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Abstract

The Mauddud Formation in North Kuwait is a giant carbonate reservoir undergoing pattern sea water flooding for the past 9 years in absence of aquifer support. The reservoir has a 48 year production history with reservoir pressure depleted below bubble point with only 4% of inplace oil produced from few wells of high productivity index. In addition to extreme reservoir heterogeneity, there is areal and vertical variation in oil properties. Flood water break-through in producers has varied from 6 months to 3 years. The reservoir pressure has shown uneven increase and is close to initial pressure at structurally favorable areas. In order to optimize production and sweep in the water flood, it is important to identify the layers of premature water breakthrough and monitor subsequent saturation changes.

Pulsed Neutron Decay logs are the conventional logging tools used for analyzing high saline formation water encroachments in Burgan and Zubair reservoirs of the field. With less saline sea water injection, these logs are not sensitive enough to evaluate the encroachments as neutron capture properties of injected water and oil are closer. Mixed formation and injected water pose further challenges in Mauddud Reservoir, but we have found that Pulsed Neutron Scatter logs (C/O) logs in combination with capture logs are useful to monitor water movements.
We have carried out an integrated study using C/O log water saturation from 19 wells with production logs, well performance, core data and structure for evaluating sweep, saturation monitoring and thief zone identification. The C/O logs have been quality checked and optimized for different vendors, available tool sizes, number of logging passes, oil/water contribution from PLT, actual volume of produced oil/water and effect of oil gravity. The integrated approach enabled identifying thief zones in perforated and unperforated layers in wells and mapping their areal distribution. Stochastic and deterministic water saturation models biased to petrophysical and structural trends were used to identify swept zones and bypassed oil.

The quantitative results from C/O logs were useful in high porous zones only when an integrated approach eliminated the effects of hold up, filtrate invasion, oil quality and Shale volume. However, our results show that the technique is qualitatively useful for water flood monitoring, planning infill wells and in formulating perforation policy to target bypassed zones while avoiding thief zones.
Saturation monitoring, Sweep Evaluation and Identification of Bypassed Oil Using Carbon-Oxygen Logs: Mauddud Reservoir, Raudhatain Field

Shaikh A/Azim, Mansoor Ali, Yahya Hassan, Ashok Pathak, Ahmad Mousawi, Krenek Ron and Hamad Al-Ajmi
Outline

- Mauddud Reservoir in North Kuwait
- Principle of C/O Logging
- Significance of C/O Logging in Mauddud Water flood
- Results of C/O Analysis
- Repeatability of results with different vendors
- Swept and Bypassed oil zones
- Quantitative use of C/O logs
- Sensitivity
- Can we use Sigma in place of C/O?
- Limitations
- Summary and Conclusions
Mauddud Reservoir in North Kuwait

**GEOLOGICAL SETTING**

Structure

**STRATIGRAPHY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Period</th>
<th>Epoch</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>Shubair</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Pliocene</td>
<td>Lower Pliocene</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miocene</td>
<td>Upper Cenomanian</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oligocene</td>
<td>Danian</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eocene</td>
<td>Rupelian</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paleocene</td>
<td>Thanetian</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cretaceous</td>
<td>Lower Cretaceous</td>
<td>Laiyli</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cretaceous</td>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cretaceous</td>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cretaceous</td>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cretaceous</td>
<td>Upper Cretaceous</td>
<td>05.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>Lower Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>Lower Jurassic</td>
<td>Amunian</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triassic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permian</td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>152.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>154.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>157.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>169.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>173.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>194.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>200.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>208.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>229.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>241.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Permian</td>
<td>Minjur</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maaddud Reservoir

- Heterogeneous Reservoir
- Areal & vertical variation in oil quality
- 48 Years of Production
- I-9 spot Sea water injection
  - Break through 0.5 to 3 years
- Variable Salinity Flood Monitoring
  - Optimize production and sweep
    - Identify layers of premature water breakthrough and monitor subsequent saturation changes.

Layering Scheme

Mauddud: Cumulative offtake

Phased Development
High Perm Features in Mauddud

- Low Porous Zones: Fractured
- High Porous Rubble (Vuggy) Zones
**Principle of C/O Logging**

---

**Inelastic Scattering**

- Fast Neutron
- Nucleus
- Slow Neutron
- Nucleus
- Excited Nucleus

---

**Neutron Capture**

- C, O, Si, Ca, Fe
- H, Cl, Si, Ca, S, Fe, Gd

---

Inelastic or capture reaction that leads to a radioactive element and decay.

**Examples:**

- **O-activation** \( T_{1/2} = 7.1 \text{ s} \)
  \[ n + ^{16}\text{O} \rightarrow ^{16}\text{N} + \cdots \rightarrow ^{16}\text{O} + \gamma + \cdots \]

- **Al-activation** \( T_{1/2} = 2.3 \text{ m} \)
  \[ n + ^{27}\text{Al} \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Al} \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si} + \gamma + \cdots \]

- **Si-activation** \( T_{1/2} = 2.3 \text{ m} \)
  \[ n + ^{28}\text{Si} \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Al} + \cdots \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si} + \gamma + \cdots \]

(Na, Cu, Fe, and many more).
Factors affecting C/O response and available Tools

- Formation Fluid
- Borehole fluid
- Porosity
- Lithology
- Borehole size
- Casing size
- Casing weight
- Far and Near C/O response depend on Borehole and Formation fluids
- At this point
  - Oil in the borehole
  - Water in the formation

**Legend:**
- w-w: water in borehole, water in formation
- o-w: oil in borehole, water in formation
- o-o: oil in borehole, oil in formation
- w-o: water in borehole, oil in formation
Significance of C/O Logging in Mauddud Waterflood

- Sigma log is insensitive: Low injected water salinity / Variable salinity in Formation (as seen in produced water)

MA Water cut during Logging: 70%
Watercut in Mauddud at the time of C/O Logging

19 wells were logged for Sw
- Different vendors
- Varying water cut
- Base line
Analysis of C/O Log

26-Jan-07  WC 60%

GOR: 450
API: 28

Water in un-perforated zone
Water in MaC from nearby injector
Water Saturation profile in Low porous zone

RA-e (Injector)  RA-D (Producer)

10-2001  9-2006  19-Feb-07

Caliper wash out
• Injected water: enters perforations and gets produced in from speed zones
• Stored in high effective porosity zones within the radius of encroachment
• Flag=1 for low porosity zones < 12
• SWCO1=SWCO IF Flag=1 SWCO1=Sw (Initial water saturation)
• IF SWCO1<Sw Then SWCO1=Sw
• SWDIFF=SWCO1-Sw
• SWCO1 and SWDIFF
  ❖ Deterministic (Interpolated) and Stochastic (SGS/Co-Simulated)
**Modeling water saturation from CO logs**

**Average Sw from Interpolation**

**Assumption:**
- SW from CO reflects K and PHI
- Permeability/effective porosity are layer bound: earlier flooding in high K & PHI
- SWCO1 of layers can be interpolated

*SWCO1 interpolated with X=Y=1 Km, biased to structure*
Modeling water saturation from CO logs

SWDIFF interpolated with X=Y=1 Km
Porosity used as trend with weight 0.20

SWCO1 unstable beyond 1Km due to short radius interpolation

Layers MaA-G

SWDIFF Co-simulated with PHIE (CC:0.58)

Layer MaB
• Logged within a week
• Major zones of encroachment similar
• Difference in Sw
C/O sensitivity to Hold up

Prior knowledge is not needed for 2 ½” C/O tool.

1 11/16” tool is subjected to uncertainty in hold up: use volume of water produced for Qc.

WC 60%
C/O logs have significant statistical variations:
- Increasing number of passes reduces statistical error

Effect of Carbon Density Value:
- High CDV input lowers Sw
- Up to 30% variation with 15-30 API oil
- Knowledge of API variation within a reservoir is critical for C/O based water saturation
Can we use Sigma in place of C/O?

- Display scales of sigma are changed
- Sometimes indicated flushed zones
- But not always

Sw from Sigma is not reliable due to:
- variable water salinity
- Lower sigma contrast at lower salinity
Limitations of C/O in Mauddud Reservoir

- Low Porosity zones: Fracture/thief zones
- Bigger Hole: 12 1/4” hole, 9 5/8” casing
- Dual Completions
- Invasion effect
  - ROI 10”
- $Sw$ from C/O could be 1.2 to 2 times Higher than actual
  - Investigated with volumetrics
  - Due to uncertainty in hold up

Water from Filtrate 5-15% increase in $Sw$
Conclusions - I

- Carried out an integrated study using C/O log water saturation from 19 wells with
  - production logs, well performance, core data and structure for evaluating
    - sweep, saturation monitoring and thief zone identification
- C/O logs have been quality checked and optimized for
  - different vendors, available tool sizes, number of logging passes, oil/water contribution from PLT, actual volume of produced oil/water and effect of oil gravity
- The integrated approach enabled
  - identifying thief zones in perforated and unperforated layers in wells and mapping their areal distribution
Stochastic and deterministic water saturation models biased to petrophysical and structural trends were used to identify swept zones and bypassed oil.

Quantitative results from C/O logs were useful in high porous zones only when the effects of hold up, filtrate invasion, oil quality and Shale volume were properly accounted for.

Qualitatively useful for water flood monitoring, planning infill wells and in formulating perforation policy to target bypassed zones while avoiding thief zones.

Application of C/O saturation needs integration with other static and dynamic data.