



Statoil

Not exactly as presented: Inversion testing part 4 and 5 added.
Maps and sections cropped. Modelling slides removed.
Some backup slides added

Pcube+ inversion – connecting rock physics and seismic amplitudes

FORCE seminar Practical Rock Physics and Inversion for Exploration and Production, 17/10-17

Ø. Skjæveland and R. P. Srivastava, Statoil

Classification: Internal

23 august 2017

© Statoil ASA

Objective

- Present a robust and relatively fast workflow
 - For using prestack seismic inversion to understand your seismic data
 - To be run by asset geophysicists - supported by inversion specialists
 - That can take noisy data as input - to be run before doing gather cleaning
- Dataset:
 - Statoil operated producing field on NCS
 - Current focus in asset: Maturing new well targets
 - Reservoir below BCU. Faulting, slumps and reworking of sands common
 - Fairly shallow water – heavily contaminated by multiples

Workflow in short

Create angle gathers. Ca 5 degrees bin interval.

Match frequencies across gather. Target: ~35 deg stack.

Calculate intercept and gradient from ~10 to ~35 degrees

Derive relative AI and vp/vs from intercept and gradient.

Use Shuey modeled reflectivity as relative inversion synthetics

Define rough Lithology Fluid Classes (LFC's) and build a prior LFC model using horizons

Do a rough prestack tie to find rough wavelets

Run a Pcube+ inversion

Calculate NRMS diff between seismic and synthetics

Investigate inversion results. Wells, locations of interest, low and high NRMS. Simple forward models helpful.

Apply data conditioning to input data and check effect of this and of inversion parameter variation. Consider if rough is good enough and if there is data support for going to details.

Relative

Absolute

Pcube+ inversion input

Input Setup
 Background Model
 Transition Probabilities
 Parameter Tuning


Seismic

Select an angle volume: # 1 - 97i_npol_match

	Angle (deg)	Peak Frequency (Hz)	S/N Ratio	Wavelet	Scaling
1	2	15	0.01	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
2	7	15	3	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
3	12	15	3	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
4	17	15	3	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
5	22	15	3	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
6	27	15	3	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
7	32	15	3	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
8	37	15	0.01	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
9	42	15	0.01	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
10	47	15	0.01	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
11	52	15	0.01	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4
12	57	15	0.01	input_gain_target_cut2_npol	4


Turn off individual angles by setting S/N close to zero

Name	Type	Color
Shale2	Gaussian	Dark Blue
Marls	Gaussian	Magenta
Brinesand	Gaussian	Blue
Oil	Gaussian	Green
Coal	Gaussian	Red
Hotshale	Gaussian	Yellow
Shale1	Gaussian	Black



LFC's – in this case extracted from well data. PDF's in vp,vs,density.

Here: Same wavelet for all angles. Statistical from 37 degree stack





Background model definition

Input Setup
 Background Model
 Transition Probabilities
 Parameter Tuning
 Output Setup

Layer Data

Layer	Name	Use horizon	Horizon	Offset (s)	Uncertainty (s)	Hierarchy
1	TOP			1.000	0.000	0
2	BCU +0s	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BCU	0.000	0.020	3
3	Top_Brent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Top_Brent_geomod	0.000	0.020	2

Facies	Type	Probability
1 Shale2	Gaussian	0.00
2 Marls	Gaussian	0.00
3 Brinesand	Gaussian	0.25
4 Oil	Gaussian	0.25
5 Coal	Gaussian	0.00
6 Hotshale	Gaussian	0.25
7 Shale1	Gaussian	0.25



Background model definition

Input Setup
 Background Model
 Transition Probabilities
 Parameter Tuning
 Output Setup



Layer Data

Layer	Name	Start time	Uncertainty	Hierarchy	Use horizon	Horizon
1	TOP	1.000	0.000	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2	BCU +0s	0.000	0.020	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BCU
3	Top_Brent	0.000	0.020	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Top_Brent_geomod

Facies	Type	Probability
1 Shale2	Gaussian	0.10
2 Marls	Gaussian	0.10
3 Brinesand	Gaussian	0.00
4 Oil	Gaussian	0.00
5 Coal	Gaussian	0.00
6 Hotshale	Gaussian	0.00
7 Shale1	Gaussian	0.80

Facies	Type	Probability
1 Shale2	Gaussian	0.00
2 Marls	Gaussian	0.00
3 Brinesand	Gaussian	0.25
4 Oil	Gaussian	0.25
5 Coal	Gaussian	0.00
6 Hotshale	Gaussian	0.25
7 Shale1	Gaussian	0.25



Facies	Type	Probability
1 Shale2	Gaussian	0.00
2 Marls	Gaussian	0.02
3 Brinesand	Gaussian	0.35
4 Oil	Gaussian	0.25
5 Coal	Gaussian	0.02
6 Hotshale	Gaussian	0.00
7 Shale1	Gaussian	0.35



BCU
T. Brent

This is the full specification of the prior model. Lateral variation controlled by horizons


Welltie & Inversion QC



Slanted well and vertical traces. Strictly only correct at BCU

Welltie & Inversion QC

7-32 degrees input both to Pcube and relative.




Slanted well and vertical traces. Strictly only correct at BCU. Relative quantities are -90 deg phase rotation of IC and IC+GR



Inversion QC in well position

7-32 degrees w/logs


NB: Inversion synthetic and residual shown for full gather, but S/N set to 0.01 for angles outside 7-32 degrees. Effectively treating the others as blind tests.



7-32 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W3 7-42 SN3 W5 7-42 SN1 W4 7-42 SN99 W4 Exit

Testing effect of varying parameters part 1


7-42 degrees w/logs. Waveletscale 4. S/N 3



7-32 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W3 7-42 SN3 W5 7-42 SN1 W4 7-42 SN99 W4 Exit

Testing effect of varying parameters part 2


7-42 degrees w/logs. Waveletscale 3. S/N 3



7-32 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W4 **7-42 SN3 W3** 7-42 SN3 W5 7-42 SN1 W4 7-42 SN99 W4 Exit

Testing effect of varying parameters part 3


7-42 degrees w/logs. Waveletscale 5. S/N 3



7-32 SN3 W4 | 7-42 SN3 W4 | 7-42 SN3 W3 | 7-42 SN3 W5 | 7-42 SN1 W4 | 7-42 SN99 W4 | Exit

Testing effect of varying parameters part 4


7-42 degrees w/logs. Waveletscale 4. S/N 1



7-32 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W4 7-42 SN3 W3 7-42 SN3 W5 7-42 SN1 W4 7-42 SN99 W4 Exit



Testing effect of varying parameters part 5

7-42 degrees w/logs. Waveletscale 4. S/N 100




7-32 SN3 W4 | 7-42 SN3 W4 | 7-42 SN3 W3 | 7-42 SN3 W5 | 7-42 SN1 W4 | **7-42 SN99 W4** | Exit


NRMS diff as tool for inversion data fit



Pcube+ NRMS diff BCU+-100ms Stack 7-42





Shuey NRMS diff BCU+-100ms Stack 7-32




NRMS as tool for inversion data fit

Substacking input and residual.
3 stacks from 7 to 42 (vs 8 on previous slide).


Many angle bins data give much superior QC than few



Pcube+ NRMS BCU+-100ms Stack 7-42




Shuey NRMS BCU+-100ms Stack 7-32




Prior and posterior oil probability

By construction, the prior oil probability is constant below BCU


Prior oil probability




Posterior oil probability



Mean oil probability BCU +/- 100ms




Mean oil probability BCU +/- 24ms




Prior	Class.	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	07	Exit
-------	--------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	------

Classification volume (LFC of max probability)


Classification volume. Darkening from probability 0.8 (bright) to 0.5 (black)




Classification volume 12 ms below BCU



Posterior oil probability




Mean oil probability BCU +/- 24ms





Prior	Class	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	07	Exit
-------	-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	------


42 deg stack input and oil prob



42 deg min amplitude in window BCU +/- 24 ms





Mean oil probability BCU +/- 100ms




Prior	Class.	42	37	32	27	22	17	12	07	Exit
-------	--------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	------


QC of individual traces



Pcube+ NRMS BCU+-100ms Stack 7-42




Mean oil probability BCU +/- 100ms where NRMS > 1



NRMS: stack over gather of $\text{RMS}(\text{residual})/\text{RMS}(\text{input})$

Gather behavior, geometries, map expressions



Oil probability as green overlay

Workflow in short

Create angle gathers. Ca 5 degrees bin interval.

Match frequencies across gather. Target: ~35 deg stack.

Calculate intercept and gradient from ~10 to ~35 degrees

Derive relative AI and vp/vs from intercept and gradient.

Use Shuey modeled reflectivity as relative inversion synthetics

Calculate NRMS diff between seismic and synthetics

Investigate inversion results. Wells, locations of interest, low and high NRMS Simple forward models helpful.

Apply data conditioning to input data and check effect of this and of inversion parameter variation. Consider if rough is good enough and if there is data support for going to details.

Define rough Lithology Fluid Classes (LFC's) and build a prior LFC model using horizons

Do a rough prestack tie to find rough wavelets

Run a Pcube+ inversion

30 mins

1 - 5 days?

Summary


- Pcube+ allows for relatively fast prestack inversion to Lithology Fluid Classes
- Constraining the inversion by limiting the freedom in v_p , v_s density space gives some robustness towards seismic noise in input data
- Direct output of LFC's (no separate classification step) gives some advantages
 - The effect of parameter variation (wavelets, background model, ..) on oil probability can be tested interactively
 - It supplies a starting point for modelling exercises
- No krieging of wells is involved to create the background model – all wells are blind tests.
- Tuning is handled properly
- Running on angle gathers give better QC options than running on sparse stacks.

Thanks


- To my co-author Ravi Srivastava
- To you for listening

Zoeppritz vs Aki-Richard

7-42 degrees w/logs. Waveletscale 4. S/N 3





Wavelet extraction



Target window – basis for statistical wavelets.

Matching to 37 degrees wavelet. Separate, filter for each angle.
Constant filter for whole cube.



Effect of matching filter

