diagnostic tests.

The attractiveness of flexibility arises from the options available, allowing active reactions based on the knowledge gained over time. Examples of flexible production systems include platform capacity expansion, modularity, intelligent wells, flexible subsea layouts, and the ability to redistribute injection quotas or switch the injected fluid.

A robust production strategy can be obtained through "robust optimization", an optimization problem formulated under uncertainty to maximize a probabilistic objective function. Alternatively, the robustness of a specialized optimized production strategy (based on deterministic approach of the reservoir properties) can be increased using performance indicators over multiple scenarios. A textbook example of robustness is the placement of producers and injectors in relation to a fault to cope with uncertainty in fault transmissibility.

3. Expected Results

After the decision regarding the strategy selection, a report should be generated including:

1. Selected strategy configuration (IJK coordinates and operational conditions of each well, production system variables, and groups constraints).
2. Efficiency indicators of the optimization process: chosen methods, number of simulation runs, computational cost, and objective function evolution.
3. Performance indicators of the selected exploitation strategy, for example:
    a. Main indicators: NPV, EMV, measures of risk, Np, RF;
    b. Secondary indicators: Gp, Wp, Wi, Gi, Pavg;
    c. Producers indicators: oil rate, gas rate, water rate, water cut and economic indicator;
    d. Injector indicators: injected water rate and costs.

4. References

1. AVANSI, G. D.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "UNISIM-I: Synthetic Model for Reservoir Development and Management Application", International Journal of Modeling and Simulation for the Petroleum Industry, v. 9, p. 21-30, April, 2015.

2. BELTRÃO, R. L. C.; SOMBRA, C. L.; LAGE, A. C. V. M.; FAGUNDES N, J. R.; HENRIQUES, C. C. D. "Challenges and New Technologies for the Development of the Pre-Salt Cluster, Santos Basin, Brazil" (OTC-19880-MS). Offshore Technology Conference, 4 – 7 May, Houston, Texas, USA, 2009.

3. BARRETO, C. E. A. G.; GASPAR, A. T. F. da S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Impact of the Use of Intelligent Wells on the Evaluation of the Oil Development and Production Strategy" (SPE-180861-MS), SPE Energy Resources Conference, 13-16 June, Port of Spain, Trinidad & Tobago, 2016.

4. CORREIA, M. G.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "An Integrated Workflow to Combine Static and Dynamic Uncertainties in Reservoir Simulation Models", 80th EAGE Conference and Exhibition 2018, 11-14 June, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2018.

5. CORREIA, M. G.; HOHENDORFF FILHO, J. C. von; GASPAR, A. T. F. da S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "UNISIM-II-D: Benchmark Case Proposal Based on a Carbonate Reservoir" (SPE-177140-MS), SPE Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference, 18-20 November, Quito, Ecuador, 2015.

6. GASPAR, A. T. F. S.; BARRETO, C. E. A. G.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Assisted Process for Design Optimization of Oil Exploitation Strategy", Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, v. 146, pp. 473-488, October, 2016.

7. GASPAR, A. T. F. S.; BARRETO, C. E. A. G.; MUNOZ MAZO, E. O.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Application of Assisted Optimization to Aid Oil Exploitation Strategy Selection for Offshore Fields" (SPE-169464-MS), SPE Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference, 21-23 Mayo, Maracaibo, Venezuela, 2014.

8. HOHENDORFF FILHO, J. C. V.; MASCHIO, C.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Production Strategy Optimization Based on Iterative Discrete Latin Hypercube", Journal of the Brazilian Society of Mechanical Sciences and Engineering, v. 38, pp. 2473-2480, December, 2016.

9. HOHENDORFF FILHO, J. C. V.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Evaluation of Reservoir and Production System Integration in Production Strategy Selection" (SPE-182624-MS), SPE Reservoir Simulation Conference, 20-22 February, Montgomery, Texas, USA, 2017.

10. MEIRA, L. A. A.; COELHO, G. P.; SILVA, C. G.; SANTOS, A. A. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "RMFinder 2.0: An Improved Interactive Multi-criteria Scenario Reduction Methodology" (SPE-185502-MS), SPE LACPEC, 17-19 May, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2017.

11. MEIRA, L. A. A.; COELHO, G. P.; SANTOS, A. A. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Selection of Representative Models for Decision Analysis Under Uncertainty", Computers & Geoscience, v. 88, pp. 67-82, March, 2016.

12. MOCZYDLOWER, B.; SALOMÃO, M.C.; BRANC O, C. C. M.; ROMEU, R. L.; HOMEM, T. R.; FREITAS, L. C. S; LIMA, H. A. T. S. “Development of the Brazilian Pre-Salt Fields - When to Pay for Information and When to Pay for Flexibility” (SPE-152860-MS.). SPE Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference, 16-18 April, Mexico City, Mexico, 2012.

13. MOORTGAT, J.; FIROOZABADI, A.; LI, Z.; ESPÓSITO, R. “Experimental Coreflooding and Numerical Modeling of CO2 Injection with Gravity and Diffusion Effects” (SPE-135563-MS). SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, 19-22 September, Florence, Italy, 2010.

14. MORAIS, V. L. R. S.; FIORAVANTI, A. L.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Methodology to Estimate Intelligent Wells Economic Impact Considering Reservoir Uncertainties" (SPE-182591-MS), SPE Reservoir Simulation Conference, 20-22 February, Montgomery, Texas, USA, 2017.

15. MOROSOV, A. L.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Field Development Process Revealing Uncertainty Assessment Pitfalls" (SPE-180094-PA), SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering-Reservoir Engineering, v. 20 (3), pp. 765-778, August, 2017.

16. NAKANO, C. M. F.; PINTO, A. C. C.; MARCUSSO, J. L.; MINAMI, K. “Pre-Salt Santos Basin – Extended Well Test and Production Pilot in the Tupi Area – The Planning Phase” (OTC-19886-MS). Offshore Technology Conference, 4-7 May, Houston, Texas, USA, 2009.

17. ODA, M. “Permeability Tensor for Discontinuous Rock Mass”. Geotechnique, v. 35 (4), pp. 483-495, 1985.

18. SANTOS, D. R.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Influence of Well Control Management on Production Strategy Selection Under Uncertainties During the oil Field Development Phase Applied to UNISIM-I-D Benchmark Case" (SPE-184933-MS), SPE Latin America and Caribbean Mature Fields Symposium, 15-16 March, Salvador, Brazil, 2017.

19. SANTOS, S. M. G.; BOTECHIA, V. E.; GASPAR, A. T. F. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Expected Value, Downside Risk and Upside Potential as Decision Criteria in Production Strategy Selection for Petroleum Field Development", Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, v. 157, pp. 81-93, August, 2017.

20. SANTOS, S. M. G.; GASPAR, A. T. F. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Comparison of Risk Analysis Methodologies in a Geostatistical Context: Monte Carlo with Joint Proxy Models and Discretized Latin Hypercube", International Journal for Uncertainty Quantification, v. 8 (1), pp. 23-41, March, 2018.

21. SANTOS, S. M. G.; GASPAR, A. T. F. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Risk Management in Petroleum Development Projects: Technical and Economic Indicators to Define a Robust Production Strategy", Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, v. 151, pp. 116-127, March, 2017.

22. SANTOS, S. M. G.; GASPAR, A. T. F. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J. "Value of Information in Reservoir Development Projects: Technical Indicators to Prioritize Uncertainties and Information Sources", Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, v. 157, pp. 1179-1191, August, 2017.

23. SCHIOZER, D. J.; AVANSI, G. D.; SANTOS, A. A. S. "Risk Quantification Combining Geostatistical Realizations and Discretized Latin Hypercube", Journal of the Brazilian Society of Mechanical Sciences and Engineering, v. 39 (2), pp. 575-587, February, 2017.

24. SILVA, M. I. O.; SANTOS, A. A. S.; SCHIOZER, D. J.; NEUFVILLE, R. "Methodology to Estimate the Value of Flexibility under Endogenous and Exogenous Uncertainties", Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, v. 151, pp. 235-247, March, 2017.

25. SWART, P. K.; Cantrell, D. L.; Westphal, H.; Handford, C. R.; Kendall, C. G. “Origin of Dolomite in the Arab-D Reservoir from the Ghawar Field, Saudi Arabia: Evidence from Petrographic and Geochemical Constraints”. Journal of Sedimentary Research, v. 35(3), p. 476-491, May, 2005.

5. Provided files

The necessary files for reservoir simulation data are available for download at http://www.unisim.cepetro.unicamp.br/benchmarks/unisim-ii/

6. Copyright