

Ain Shams University
Faculty of Science
Geophysics Department



Aquifer mapping using Pre-stack Seismic Data, WDDM, Nile Delta.

A thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Science as a partial fulfillment
for the requirements of Master degree of Science in Applied Geophysics.

By

Islam Yehia Ahmed Mohamed

B.Sc. in Geology and Geophysics
Faculty of Science – Ain Shams University, 2007

To

**Geophysics Department
Faculty of Science
Ain Shams University**

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Abd Elnaser Mohamed Helal

Professor of Geophysics
Geophysics department – Faculty of Science – Ain Shams University

Dr. Azza Mahmoud Abd El-Latif El-Rawy

Lecturer of Geophysics
Geophysics department – Faculty of Science – Ain Shams University

Cairo – 2015

Note

The present thesis is submitted to faculty of Science, Ain Shams University in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the Master degree of Science in Geophysics.

Beside the research work materialized in this thesis, the candidate has attended ten post-graduate courses for one year in the following topics:

1. Geophysical field measurements
2. Numerical analysis and computer programming
3. Elastic wave theory
4. Seismic data acquisition
5. Seismic data processing
6. Seismic data interpretation
7. Seismology
8. Engineering seismology
9. Deep seismic sounding
10. Structure of the earth

He successfully passed the final examinations in these course.

In fulfillment of the language requirement of the degree, he also passed the final examination of a course in the English language.

Prof. D. Said Abdel-Maaboud Aly

Head of Geophysics Department

Acknowledgments

After thanks to Allah, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. **Abd Elnaser Helal** and Dr. **Azza El-Rawy** for their guidance and leading comments in this work and reviewing the write up.

I would like also to thank **RASPETCO** and **BG-Egypt** for providing the data.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my **family** who has been always supporting me. Especial dedication is to my **mother** whose love and devotion kept me going.

Abstract

Water production is the main production problem in WDDM concession in Nile delta. Water comes in surprisingly so fast with high rates. This comes from the underestimation of the aquifer description. Usually aquifer is estimated “guessed” and modeled as numerical aquifer. Unfortunately stacked seismic reflection data doesn’t help so much in mapping aquifers. Water sands reflectivities appear as much dimmer amplitudes. If seismic can give a hand in this it would be priceless knowledge. The study area, Sequoia gas field, is located in West Delta Deep Marine (WDDM) concession. It is about 70 kilometers to the North East offshore Alexandria.

The rock physics model suggests that, the intercept and the gradient of a shale-to-shale interface are close to those of shale-to-water interface. However the shale-to-gas interface has about the same magnitude (but opposite polarity) of shale-to-water however the gradient is much higher. So when the seismic CDPs are stacked, gas sand amplitudes dominates the picture and the water sands lie in the same color range of the shales. In order to overcome this problem, we need to go back to the pre-stack data and invert them for the physical properties, so their effect on the post-stack can be separated, analyzed and used for the seismic facies classification.

AVO simultaneous inversion inverts pre-stack seismic into elastic properties; compressional impedance, shear impedance and density. The products of AVO simultaneous inversion can be coupled with other wire-line logging data via Bayesian classification, so seismic sections can be transformed into geologic cross-sections with meaningful facies codes. Then water sands can be discriminated from other facies existing in the field so they can be delineated, mapped and modeled in the 3D static models. The Bayesian classification outputs gave a reasonable match to the actual facies found in the wells of the study area.

Keywords: Water production, AVO simultaneous inversion and Naïve Bayesian Classification

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	III
Abstract	V
Contents	VII
List of Figures	XI
List of Tables	XVX
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Location of Study Area	1
1.2 Aim of Study	2
1.3 Available Data.....	2
1.4 Methodology and Workflow	2
2 Regional Geological Setting	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Stratigraphy	4
2.2.1 Pre-Miocene.....	6
2.2.2 Miocene	7
2.2.3 Pliocene to Recent	7
2.2.3.1 Kafr El Sheikh Formation.....	8
2.2.3.2 El Wastani Formation	8
2.2.3.3 Mit Ghamr Formation	8
2.2.4 Pleistocene	9
2.3 Structural Setting.....	9
2.3.1 Rosetta Fault.....	10
2.3.2 East-West Faults.....	11
2.4 Tectonic Evolution	11
2.5 Field Geology	13

3	Rock Physics	17
3.1	Introduction	17
3.2	Theoretical Background	17
3.2.1	Elastic Properties	17
3.2.1.1	Bulk Modulus- Incompressibility (K).....	18
3.2.1.2	Shear Modulus – Rigidity (μ)	18
3.2.1.3	Lame’s Constant (λ).....	18
3.2.2	Seismic Properties	19
3.2.2.1	Compressional Velocity (VP).....	19
3.2.2.2	Shear Velocity (VS)	19
3.2.2.3	Poisson's Ratio (σ).....	19
3.2.2.4	Lambda Rho Attributes.....	20
3.2.3	Anisotropic Properties	20
3.2.4	AVO Modeling Theory	20
3.2.4.1	Shuey’s Approximation	22
3.2.4.2	Aki-Richard Approximation	23
3.2.5	AVO Analysis Theory	23
3.3	Point Modeling.....	26
3.4	Facies Interpretation.....	28
3.5	Finding Best Discrimination Spaces	28
4	AVO Inversion	33
4.1	AVO Inversion Theory.....	33
4.1.1	Fatti Modification of Aki-Richard’s Equation	34
4.1.2	Expressing Reflectivities in Impedances	34
4.1.3	Fatti Modification of Aki-Richard’s Equation	36
4.1.4	Convolution as a Matrix Multiplication	36
4.1.5	Final Inversion Formula Form.....	37
4.2	Wavelet Extraction.....	41

4.3 Angle Stacks Conditioning.....	44
4.3.1 Frequency Filtering.....	46
4.3.2 Events Alignment (Trim Statics).....	47
4.3.3 Amplitude Balancing/Scaling.....	48
4.4 Initial Model Building.....	51
4.4.1 Initial Model Geometry	51
4.4.2 Well Data.....	51
4.4.2.1 Well Data Lateral Interpolation	51
4.4.2.2 Well Data Vertical Extrapolation.....	52
4.4.3 Initial Model Layering.....	52
4.4.4 Initial Model Frequency Content.....	53
4.4.5 Initial Model Parameters Summary	55
4.5 Inversion Parameters Optimization.....	55
4.5.1 Wavelets Set	55
4.5.2 Constraining Relationships.....	55
4.5.3 Pre-whitening Method	59
4.5.4 Scalars.....	60
4.5.5 Inversion Sensitivities.....	60
4.6 Inversion Outputs	68
5 Facies Classification	75
5.1 Introduction	75
5.2 Theoretical Background	76
5.2.1 Bayesian Classification.....	76
5.2.1.1 Theory Mathematical Development	76
5.2.1.2 Applied Intuitive Understanding of the Theory	77
5.2.2 PCA Theory.....	79
5.2.2.1 Points Projection	80
5.2.2.2 Finding PCAs.....	82

5.2.2.3 Variance Theory.....	83
5.2.2.4 Singular Decomposition Theory	84
5.3 Principal Component Analysis.....	85
5.4 Properties Distributions & Distributions Modeling	87
5.5 Classification at Wells.....	90
5.6 Classifying AVO Inversion Volumes	92
6 Summary and Conclusions	100
Appendix A	103
Data QC	103
A.1 Check-shots Editing	103
A.2 Check-shot Correction.....	105
Appendix B	110
AVO Inversion	110
B.1 Wavelet Extraction	110
B.2 AVO Synthetics and Selecting Base Case Wavelets Set.....	114
B.3 Angle Stacks Conditioning – Events Alignment (Trim Statics).....	121
B.4 Amplitude Balancing (Scaling)	127
References.....	130

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Sequoia location map.....	1
Figure 1-2: Study workflow.....	3
Figure 2-1: Generalized Lithostratigraphic Column of the Nile Delta area (EGPC, 1994).....	5
Figure 2-2: Nile Delta tectonostratigraphy showing key stratigraphic and tectonic events and hydrocarbon occurrences.(Dolson et al., 2005)	6
Figure 2-3: Main fault trends of the Nile Delta. Modified from (Abd El Aal et al., 2000).	10
Figure 2-4: The faults, anticlines, and convergence arcs are compiled by Abd-Allah (2012).	13
Figure 2-5: stratigraphic column of WDDM Nile delta (Nigel cross et al, 2009).	14
Figure 2-6: Geological model of Sequoia gas field. It is an early Pliocene slope channel. (Nigel cross et al, 2009).	15
Figure 2-7: Sequoia reservoir architecture (Nigel cross et al, 2009).	15
Figure 2-8: A is amplitude map between the top and base surfaces, B is the top two-way time interpretation.	16
Figure 2-9: Pressure vs. depth for the four wells, shows that the Northern wells are of different pressure than the Southern ones.	16
Figure 3-1: Bulk Modulus of a rock. Modified from European Space Agency.	18
Figure 3-2: Shear Modulus of a rock. Modified from European Space Agency.	18
Figure 3-3: Wave Reflection and Transmission of waves. After Hampson and Russell Software manual guide v. 9/R1.7.	21
Figure 3-4: AVO classes related to clastics geologic setting. After Rocky Roten et al (2014).....	24
Figure 3-5: Intercept versus gradient crossplot displaying location of AVO classes. After Rocky Roten et al (2014).....	26
Figure 3-6: Intercept gradient plot for three interfaces from a point model.	27
Figure 3-7: Amplitude versus angle plot for the three point interfaces. Reflectivities modeled by Shuey's equation.	27

Figure 3-8: Quality check of the visually-re-interpreted facies and original NMR interpretation for Rosetta-10.	29
Figure 3-9: Vp/Vs ratio vs. P-impedance cross-plot of Rosetta-10 data colored by NMR original facies (Left) and re-interpreted one (right).....	29
Figure 3-10: Vp/Vs ratio vs. P-impedance cross-plot of all wells colored by facies.	30
Figure 3-11: Poisson's ratio vs. P-impedance cross-plot of all wells colored by facies.	31
Figure 3-12: Lambda*Rho vs. P-impedance cross-plot of all wells colored by facies.	31
Figure 3-13: Mu*Rho vs. P-impedance cross-plot of all wells colored by facies.	31
Figure 3-14: Mu*Rho vs. Lamda*Rho cross-plot of all wells colored by facies.	32
Figure 3-15: S-Impedance vs. VpVs ratio cross-plot of all wells colored by facies.	32
Figure 4-1: Convolution Example.	37
Figure 4-2: Constraining the inversion by the deviations from the background trend.	38
Figure 4-3: AVO simultaneous inversion workflow.	41
Figure 4-4: Wavelets extraction workflow.	42
Figure 4-5: Averaging of best extracted wavelets per well in both time (top) and frequency (bottom) domains.	43
Figure 4-6: Comparison between the AVO synthetic and the raw seismic gather at Rosetta-10 well location, (Peak is soft kick = downward decrease of impedance = blue).....	44
Figure 4-7: Comparison between AVO response for the top reservoir at Rosetta-10 well on the AVO synthetic (left) and raw seismic gather (right), (amplitude balancing step, Positive value = soft kick = peak = downward decrease in acoustic impedance).	45
Figure 4-8: Angle gather conditioning workflow	46
Figure 4-9: Amplitude spectra of seismic gather volume before (top) and after (bottom) applying the low-pass filter displayed in transparent orange in the top graph.....	47

Figure 4-10: Log panel for Rosetta-10 showing effect of frequency filtering and trim statics on the seismic angle gather, (Peak is soft kick = downward decrease of impedance = blue).....	49
Figure 4-11: Amplitude balancing Equations.....	49
Figure 4-12: AVO gradient analysis of the top gas at Rosetta-10 well comparing AVO response before (left) and after (right), (amplitude balancing step, Positive value = soft kick = peak = downward decrease in acoustic impedance).	50
Figure 4-13: The effect of conditioning the layering to the horizons.....	53
Figure 4-14: Effect of high-cut frequency filtering of well log data in building the initial model.	54
Figure 4-15: Summary of the optimum initial model parameters.	55
Figure 4-16: LnZs vs. LnZp plot on the left and LnDn vs. LnZp on the right. Shows that there are some off-trend points.....	57
Figure 4-17: cross-plot between sonic and shear transit time sonic data, color-coded by facies and symbol-coded by wells, shows that the anomalous points belong to Sapphire-1 well.	58
Figure 4-18: Seismic cross section across three wells, displays thinner overburden in Sapphire-1 location.	58
Figure 4-19: Inversion parameters sensitivities summary.	62
Figure 4-20: Inversion trials description.....	63
Figure 4-21: inversion errors yardsticks of the 24 inversion experiments after scaling to the maximum error found, color-coded by red (highest error) and green (lowest error). It shows that the lowest errors experiments are of number 16 and 22.	64
Figure 4-22: inversion analysis of Rosetta-8, in red is the inversion output and in blue is the well data.....	65
Figure 4-23: inversion analysis of Sapphire-1, in red is the inversion output and in blue is the well data.	66
Figure 4-24: inversion analysis of Rosetta-10, in red is the inversion output and in blue is the well data.	67
Figure 4-25: Inverted P-impedance section at Rosetta-8 location, the colored strip in the gap is the P-impedance from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	69

Figure 4-26: Inverted P-impedance section at Rosetta-10 location, the colored strip in the gap is the P-impedance from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	69
Figure 4-27: Inverted P-impedance section at Sapphire-1 location, the colored strip in the gap is the P-impedance from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	70
Figure 4-28: Inverted S-impedance section at Sapphire-1 location, the colored strip in the gap is the S-impedance from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	70
Figure 4-29: Inverted S-impedance section at Rosetta-8 location, the colored strip in the gap is the S-impedance from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	71
Figure 4-30: Inverted S-impedance section at Rosetta-10 location, the colored strip in the gap is the S-impedance from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	71
Figure 4-31: Inverted Density section at Rosetta-8 location, the colored strip in the gap is the density from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	72
Figure 4-32: Inverted Density section at Rosetta-10 location, the colored strip in the gap is the density from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	72
Figure 4-33: Inverted Density section at Sapphire-1 location, the colored strip in the gap is the density from the log data, black log is GR, blue is resistivity.....	73
Figure 4-34: Inverted Vp/Vs section at Rosetta-10 location, the colored strip in the gap is the Vp/Vs from the log data, black log is GR, and blue is resistivity.	73
Figure 4-35: Inverted Vp/Vs section at Rosetta-8 location, the colored strip in the gap is the Vp/Vs from the log data, black log is GR, and blue is resistivity.	74
Figure 4-36: Inverted Vp/Vs section at Sapphire-1 location, the colored strip in the gap is the Vp/Vs from the log data, black log is GR, and blue is resistivity.	74
Figure 5-1: Example of 2D data scatter.	80
Figure 5-2: Projecting a point into a specific direction.	80
Figure 5-3: Projecting a point onto other basis.....	81

Figure 5-4: Modeling Vp/Vs ratio distributions for the three rock types; A for shale, B for brine sands and C is for gas sands. Modeled distributions are in orange.....88

Figure 5-5: Modeling S-impedance distributions for the three rock types; A for shale, B for brine sands and C is for gas sands. Modeled distributions are in orange.....88

Figure 5-6: Summary of the raw distributions on left and modeled distributions on right.89

Figure 5-7: Bayesian classification result in summation curve on right, with the raw facies on the next left one, color-coded similarly but a bit lighter for the classification probabilities.....91

Figure 5-8: Example of misinterpretation, where the gas sand properties are just anomalous or extremes in statistical terms. The point values are in red lines in the raw distributions.91

Figure 5-9: Bayesian classification probabilities compared to GR and resistivity log at the blind well (Sapphire-1).....92

Figure 5-10: Water sand probability cube across the three wells high probability is in red, gamma ray log is on the left of each well path and resistivity on the right of each well path. Low GR at Rostta-10 in the red circle are in a casing shoe.93

Figure 5-11: Gas sand probability cube across the three wells high probability is in red, gamma ray log is on the left of each well path and resistivity on the right of each well path. Low GR at Rostta-10 in the red circle are in a casing shoe.94

Figure 5-12: Shale probability cube across the three wells high probability is in blue, gamma ray log is on the left of each well path and resistivity on the right of each well path. Low GR at Rostta-10 in the red circle are in a casing shoe.94

Figure 5-13: Base case seismic facies probability line across the three wells, gamma ray log is on the left of each well path and resistivity on the right of each well path. Low GR at Rostta-10 in the red circle are in a casing shoe.95

Figure 5-14: Zoomed seismic facies cross sections at Rosetta-8 in A, Sapphire-1 in B and Rosetta-10 in C, dashed lines are the horizons interpretations of Top gas, base gas and base channel from top to bottom.95