



#### THE DIGITAL OIL FIELD IN PRACTICE

How the DoF can be used in high uncertainty and low RT measurement contexts

#### INTRODUCTION

Many fields experience significant data quality and availability issues. Real-time, digital oilfield (DOF) systems are often viewed as the exclusive preserve of fields with high levels of data availability and frequency. The DOF can also provide a significant amount of value to systems that have significant data issues.

This field case details how the Petroleum Experts DOF system was used to address some significant technical challenges experienced by the field. In particular the serving to reduce the uncertainty present in the system and address some of the data availability and quality issues.

#### CHALLENGES

One of the main challenges that was experienced by the field was the significant uncertainty in current operating conditions; this stems from a historical lack of adequate allocation data and the inability to test many of the wells on their own.

In many systems the 'test-by-difference' principle is used to infer producing conditions from wells that cannot be tested individually. In this field, this technique does not allow for a complete understanding in the system since there is very little real-time information available for many of these wells also (e.g.  $\approx$ 50% of WHP and/or FLP gauges are currently not working...). These complications mean that there has been a great deal of uncertainty in the current operating conditions and consequently production allocation for some time.

#### FIELD DESCRIPTION

The field consists of 5 subsea templates produced through 6 risers. There are a total of 22 Gas lifted wells and one gas injector. The field has 2 separators, one production, and one test separator.

Perhaps one of the most significant uncertainties in the system is the gaslift gas injection rate provided to each well.

This creates a substantial issue when attempting to generate an understanding of the current water cut and gas oil ratio being produced through each well.

Compounding this issue is the fact that the gas lift injection system is also being used to provide gas to the gas injector for the field.





# **THE DIGITAL OIL FIELD IN PRACTICE** How the DoF can be used in high uncertainty and low RT measurement contexts

## **OBJECTIVE OF THE SOLUTION**

The main objective of the solution is to provide a system that can be used to optimise the production system. To achieve this it is first necessary to create a valid physics-based model tuned to the current production conditions.

# SOLUTION FORMULATION

- Enable field surveillance through real-time production monitoring
  - $\Rightarrow$  Considering the data availability issues

CASE STUDIES

- Implement standard workflows:
  - $\Rightarrow$  AWS well surveillance
  - $\Rightarrow$  GLA Gas-Lift allocation
  - $\Rightarrow$  SQC System Quality Control
  - $\Rightarrow$  MWA test separator multi-well allocation
  - $\Rightarrow$  MWA field wide multi-well allocation
  - $\Rightarrow$  OPT Optimisation
    - $\Rightarrow$  Production system optimisation {Gas lift allocation, well control optimisation}
    - $\Rightarrow$  GIRO {well/riser routing optimisation}
- Create a platform within which any custom field surveillance workflows can be leveraged

# The high level solution: Petroleum Experts Digital Oilfield

To be able to achieve the stated objectives (and overcoming the issues), a production optimisation surveillance system is necessary that combines the physical models of the field with real time data. The petroleum Experts Digital Oilfield was chosen to do this.

The premise was to capture the entire system from wellbore to the production and test separators, whilst being connected to a high frequency real-time data. This was achieved using the following Petroleum Experts tools: PROSPER, GAP, RESOLVE, IFM and IVM.

# A Detailed Description of the Solution

The Digital Oilfield (DoF) is made up of three key layers (under which we may sub categorise tasks/software):

- Physical Models (IPM)
- Integrated Field Management (IFM)
- Data Management and Integrated Visualisation of the system and its associated sub components (IVM)



These models are intended for use by engineers to represent field reality and as such a system is required which can identify and remedy any deviations from reality. This meant that a system needed to be provided which could help in identifying the causes for any divergence between model and reality. IFM is composed of two sub systems: **Model Catalogue** and the **Workflow manager**. The IFM workflow manager automates the calculations carried out with the physical models; one example would be the Network Pressure Estimator.

#### Data availability issues

One significant challenge that presents itself in this field is the significant lack of available real-time field measurements. Around 50% of the wellhead pressure gauges (FWHP) and flow line pressure gauges (FLP) are not currently functioning. Many downhole gauges are also not functioning. (Fig. 5)

1	Summery	Well Su	rvediance	Model Based Analytics	Tests	Config - General	Config - A	WS Con	fig - Fie	id MWA	Config	OFT Confe
Real Time Measurements				😥 Well	Rate Estimat	tion	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-		Freferred	
and American Management and American	Calc Method		VLP/PR	1			stoRate	SQC		· ·	Rate	
	Sensitivity to	Input	2.711					_	Leg	end		
	Preferred Me	thod					0		0	) [	VLP/PR	
Castle 🖉 🦉 The Park State Inc.	PRODUCTIO	RATES										
201 at 04.04 221 a	Oil Rate		1,507	1		1	1,507	1,667	0 1	,486	1,507	STR/day
a second second	Water Rate		2,799	5			2,799	3,096		2,760	2,799	STR/day
KOK 0.27 n 📅 1 🧩	Gas Rate		0.77	7			0.77	0.85	•	0.75	0.77	MMsdd
Adventure L	Liquid Rate		4,306				4,306	4,763		1,246	4,306	STR/day
	PRODUCTIO	CONDETE	ORS (Dev	sations with respect to	Base valu	ers)						
	1000	lase Value		12.44			-		-	-		221
-101 101-	WC			65.00			63.00	65.00		5.00	65.00	*
	GOR			508			508	508	0	508	508	sc/STB
The second se	GL.			1.638			1.638	1.630	-	1940	1.6.38	MMICO
and the second se	PRESSORES	AND ITM	RATURE	S (Deviations with res	pect to Me	nanured)	Cast					
and the second s		Measured 441	445	i i			445	386	100	451	445	exten.
The second se	B.T	112	134				134	138	1	10	134	15
	PUMP	444	444				444	391	1	414	446	-
	PANT	0	135				135	138		135	135	15
and the second se	LOHCE	1000	1202	8			1202	1134	800	1211	1202	Print .
	LOHGT	160	171	8			171	171	2	171	171	16
	FBIP	244	1235	1			1235	1169	-	1244	1235	250
11	FEHT		160	5		-	160	160	-	160	160	+¢
	OP	1310	845	i i		1	845	800	3	851		2990
				-					_			
		lase Valuer										
	Res Pres	1801	1801				1801	1801		1801	1801	poing
WILL SURVEILLANCE KPI	P1	8.10	8.10				8.10	8.10		8.10	8.10	STR/d/psi
N/A Good Poor												





## THE DIGITAL OIL FIELD IN PRACTICE

How the DoF can be used in high uncertainty and low RT measurement contexts

Many of the wells in the system however were produced through sub-sea templates that were shared with wells that did have pressure gauges. A custom workflow was therefore developed that could infer pressures for the missing data using gauges that were close-by.

The workflow encapsulates a logical set of steps that is used to select the most appropriate gauge to use to calculate flow line and wellhead pressure. The workflow is run in real-time, selecting a proximal well if possible, then if none is found finding a well that is producing through the same riser and applying a pressure correction to the measured pressure.

Since each well on the template can be produced through two risers this workflow is run at high frequency in order to capture the correct FWHP and FLP for each well in as close to real-time as possible.

Another example of such is the GLA workflow that pulls



The GLA workflow leverages all the available information to calculate the gas lift rates being provided to the wells. These calculated rates rely on different boundary conditions, the concept of redundancy that is utilised in many of the workflows allows the GLA workflow to monitor and validate the allocated gas lift rates as well as the performance of the individual gas lift chokes and gas lift valves in the wells. (Fig. 4)

In addition to balancing the rate calculations using the different methods the GLA workflow performs sensitivities which are designed to calculate the systems required to match the calculated rates.

These values can be used to match the performance of the wells and provide valuable information to the surveillance engineers that can be used to calibrate the well models. (Fig. 5)





#### THE DIGITAL OIL FIELD IN PRACTICE

How the DoF can be used in high uncertainty and low RT measurement contexts

An additional validation point that can be exploited in the system is that the total gas lift gas allocated to each well must equal the total injected into the system; a quantity that can be more easily measured at the facilities. (Fig. 6) In fact it is critical to ensure that the calculated rates for the gas lift can be reconciled to the total measured for the field. This provides another validation that the physical models reproduce reality.

The GLA workflow contains a number of methods that can perform this reconciliation.

The AWS workflow is then used to compliment the GLA workflow in that it can exploit any data redundancy by performing as many well performance calculations (e.g. rate estimations) as possible using different methods (and subsets of data), challenging our understanding of the reality of the well from as many 'angles' as possible.

I) Rat	e Selection	Reconciliation	Input for Workflo	ws
2.447		Reconciliation Factor 0.995	GL Rate used for A SQC, OPT workflow Data Source LA QC Unreconcile User Entere	e e
			3.400	]
2.633	2.633	2.620	2.633	]
5.312		GL Rate		
erence) Sele	ction Mode	Rec Mode		
4.696	Dynamic	Smart		
2.447	Change	Change		
Sensit	ivity Calculation	5		
Sensit GLS Ra	ivity Calculation	ase GL	Current	
Sensit GLS Ra produce oduce	te GLV Rate B	3 ase GL 0.210 in	Current 0.220 in 1.000 Change	
GLS Ra GLS Ra produce oduce	ivity Calculation te GLV Rate B 0.310 1.990	5 ese GL 0.210 in 0.930	Current 0.220 in 1.000 Change	
Sensit GLS Ra oroduce oduce	ivity Calculation te GLV Rate B 0.310 1.990	5 ese GL 0.210 in 0.930	Current 0.220 in 1.000 Change	
	2.447 2.417 5.313 srence) Sele 4.696 2.447	2.447 2.437 2.633 2.633 2.633 2.633 2.633 2.693 2.699 Dynamic Change	2.447 2.447 2.447 2.433 2.633 2.633 2.633 2.620 Reconciled G. Rate Sence) Selection Mode Rec Mode 4.696 Dynamic Change Change	E Reconciliation GL Rate used for A SQC OPT works   2.447 Extended Extended   2.447 2.633 2.620   2.433 2.633 2.620   2.433 2.633 2.620   2.433 2.633 2.620   2.447 Change Change

Each method attempts to isolate one element of the well so that it results focuses primarily on one clearly defined aspect of the well (e.g. Inflow Performance, ESP, Wellbore, Choke, etc.).

As each method is affected differently by the input data used (many of which are uncertain values such as current production conditions), the results of the various methods can be used to validate not only the physical models but the real-time data from the field.



© Text and images contained herein are subject to copyright laws, and should not be reproduced without permission of Petroleum Experts. Petroleum Experts is a registered trademark.



# CASE STUDIES

#### THE DIGITAL OIL FIELD IN PRACTICE

How the DoF can be used in high uncertainty and low RT measurement contexts

#### Multi-well allocation

The AWS and GLA workflows are then complimented by the use to the Multi-well allocation workflow (MWA). This workflow is used to allow the system to extract the necessary information to generate well test information for the wells that currently have the greatest uncertainty.

The MWA workflow monitors both the test separator and the field as a whole. The DOF system automatically detects which wells are in test and uses the MWA to test the wells in real-time continuously through production. It is therefore possible to implement a testing regiment that aims to combine wells that have the largest quantity of available data (also wells that can still be tested individually) and wells that still have significant uncertainty to generate useful production test data.

#### Summary

In the well metered and high frequency data available contexts, the Digital Oil Field system are continually proving themselves as an invaluable resource to all serious operators looking to maximise production, and minimise production loses through better understanding of the field response.

The above case is a very good example of how the very same approach could be (and is currently) being applied to fields with data frequency and quality issues. In this context, using multiple workflows (to create redundancy in calculations) and deductive reasoning the engineer can gain a much clearer understanding of what is happening in the system, and thus make higher quality decisions.