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Abstract

Lower Goru Formation reservoirs sands (Lower Cretaceous) characterization in the Middle Indus Basin is challenging due to complex mineralogy of the rocks. The varying mineralogy characteristically makes the Petrophysical Evaluation difficult and cannot be resolved by using basic conventional log suites. To resolve this ambiguity in Lower Goru Formation evaluation, proper additional data sets are required.

Reservoir quality is defined by two main factors, porosity and permeability of a rock. The reservoir quality index or rock type is known to be an important input for field static and dynamic models. Core data analysis in Lower Goru Sands across the Middle Indus Basin reveals the presence of heavy minerals, calcareous cement, conductive mineral i.e. chlorite, chamosite etc. that effect the conventional wireline logs response i.e. reservoir porosity (storage capacity) and permeability (flow capacity). Hence, the quantification of the mineral contents becomes important in classifying the rock type.

However, estimation of complex mineralogy from conventional logs (density, neutron, and sonic) is also complicated by several factors such as barite mud effects, oil base mud filtrate invasion, sensitivity of the tools’ measurements, as well as differences in the tools’ vertical resolution and depth of investigation.

Developments in the neutron capture spectroscopy logs make it possible to estimate all matrix parameters which are significant for accurate formation evaluation. The number of parameters is dramatically reduced. Using the measured spectroscopy data as input to
multi-mineral solver software, provides more accurate mineralogy output, consequently yielding better porosity and water saturation calculation.

This paper describes the application of neutron capture spectroscopy data to formation evaluation and characterization of Middle Indus Lower Goru Sands. The formation evaluation result in the studied well is found to be validated with core data.
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Regional Structural Framework

Study Area

Petroliferous Basins and Tectono-stratigraphic Provinces of Pakistan

- Sulaiman Fold Belt
- Punjab Platform
- Fore-arc Flysch Belt
- Makran Onshore and Offshore Flysch Belt
- Arabian Sea Platform
Stratigraphic Framework

Schematics of Lower Goru Strat Play

- Shoreface sand
- Lower Shoreface - Offshore
- Transgressive & distal offshore shale
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Field Description

Acoustic Impedance draped on the TWT Structure Map of the prospective reservoir.

Studied Well

C.I: 3 ms

GR

Top A Sand

Top Chiltan
Well Results

**Well X-1**
- Average Core Permeability < 1mD
- Perforated together using TCP guns
- Produced Gas @ 3.71 MMscfd

**Studied Well**
- Gross Interval 81 m - 83 m
- Net Sand 26.1 m - 28 m
- Net Pay 8.8 m - 9 m
- Avg. Porosity 9.00% - 9.00%
- Avg. Sw 26% - 24%

**Petrophysical Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>X-1</th>
<th>Studied Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Interval</td>
<td>81 m</td>
<td>83 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Sand</td>
<td>26.1 m</td>
<td>28 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Pay</td>
<td>8.8 m</td>
<td>9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Porosity</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Sw</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems faced in Lower Goru Sands - Middle Indus

• Mismatch between calculated & core porosities
  ▪ Actual grain density unknown
  ▪ Fixed Density of matrix, $\rho_{ma}$, used in porosity equation;
    
    $\Phi = (\rho_{ma} - \rho_b) / (\rho_{ma} - \rho_f)$,

Limestone      2.71 g/cc
Sandstone      2.65 g/cc
Dolomite      2.83 g/cc

▪ Core gives stationary measurement of grain density & permeability not entire spectrum
▪ Accurate porosity & permeability essential for reservoir volumetric and reservoir flow potential
Problems faced in Lower Goru Sands of Middle Indus

- Need of Accurate Mineralogy for Reservoir Volumetric
  - High GR due to radioactive minerals or Clay?
  - Neutron-Density are effected by heavy minerals?
  - Difficult to predict accurate mineral volumes from conventional logs
  - Mud logs only provides basic information
  - SCAL / Core Sedimentology Results are time consuming
Problems faced in Lower Goru Sands of Middle Indus

- Conventional Petrophysical Evaluation - Basic Assumptions
  - Porosity (fixed grain density)
  - Vclay (GR, Neutron, Density)
  - Matrix/Mineral (Cross-plots)

Ambiguities in Conventional Petrophysical Interpretation
- Do not estimate accurate mineralogy
- Over/under estimate porosity
- Over/Under estimate fluid saturations
Elemental Capture Spectroscopy - Methodology

• A single advance tool to resolve all petrophysical issues in one go
• Identify carbonate (CaCO₃), gypsum (CaSO₄·2H₂O) and anhydrite (CaSO₄); quartz (SiO₂), feldspar (Ca-Mg-K-Silicates) and mica; pyrite (FeS₂), siderite (FeCO₃), coal, and salt (NaCl) fractions for complex reservoir analysis

• Estimate exact amount of clay using aluminum
• Estimate most realistic total porosity using bulk density
• Estimate mineralogy-based permeability
• Determine well-to-well correlation from geochemical stratigraphy
• Determine sigma matrix for cased hole and openhole sigma saturation analysis
• Obligatory requirement for Shale Gas evaluation
• Estimate producibility and in situ reserves
Continuous Grain Density for Measuring Accurate Porosity

Core grain density varies from ~2.66 to 2.69

Very good match between porosity from core and porosity using grain density from spectroscopy data
Estimation of Continuous Permeability

- Permeability from spectroscopy data is called K-Lambda permeability as is derived using following equation:

\[ k = \frac{Z \cdot \phi_t^{m+2}}{\rho_g^2 \cdot (1 - \phi_t)^2 \cdot \left( \sum W_i \cdot S_{0i} \right)^2} \]

- Whereas:
  - \( k \) is the absolute permeability (mD)
  - \( Z \) is proportionality constant with a default value of 200000.0 (dimensionless)
  - \( \phi_t \) is the total porosity using spectroscopy grain density (v/v)
  - \( m \) is the cementation factor
  - \( \rho_g \) is the grain density from spectroscopy (g/m³)
  - \( W_i \) is the weight fraction of mineral i (w/w)
  - \( S_{0i} \) is the specific surface area of mineral i (m²/g)
Estimation of Continuous Permeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Group</th>
<th>$S_0$ (g/cm³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz-Feldspar-Mica</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhydrite</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrite</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siderite</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halite</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If the initial estimate of $k$ is less than 100 mD, the calculated permeability is modified using the following expression:

\[
\text{if } (k < 100.0) \text{ then } k = 0.037325 \cdot k^{1.714}
\]
Core Results Vs Spectroscopy Log - Perfect Match
### MODEL-3 USING SPECTROSCOPY DATA AND CONVENTIONAL LOGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir Model</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Shale Model</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Equations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Volumes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt (DWA)</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>Bulk density</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rxo (DWA)</td>
<td>Calcite</td>
<td>Neutron porosity</td>
<td>Calcite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk density</td>
<td>Illite</td>
<td>DWAL</td>
<td>Illite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutron porosity</td>
<td>Kaolinite</td>
<td>DWSI</td>
<td>Kaolinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWAL</td>
<td>Chlorite</td>
<td>DWCA</td>
<td>Chlorite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWSI</td>
<td>Siderite</td>
<td>DWFE</td>
<td>Siderite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWCA</td>
<td>Pyrite</td>
<td>DWSU</td>
<td>Pyrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWFE</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>WWTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWSU</td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above illustrates the use of spectroscopy data in multi-mineral model equations to accurately evaluate petrophysical properties.
Accurate Petrophysical Evaluation using Spectroscopy Data in Multi-mineral Model
Comparison between Conventional Interpretation and Interpretation using Spectroscopy Data
## Reliable Results with High Confidence Level

### NEUTRON INDUCED GAMMA RAY SPECTROSCOPY – A MEASUREMENT TO RESOLVE COMPLEX RESERVOIRS

**AUTHORS:** Aziz, Kamran, et al.
Conclusions & Recommendations

Conclusions

• Reliable amount of clay/types and other minerals
• Estimation of accurate porosity due to variable grain density measurements
• Estimation of reliable continuous permeability for understanding reservoir potential and making well testing decision
• Resolution of complex lithology/mineralogy throughout reservoir interval

Recommendations

• Elemental Spectroscopy provides reliable information in making timely/right decision for well testing
• Elemental Spectroscopy can replace expensive coring program in exploration as well as in development wells
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