

**THE AVO APPLICATION IN HYDROCARBON  
EXPLORATION,  
NILE DELTA, EGYPT.**

**(A REAL CASE STUDY)**

**M.Sc. Thesis**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE IN GEOPHYSICS**

Department of Geophysics

Faculty of Sciences

Ain Shams University

Submitted by:

**Moataz Nady Sayed**  
Exploration Geophysicist  
leoc Egypt Branch, ENI Group

Supervised by:

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Abu El-Ata**  
Prof. of Geophysics  
Ain Shams University

**Dr. Abdel Khalek Mahmoud El-Werr**  
Assist. Prof. of Geophysics  
Ain Shams University

**Dr. Brian H. Russell**  
Vice President  
Hampson-Russell  
A CGG Veritas Company

March 2010

## **Approval Sheet**

**Name:** Moataz Nady Sayed Mohamed Moawed

**Title:** "THE AVO APPLICATION IN HYDROCARBON  
EXPLORATION, NILE DELTA, EGYPT.  
(A REAL CASE STUDY)"

**SUBMITTED TO AWARD THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN GEOPHYSICS**

**Supervised by:**

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Abu El-Ata**  
Prof. of Geophysics  
Ain Shams University

**Dr. Abdel Khalek Mahmoud El-Werr**  
Assist. Prof. of Geophysics  
Ain Shams University

**Dr. Brian H. Russell**  
Vice President  
Hampson-Russell  
A CGG Veritas Company



## **Abstract**

Seismic data are used in petroleum exploration to define geologic features in the subsurface. The effects of rock and fluid properties on seismic attributes have been examined recently in seismic exploration to analyze the prospectivity of the study area.

This thesis studied the fluid properties and their effect on seismic response and attempted to relate the seismic attributes computed from 3D seismic data covering the SUN field Pliocene discoveries and some other nearby Pliocene DHI prospects located in the offshore Nile Delta, Egypt. Amplitude versus offset (AVO) attributes are studied for lithology differentiation and hydrocarbon indication.

A number of published predictors are used to model reservoir data and to study the fluid properties and their seismic significance. The models include the Batzle and Wang model to predict fluid properties, the Gassmann-Biot model to predict rock velocities as a function of saturating fluids, and the amplitude variation with offset model (AVO) using Zoeppritz equations to predict seismic response from the layered rock properties.

The modeling of SUN field illustrates the benefits of using AVO analysis methods, as the SUN field is covered by two different seismic surveys; and each survey covers one Pliocene direct hydrocarbon indicator (DHI) discovery and some nearby Pliocene DHI prospects. In this study, each seismic survey was studied

separately, because different kinds of data are available for the two surveys.

First case study: (SUN-1 discovery, STAR and JUPITER prospects), where the common depth point (CDP) data (pre-stack domain) of the older seismic survey are not amplitude-preserved. So, the AVO analysis will be based only on the partial stack data and the enhanced pseudo-gradient analysis.

The second case study: (SUN-2 discovery and MOON prospect) lies in a more recent seismic survey. So, it will be supported by CDP gather, angle gather analysis, attribute analysis and intercept versus gradient cross plotting.

The sand reservoirs of the discoveries and the prospects either within the faulted anticline closures (like the SUN field discoveries and the JUPITER prospect), or the sand channel features (like the STAR and the MOON prospects) are surrounded by the water bearing Pliocene shale. So, the seismic data show significant reservoirs thickness due to the change of the density and the velocity between the gas bearing sand layers and the water bearing layers.

The flat spot due to the gas water contact (GWC) can be detected in the seismic data which can be proved later by the well logs. The positive AVO analysis results of the SUN field which are similar to the results of the nearby prospects by using different AVO analysis techniques give good indications of the presence of dry gas in the sand reservoirs of these prospects.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First foremost, I would like to thank Allah for all that I have been given.

I thank my advisors: Prof. Dr. Ahmed Abu El-Ata, Dr. Brian Russell and Dr. Abdel Khalek El-Werr for all the guidance and opportunities they have provided me. I thank also Prof. Dr. Adel Othman and Prof. Dr. Salah Shibl for reviewing this thesis.

I thank leoc Egypt (Eni Group) management for their support of this project through funding and for the use of SUN field wells and seismic data. I would like also to thank Hampson-Russell (A CGG Veritas Company) for providing me the software that I have used.

Thanks to Mr. Kamal Barssoum Nile Delta exploration project manager and my project leader Mr. Gianfranco Francescato, and special thanks for Mrs. Giulia Capponi for their great support, ideas and input for this work.

Finally I thank my family for their support and for being there for me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of contents.....	iv
List of tables.....	vii
List of figures.....	viii
 <b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	 <b>1</b>
1.1 Methods and techniques .....	2
1.2 P-wave and S-wave AVO analysis.....	3
1.3 Thesis objectives.....	4
1.4 Thesis organization.....	5
1.5 Hardware and software used.....	5
 <b>CHAPTER 2: AVO THEORY.....</b>	 <b>7</b>
2.1 Rock properties.....	7
2.2 Theoretical basis of AVO analysis.....	15
2.3 The physical phenomenon of AVO.....	17
2.4 Compressional wave propagation.....	20
2.5 Snell's law.....	21
2.6 The effect of Poisson's ratio on reflection coefficient.....	22
2.7 Zoeppritz's equations of P-P and P-S reflection coefficient.....	23
2.8 Linear approximation of Zoeppritz's equations.....	24
2.9 Bortfeld's approximation: the fluid and rigidity terms.....	25
2.10 Aki and Richard's approximations: velocities and density terms.....	26
2.11 Shuey's approximation: normal incidence & Poisson reflectivity.....	30
 <b>CHAPTER 3: AVO FLUIDS MODELS.....</b>	 <b>32</b>
3.1 AVO modeling.....	32
3.2 Gassman-Biot rock and fluid model.....	35
3.3 Batzle & Wang fluid property model.....	45
3.4 Gas model.....	47
3.5 Oil model.....	53
3.6 Brine model.....	59

3.7 Mixture model.....	62
------------------------	----

## **CHAPTER 4: AVO CLASSES AND ATTRIBUTES CROSS PLOTTING.....65**

4.1 AVO classes.....	65
4.2 Rutherford and Williams classification and recognition of hydrocarbons.....	68
• Class 1.....	70
• Class 2.....	72
• Class 3.....	76
• Class 4.....	77
4.3 AVO attributes.....	79
4.3.1 AVO attribute cross-plotting.....	87

## **CHAPTER 5: NILE DELTA REAL CASE STUDY 1.....93**

5.1 Generalities.....	93
5.1.1 Objectives.....	94
5.2 Geologic background .....	95
5.2.1 Nile Delta basin.....	95
5.2.2 Structural setting of the Nile Delta.....	97
5.2.3 Pliocene formation.....	100
<b>First case: The SUN-1 discovery, STAR and JUPITER prospects.....</b>	<b>102</b>
5.3 SUN-1 well objectives.....	102
5.4 STAR and JUPITER prospects history.....	104
5.5 Geological considerations.....	106
5.6 Geophysical considerations.....	109
5.6.1 Seismic database.....	109
5.6.2 Seismic interpretation and mapping.....	109
5.7 AVO analysis.....	110
5.7.1 Dataset processing flow.....	111
5.8 AVO reference model.....	113
5.9 Angle stack data analysis.....	117

## **CHAPTER 6: NILE DELTA REAL CASE STUDY 2.....128**

<b>Second case: The SUN-2 discovery and MOON prospect.....</b>	<b>128</b>
6.1 SUN-2 well objectives.....	128

6.2 MOON prospect history.....	129
6.3 Geological considerations.....	131
6.4 Geophysical considerations.....	131
6.4.1 Seismic database.....	131
6.4.2 Seismic interpretation and mapping.....	131
6.5 AVO analysis.....	132
6.5.1 Dataset processing flow.....	133
6.6 AVO reference model.....	134
6.7 CDP data analysis.....	139
6.8 Angle stack data analysis.....	145
6.9 AVO attribute analysis.....	151
<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>163</b>



## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1 Weighted terms a,b,c and d,e,f.....	29
Table 3.1 Coefficient for velocity of fresh water calculation (V <sub>w</sub> ).....	61
Table 4.1 different AVO attributes.....	80

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure (2.1): the rock content.....	9
Figure (2.2): rock deformation with P and S waves.....	10
Figure (2.3): the behavior of P and S wave particle propagation...11	
Figure (2.4): P wave, horizontal and vertical shear wave.....	11
Figure (2.5): relationship between Poisson's ration and $V_p/V_s$ .....	13
Figure (2.6): linear relationship between $V_p$ and $V_s$ .....	14
Figure (2.7): wave behavior in the subsurface.....	18
Figure (2.8): waves generated by an incident P-wave at an interface between two infinite elastic half spaces.....	21
Figure (3.1): example of AVO modeling using well logs to identify the Hydrocarbon bearing zones.....	33
Figure (3.2): example of AVO analysis on the synthetic CDP.....	34
Figure (3.3): different pre-stack models for different fluid simulations.....	35
Figure (3.4): rock content showing dry and saturated rock.....	40
Figure (3.5): example of fluid substitution knowing the $V_p$ , $V_s$ and $\rho$ logs.....	43
Figure (3.6): example of $V_s$ curve calculating knowing the $V_p$ , $\rho$ logs and $S_w$ .....	44
Figure (3.7): example of using Castanga equations to calculate the $V_s$ log curve which is not reliable in the reservoir zone.....	44
Figure (3.8): example of using Biot-Gassmann equations to calculate the $V_s$ log curve which is reliable in the reservoir zone..	45
Figure (3.9): velocity versus water saturation relationship (gas case).....	51
Figure (3.10): Poisson's ratio versus water saturation relationship (gas case).....	52
Figure (3.11): velocity versus water saturation relationship (oil case).....	57
Figure (3.12): Poisson's ratio versus water saturation relationship (oil case).....	58
Figure (4.1): the behavior of different AVO classes (Rutherford and Williams, Castanga).....	65

Figure (4.2): Rutherford and Williams classification with respect to Acoustic Impedance.....	68
Figure (4.3): different classes behavior, there are the generic AVO curves at the top of the gas sand.....	69
Figure (4.4): example of Class 1 anomaly (Rutherford and Williams 1989).....	71
Figure (4.5): example of model of class 1 anomaly(Rutherford and Williams 1989).....	71
Figure (4.6): example of Class 2 anomaly (Rutherford and Williams 1989).....	73
Figure (4.7): Ross and Kinman Near trace and Far trace range.....	74
Figure (4.8): example of Class 2 sands.....	74
Figure (4.9): example of Class 2P sands.....	75
Figure (4.10): example of Class 3 anomaly.....	76
Figure (4.11): example of Class 4 anomaly concept (Castagna et al 1998).....	78
Figure (4.12): example of the picked amplitude.....	81
Figure (4.13): example of Intercept and Gradient calculated volumes.....	82
Figure (4.14): example of AVO anomalies form.....	82
Figure (4.15): example of AVO product shows a positive response at the top and base of the reservoir.....	83
Figure (4.16): example of AVO sum (A+B) shows a negative response at the top of the reservoir (decrease in $\sigma$ ) and a positive response at the base (increase in $\sigma$ ).....	84
Figure (4.17): Examples of different AVO attributes.....	85 & 86
Figure (4.18): Intercept versus Gradient cross-plot showing different AVO Classes.....	87
Figure (4.19): example of drilled bright spot, the Intercept and Gradient cross-plot showing class 3 anomaly.....	90
Figure (4.20): example of AVO Hodograms Intercept versus Gradient cross-plot showing different AVO classes.....	91
Figure (5.1): SUN field discoveries in Kafr el Sheikh Formation..	93
Figure (5.2): Satellite image for the Nile Delt.....	95
Figure (5.3) Nile Delta structural features (Kamel et al. 1998).....	98

Figure (5.4): Pliocene Formation undisturbed zone and active growth faults.....	101
Figure (5.5): SUN-1 discovery DHI anomaly within Kafr el Sheikh Formation.....	103
Figure (5.6): SUN-1 discovery DHI anomaly within Kafr el Sheikh Formation.....	103
Figure (5.7): STAR prospect DHI anomaly within Kafr el Sheikh Formation.....	104
Figure (5.8): JUPITER prospect DHI anomaly within Kafr el Sheikh Frm.....	105
Figure (5.9): Pliocene sealing faults.....	106
Figure (5.10): Pliocene growth faults and the associated rollovers.....	106
Figure (5.11): Pliocene buried and active growth faults.....	108
Figure (5.12): SUN-1 well logs used in AVO modeling.....	114
Figure (5.13): P-impedance versus Resistivity relationship in SUN-1 well.....	115
Figure (5.14): P-impedance versus Gamma ray relationship in SUN-1 well.....	116
Figure (5.15): SUN-1 discovery amplitude anomaly on Near stack section.....	117
Figure (5.16): SUN-1 discovery amplitude anomaly on Far stack section.....	117
Figure (5.17): SUN-1 discovery amplitude anomaly on enhanced stack section (Far-Near)*Far.....	118
Figure (5.18): RMS amplitude extraction of SUN-1 anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	118
Figure (5.19): Maximum amplitude extraction of SUN-1 anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	119
Figure (5.20): SUN-1 discovery anomaly enhanced pseudo-gradient RMS and Maximum amplitude extraction.....	120
Figure (5.21): STAR prospect amplitude anomaly on Near stack section.....	121
Figure (5.22): The STAR prospect amplitude anomaly on the Far stack section.....	121

Figure (5.23): The STAR prospect anomaly on an enhanced stack section(Far Near)*Far.....	121
Figure (5.24): The JUPITER prospect amplitude anomaly on the Near stack Section.....	122
Figure (5.25): The JUPITER prospect amp. anomaly on the Far stack section.....	122
Figure (5.26): The JUPITER prospect anomaly on the enhanced stack section (Far-Near)*Far.....	123
Figure (5.27): The RMS amplitude extraction of the STAR prospect anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	123
Figure (5.28): The RMS amplitude extraction of the JUPITER prospect anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	124
Figure (5.29): Maximum amplitude extraction of the STAR prospect anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	124
Figure (5.30): Maximum amplitude extraction of the JUPITER prospect anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	125
Figure (5.31): STAR prospect anomaly enhanced pseudo-gradient RMS and Maximum amplitude extraction.....	125
Figure (5.32): JUPITER prospect anomaly enhanced pseudo-gradient RMS and Maximum amplitude extraction.....	126
Figure (6.1): SUN-2 discovery DHI anomaly within Kafr el Sheikh Formation.....	128
Figure (6.2): SUN-2 discovery DHI anomaly within Kafr el Sheikh Formation.....	129
Figure (6.3): The MOON prospect DHI anomaly within the Kafr el Sheikh Fm.....	130
Figure (6.4): The MOON prospect DHI anomaly within the Kafr el Sheikh Fm.....	130
Figure (6.5): The SUN-2 well logs used in AVO modeling.....	136
Figure (6.6): The P-impedance versus Res. relationship in the SUN-2 well.....	137
Figure (6.7): The P-impedance versus Gamma ray relationship in SUN-2 well.....	138
Figure (6.8): CDP gather across the SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly (on the right amplitude envelope colored).....	139
Figure (6.9): CDP gather across MOON prospect amplitude anomaly (on the right amplitude envelope colored).....	140

Figure (6.10): CDP stack section across the SUN-2 discovery amp. Anomaly.....	140
Figure (6.11): CDP stack section across the SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly (amplitude envelope colored).....	141
Figure (6.12): CDP stack section across the MOON prospect amp. Anomaly.....	141
Figure (6.13): CDP stack section across the MOON prospect amplitude anomaly (amplitude envelope colored).....	142
Figure (6.14): Angle gather across the SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly (on the right amplitude envelope colored).....	142
Figure (6.15): Angle gather across the MOON prospect amplitude anomaly (on the right amplitude envelope colored).....	143
Figure (6.16): Angle stack section across the SUN-2 discovery amplitude Anomaly.....	143
Figure (6.17): Angle stack section across the SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly (amplitude envelope colored).....	144
Figure (6.18): Angle stack section across the MOON prospect amplitude anomaly (amplitude envelope colored).....	144
Figure (6.19): Angle stack section across the MOON prospect amplitude anomaly (amplitude envelope colored).....	145
Figure (6.20): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on a near angle stack Section.....	145
Figure (6.21): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on a far angle stack Section.....	146
Figure (6.22): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on an enhanced stack section (Far-Near)*Far.....	146
Figure (6.23): RMS amplitude extraction of the SUN-2 anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	147
Figure (6.24): Maximum amplitude extraction of the SUN-2 anomaly on Full, Near and Far stacks.....	147
Figure (6.25): The SUN-2 discovery anomaly enhanced pseudo-gradient RMS and Maximum amplitude extraction slices.....	148
Figure (6.26): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on a Near angle stack Section.....	148
Figure (6.27): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on a Far angle stack Section.....	149

Figure (6.28): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on an enhanced stack section (Far-Near)*Far.....	149
Figure (6.29): RMS amplitude extraction of the MOON anomaly on Full, Near and Far angle stacks.....	150
Figure (6.30): Maximum amplitude extraction of the MOON anomaly on Full, Near and Far angle stacks.....	150
Figure (6.31): The MOON prospect anomaly enhanced pseudo-gradient RMS and Maximum amplitude extraction.....	151
Figure (6.32): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on Intercept section.....	152
Figure (6.33): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on Gradient section.....	152
Figure (6.34): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on Intercept*Gradient (P*G) section.....	153
Figure (6.35): The SUN-2 discovery amplitude anomaly on a Restricted Gradient ( $G*\text{sign}(P)$ ) section.....	153
Figure (6.36): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on Intercept section.....	154
Figure (6.37): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on Gradient section.....	154
Figure (6.38): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on an Intercept*Gradient (P*G) section.....	155
Figure (6.39): The MOON prospect amplitude anomaly on a Restricted Gradient ( $G*\text{sign}(P)$ ) section.....	155
Figure (6.40): The SUN-2 discovery Intercept versus Gradient cross-plotting.....	156
Figure (6.41): The SUN-2 discovery AVO attribute stack (in red: samples of class 3 gas sand distribution).....	157
Figure (6.42): The MOON prospect Intercept versus Gradient cross-plotting.....	158
Figure (6.43): The MOON prospect AVO attribute stack (in red: samples of class 3 gas sand distribution).....	158