A bane of the petrophysical profession is that a workable “preliminary evaluation” of a data set can often be produced in less than an hour, whereas it can take weeks, sometimes more, to issue a first version of the “final evaluation”. Most of the intervening time has to be spent on thoroughly checking all the data, and gathering and conditioning ancillary data to support the interpretation. Petrophysicists have an efficiency problem, and this situation may not be improving. Data sets are increasing in variety, complexity, and size, and with time lacking, interpreting a data set is often reduced to a matter of understanding what it is, rather than what it means. There seem to be no widely accepted guidelines on, for instance, how to fill in a log header, to check a digital tape, to record a durable audit trail, or to present results, all of which would assist future users of the data.

Early in 2006, some concerned members of FESWA formed a working group to review chronic bottlenecks and other vexing problems facing petrophysicists. It adopted principles of independence and openness, and declared its interest in real-world issues and long-term value. It set itself to work on simple questions first, reviewing existing practices and methods, and offering practical recommendations which it posted on its public website. Nearly a year later, the presenter will review the challenges faced and the results achieved so far, together with the perceived impact of this initiative on peers, companies, and the authorities.