



Cairo University

# **INCREASING MATURE OIL FIELDS PRODUCTION BY GAS LIFT OPTIMIZATION**

By

**Mohamed Mokhtar Mansour**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**  
**In**  
**PETROLEUM ENGINEERING**

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY

GIZA, EGYPT

2018

# **INCREASING MATURE OIL FIELDS PRODUCTION BY GAS LIFT OPTIMIZATION**

By

**Mohamed Mokhtar Mansour**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE  
In  
PETROLEUM ENGINEERING**

Under the Supervision of

**Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir**

Professor of Petroleum Engineering  
Mining, Petroleum and Metallurgical  
Engineering Department  
Engineering, Cairo University

**Prof. Dr. Ismail Shaaban Mahgoub**

Head of Petroleum Engineering  
Department at Future university in Egypt

**FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY**

**GIZA, EGYPT**

**2018**

# **INCREASING MATURE OIL FIELDS PRODUCTION BY GAS LIFT OPTIMIZATION**

By

**Mohamed Mokhtar Mansour**

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University  
In Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE  
In  
PETROLEUM ENGINEERING**

Approved by the  
Examining Committee

---

**Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir,**

Thesis Main Advisor

---

**Prof. Dr. Ismail Shaaban Mahgoub,**  
Head of Petroleum Engineering Department,  
Future university, Egypt

Thesis Advisor

---

**Prof. Dr. Abdel Waly Abdalla Abdel Waly,**  
Petroleum Engineering Professor, Cairo University

Internal Examiner

---

**Prof. Dr. Attia Mahmoud Attia,**  
Petroleum Engineering and Gas Technology  
Professor, British University

External Examiner

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY

GIZA, EGYPT

2018

**Engineer's Name** : Mohamed Mokhtar Mansour  
**Date of Birth** : 1/3/1986  
**Nationality** : Egyptian  
**E-mail** : Mohammedmokhtar86@gmail.com  
**Phone** : 01280426295  
**Address** : Aghour Alkobra, Toukh, Kaliobia  
**Registration Date** : 1/10/2012  
**Awarding Date** : 2018  
**Degree** : Master of Science  
**Department** : Mining, Petroleum and Metallurgical Engineering



**Supervisors** : Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir  
 Prof. Dr. Ismail Shaaban Mahgoub  
 Head of Petroleum Engineering Department,  
 Future university, Egypt

**Examiners** : Prof. Dr. Attia Mahmoud Attia (External examiner)  
 Petroleum Engineering and Gas Technology  
 Professor, British University.  
 Prof. Dr. Abdel Waly Abdalla Abdel Waly (Internal examiner)  
 Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir (Thesis Main Advisor)  
 Prof. Dr. Ismail Shaaban Mahgoub (Thesis Advisor)  
 Head of Petroleum Engineering Department,  
 Future university, Egypt

### **Title of Thesis:**

INCREASING MATURE OIL FIELDS PRODUCTION BY GAS LIFT OPTIMIZATION

### **Key Words:**

Integrated Asset Modeling; Production Optimization; Intermittent Gas Lift Evaluation; Optimum Gas Lift Injection Depth; Flow Assurance.

### **Summary**

Field wide optimization became mandatory in producing mature oil fields. Integrated asset model was created to optimize injection gas in mature oil field and saved 19 MMSCFPD with 330 bbls/day oil gain. Gas lift injection depth was deepened for some wells resulting in increasing oil production by 1700 bbls/day and saving 14 MMSCFPD. Intermittent gas lift was applied on low potential wells and saved 55% of injection gas requirements. The field was optimized for the best operating conditions to improve production.

# Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to Professor Ismail Mahgoub and Professor Eissa Mohamed Shokir for their valuable guidance and continuous support throughout this thesis work.

I would like to thank all those who helped me with any respect to complete this thesis work, special gratitude to Gulf of Suez Petroleum Company and Cairo University for helping me to write this thesis.

I am hearty thankful to all my professors at Cairo university and petroleum and mining engineering at Suez, who spent their time and health to help me to be an engineer without any compensation.

I would like to express my thanks to all my friends in District Engineering, Base management, and Production departments for their kind cooperation and support with data and experience throughout this thesis work.

I deeply thank my lovely wife and children, Adam and Aser, for their love and support in relinquishing our time together to complete this work. I am also so grateful for the prayers and support of my parents.

## **Dedication**

In the name of Allah, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents who paid their time, money and support without any compensation to provide me with an outstanding education from the primary to post graduate studies. Their help and support encouraged me to improve myself and be a good engineer. This support always motivates me in all my works.

# Table of Contents

Table of contents .....	vii
List of tables .....	x
List of figures .....	xii
Nomenclature.....	xv
Abstract.....	xvii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Summary of Chapters .....	2
Chapter 2: literature review .....	3
2.1 Introduction and Fundamentals .....	3
2.2 Overview of Artificial Lift Methods .....	3
2.2.1 Types of Artificial Lift Methods .....	3
2.3 Gas Lift System .....	4
2.3.1 Principle of Gas Lift .....	4
2.3.2 Types of Gas Lift .....	5
2.3.2.1 Continuous Flow Gas Lift .....	7
2.3.2.2 Intermittent Gas Lift .....	8
2.3.2.3 Intermittent Gas Lift Review .....	8
2.4 Gas Lift Valves.....	8
2.4.1. Classification of gas lift valves.....	9
2.4.1.1. Injection pressure operated valves (IPO) .....	9
2.4.1.2. Production Pressure Operated Valves (PPO) .....	9
2.4.1.3. Pilot Valves .....	10
2.5 Gas Lift Optimization.....	11
2.5.1 Introduction .....	11
2.5.2 Individual Well Optimization.....	11
2.5.3 Gas Lift Allocation to a Group of Wells .....	14
2.5.3.1 Conventional Calculation Model.....	14
2.5.3.2 Field-Wide Optimization.....	16
2.5.4 Gas Lift Optimization Techniques .....	17
2.5.5 Gas Lift Optimization Review .....	18
2.6 Flow Assurance .....	22
Chapter 3: Statement of Problem .....	25
Chapter 4: Integrated Field Modeling And Production Optimization.....	27
4.1 Building Prosper Model .....	27
4.1.1 Prosper Overview .....	27
4.1.2 Working Procedure to Build up Prosper Model .....	27
4.1.3 Prosper Model Validation .....	45
4.2 Building Of General Allocation Package (GAP) Model .....	46

4.2.1 Introduction .....	46
4.2.2 Working Procedure to Build up a GAP Model .....	47
4.2.3 GAP Model Validation. ....	56
Chapter 5: Intermittent Gas Lift Evaluation .....	58
5.1 Introduction .....	58
5.2 Analytical Approach to Calculate Optimum Cycle .....	58
5.3 Intermittent Gas Lift Design Example .....	65
5.4 Selecting the Optimum Cycle Time .....	67
5.5 Evaluate Applying IGL Using Existing Gas Lift System .....	68
Chapter 6: Mature Oil Field Case Study .....	71
6.1 Introduction .....	71
6.2 Reservoir Description .....	72
6.3 Surface Facility .....	74
6.4 Current Field Conditions .....	75
6.5 Data Sources for Production Optimization .....	76
6.6 Gas Lift Optimization for (M) Field .....	76
6.6.1 Building Prosper Models .....	76
6.6.2 Building GAP Model .....	78
6.7 Intermittent Gas Lift Evaluation .....	78
Chapter 7: Results and Discussions .....	81
7.1 Introduction .....	81
7.2 Determine the Optimum Gas Lift Injection Rate .....	81
7.3 Determine the Optimum Injection Depth .....	87
7.3.1 Evaluate Wells' Performance at Optimum Gas Lift Injection Depth...	87
7.3.2 Gas Lift Optimization after Changing the Injection Depth .....	90
7.4 Effect of Changing Injection Gas Specific Gravity .....	91
7.5 Evaluate the Effect of Changing Separator Pressure .....	92
7.6 Intermittent Gas Lift Evaluation .....	93
7.7 Flow Assurance in (M) Field Pipeline Network .....	98
7.8 Evaluate the PVT and VLP Correlations .....	100
Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations .....	102
References .....	103
Appendices .....	108



# List of Tables

Table 4.1 : PVT Input Data for W Reservoir Fluids .....	28
Table 4.2 : Comparison between the actual well test data and GAP Model Calculated data .....	55
Table 5.1 : Input Data for Intermittent Gas Lift Design of well E-2 .....	63
Table 5.2 : Well E-2 Intermittent Gas Lift Calculation Summary .....	64
Table 5.3 : Well A-3 Input Data for Maximum Injection Pressure Calculations...	66
Table 6.1 : Comparison of Well Test and PROSPER Calculated Data.....	75
Table 6.2 : Maximum Injection Pressure Summary .....	77
Table 6.3 : Intermittent Gas Lift Design Using the Existing Gas Lift System.....	77
Table 6.4 : Intermittent Gas Lift Design Using Maximum Surface Injection Pressure.....	78
Table 7.1 : (M) Field Performance before and after Gas Lift Optimization .....	80
Table 7.2 : Comparison between the Current Condition and Optimization using 35 MMSCFPD.....	82
Table 7.3 : Comparison between Current and Optimum Injection Depth .....	97
Table 7.4 : Effect of Changing Injection Depth on Total (M) Field Performance (54 MMSCFPD) .....	86
Table 7.5 : Gas Lift Optimization Results after Deepening the Point of Injection	88.
Table 7.6 : Effect of Changing Separator Pressure on (M) Field .....	90
Table 7.7 : IGL Design Results using Maximum Surface Injection Pressure .....	91
Table 7.8 : Comparison between the Wells Performance before and after IGL Application .....	92
Table 7.9 : IGL Design Results using Existing Gas Lift System .....	93
Table 7.10 : Comparison between Wells Performance before and After IGL Application using Existing Gas Lift System .....	93
Table 7.11 : 8" Oil Pipeline Data form E to A Platforms (All wells are open).....	96
Table 7.12 : 8" Oil pipeline Data form E to A Platforms when only E-1 is Open .	96
Table 7.13 : 8" Oil line De-Bottlenecking Data .....	96
Table 7.14 : 8" Oil line Bottlenecking Limit (All wells are open) .....	97
Table 7.15 : Bottlenecking limit when the only E-1 and E-3 online .....	97
Table 7.16 : 8" Oil line Current Condition .....	97
Table 7.17 : 8" Oil line Bottlenecking Limit.....	98
Table 7.18 : Matched PVT correlation (Bo, Rs) for (M) Field Reservoir Fluids...	98
Table 7.19 : Matched PVT Correlations (Viscosity) for (M) Field Reservoir Fluids .....	98
Table 7.20 : VLP Matching Results .....	99

# List of Figures

Figure 2.1 : Examples of Artificial Lift Systems .....	4
Figure 2.2 : Typical Gas Lift System .....	5
Figure 2.3 : Continuous Flow Gas Lift .....	6
Figure 2.4 : Intermittent Gas Lift operation .....	7
Figure 2.5 : Valve Parts for Single Element Bellows Valve .....	9
Figure 2.6 : Injection and Production Pressure Operated Gas lift Valves .....	10
Figure 2.7 : Schematic of Pilot Valve .....	11
Figure 2.8 : Gas Lift Performance Curve .....	12
Figure 2.9 : Well Performance Curves for Various Tubing Sizes .....	12
Figure 2.10 : GUF Curves .....	13
Figure 2.11 : Cost/Revenue Curve .....	14
Figure 2.12 : Optimization for group of wells with unlimited gas availability .....	15
Figure 2.13 : Principle of optimum gas allocation using equal slope.....	16
Figure 2.14 : Optimization of gas allocation (limited gas availability) .....	16
Figure 4.1 : System Summary Menu .....	27
Figure 4.2 : PVT Input Menu .....	28
Figure 4.3 : Actual PVT data at Reservoir Temperature .....	29
Figure 4.4 : PVT Regression .....	29
Figure 4.5 : PVT Correlations Parameters .....	30
Figure 4.6 : Comparison between Actual and Calculated PVT Data .....	31
Figure 4.7 : Gas Lift Input Data .....	32
Figure 4.8 : Deviation Survey .....	33
Figure 4.9 : Downhole Equipment Drawing .....	34
Figure 4.10 : Geothermal Gradient.....	34
Figure 4.11 : Average Heat Capacities .....	35
Figure 4.12 : Inflow Performance Relationship (IPR) .....	36
Figure 4.13 : VLP/IPR Match.....	37
Figure 4.14 : Heat transfer co-efficient calculation.....	37
Figure 4.15 : VLP correlation Comparison Curves.....	39
Figure 4.16 : Well D1 Tubing Correlation Matching.....	40
Figure 4.17 : VLP Correlation after Matching with Well Test Data.....	41
Figure 4.18 : Adjusting IPR based on Well Test Data .....	42
Figure 4.19 : Well D-1 Gas Lift QuickLook .....	43
Figure 4.20 : Well D1 Current Operating Conditions .....	43
Figure 4.21 : Well D1 Gas Lift Performance Curve.....	44
Figure 4.22 : Prosper Calculations versus Actual Well Test Data for Well A2 .....	45
Figure 4.23 : Defining System Options .....	46
Figure 4.24 : Field (M) Production System Drawing .....	47
Figure 4.25 : HPG system of (M) Field.....	48
Figure 4.26 : Well Summary Screen .....	49
Figure 4.27 : IPR Input Data .....	50
Figure 4.28 : Control Data.....	51
Figure 4.29 : VLP Input Data .....	51
Figure 4.30 : Well Constraints Screen.....	52
Figure 4.31 : Pipe line Input Data .....	52
Figure 4.32 : VLP Generate Data .....	53
Figure 5.1 : Average Gas Temperature Calculation by Enthalpy Balance .....	61

Figure 5.2 : Well E-2 Intermittent Gas Lift Performance Curves .....	65
Figure 6.1 : (M) Field Location .....	69
Figure 6.2 : (M) Field Total Production Rates and Cumulative Produced Oil .....	70
Figure 6.3 : (M) Field schematic stratigraphic column .....	71
Figure 6.4 : Y Formation Structural Map .....	71
Figure 6.5 : (M) Field Pipeline Network .....	73
Figure 6.6 : Comparison between Current Well Test and Prosper Results .....	76
Figure 7.1 : Comparison between (M) wells' performance before and after Gas lift Optimization Using 54 MMSCFPD .....	81
Figure 7.2 : Comparison between Injection Gas Required before and after Gas lift Optimization Using 54 MMSCFPD .....	81
Figure 7.3 : Well H-3 Gas Lift Performance Curve .....	83
Figure 7.4 : Well D-6 Gas Lift Performance Curve .....	95
Figure 7.5 : Comparison between (M) wells performance before and after Gas lift Optimization Using 35 MMSCFPD .....	84
Figure 7.6 : Comparison between Injection Gas on (M) field wells before and after Gas lift Optimization Using 35 MMSCFPD .....	84
Figure 7.7 : Injection Depth Change with Increasing HPG Injection Pressure .....	87
Figure 7.8 : (M) Field wells Performance Change with Changing Injection Depth .....	87
Figure 7.9 : Effect of Injection Gas Specific Gravity on Wells' Performance .....	89
Figure 7.10 : Average Gas Temperature comparison .....	94
Figure 7.11 : Injection Gas Calculations Comparison .....	94
Figure 7.12 : Sensitivity of Injection Gas with Temperature .....	95

# Nomenclature

A	Cross section area of the pipe, m <sup>2</sup>
AOF	Absolute open flow, MMSCFPD
A <sub>p</sub>	Valve port Area, in <sup>2</sup>
A <sub>b</sub>	Bellows Area, in <sup>2</sup>
BOPD	Oil Rate, bbls/day
BFPD	Liquid Rate, bbls/day
B <sub>g</sub>	Gas formation volume factor, bbl/scf
B <sub>w</sub>	Water formation volume factor, bbl/stb
D/S	Downstream Pressure, psi
FPHP	Flowing Bottom Hole Pressure, psi
GOR	Gas Oil Ratio, scf/stb
GLVC	Gas Lift Valve Change
H	Height of perforated interval, ft
PI / J	Productivity Index, bbls/day/psi
P <sub>i</sub>	Initial reservoir pressure, psi
P <sub>t</sub>	Tubing Pressure, psi
P <sub>R</sub>	Reservoir pressure, psi
P <sub>wf</sub>	Bottom hole flowing pressure, psi
P <sub>c</sub>	Closing Pressure, psi
P <sub>b</sub>	Valve bellows pressure, psi
SCF	Standard cubic feet
SSSV	Subsurface Safety Valve
U	Heat Transfer Co-efficient, BTU/hr/ft
U/S	Upstream Pressure, psi
W.C	Water Cut, Percentage
Z	Gas compressibility factor
ρ <sub>g</sub>	Gas density, bound per gallon
ρ <sub>m</sub>	Gas / liquid mixture density, lbs/ft <sup>3</sup> (or kg/m <sup>3</sup> )
ρ <sub>w</sub>	Water density, bound per gallon
ΔP	Draw down pressure, Psi
STBOPD	Stock tack barrel oil per day

## Abbreviations

a	Laminar flow coefficient.
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
GAP	General Allocation Program
H <sub>2</sub> S	Hydrogen Sulphide
IPR	Inflow Performance Relationship
IPO	Injection Pressure Operated
PPO	Production Pressure Operated
IAM	Integrated asset model
I.D	Inside Diameter
MMSCF	Millions Standard cubic feet
PVT	Pressure, Volume, and temperature
VLP	Vertical lift performance
N <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen

## **Abbreviations** (cont.)

P/F	Platform
LPG	Low-pressure gas
IGL	Intermittent Gas Lift
PLT	Production logging tool
HPG	High Pressure Gas
TGLR	Total Gas Liquid Ratio

## Abstract

Gas lift is an artificial lift method in which gas is injected with high pressure into the tubing string through gas lift valve to reduce the formation fluid density and assist its production to surface.

In mature oil fields, water cut continuously increases and accordingly produced gas volume decreases to a limit not sufficient to compensate daily gas losses. This limited lift gas volume has to be optimally distributed on the wells to ensure maximum production capacity. Performance of mature field wells changes with production due to change in water cut or reservoir pressure; which results in changing gas lift injection depth and affects total field performance.

Low rate producing wells need high amount of injection gas to be produced continuously; and with limited injection gas volume, they are usually shut in. Finding a cost effective solution to produce these low potential wells is essential.

The work aimed to: (1) identify a road map for gas lift optimization methodology (2) evaluate the effect of changing reservoir pressure and W.C on gas lift injection depth on total field performance (3) evaluate applying intermittent gas lift (IGL) on low rate wells (4) evaluate the pipeline network for any possible bottlenecking or flow assurance problems (5) determine the VLP and PVT correlations that best match mature field performance.

An integrated asset model was developed for the gas lift wells and surface network using PROSPER and GAP software. The developed model was matched with actual well test data and resulted a good match. Analytical approach was used to apply IGL on low potential wells, evaluate their performance, and the requirement to change the entire gas lift system. Simple average method was developed to calculate the average temperature below liquid slug. The results of this method were compared to the enthalpy balance method calculations and yielded a good match.

Applying gas lift optimization and IGL approaches on a mature field (M) resulted in saving 19 MMSCFPD and an oil gain of 330 bbls/day. On the other hand, some wells on (M) field are candidates for deepening the point of gas injection with an oil gain of 1700 BOPD and saving 14 MMSCFPD .

Applying intermittent gas lift on seven low rate wells in (M) field resulted in saving 8.0 MMSCFPD (55% of current injection gas rate). Calculating injection gas rate using simple average temperature showed a deviation of 2% from calculations using enthalpy balance method. In addition, the pipeline network was evaluated for any possible flow assurance problems in order to ensure safe operating conditions. Finally, the best PVT and VLP correlations that match (M) field performance are evaluated..

# Chapter 1 : Introduction

## 1.1. Background

Gas lift is an artificial lift method in which gas is injected with high pressure into the tubing string through gas lift valve to reduce the formation fluid density and assist its production to surface. On the surface, low-pressure gas, formation gas, and injected gas lift are separated from liquid and used as a suction for gas compressors. Gas lift network is a closed system with daily gas losses due to fuel of gas compressors and surface facility in addition to flared gas.

During the life of gas lift well, water cut increases and produced gas volume decreases to a limit not sufficient to compensate daily gas losses in the network. In this situation, the limited injection gas volume has to be optimally distributed to ensure maximum production capacity.

In mature field, reservoir pressure, production rate, and water cut of wells changes and so the vertical lift performance, which results in changing gas lift injection depth. Unfortunately, some gas lift wells are equipped with orifice valves above the deepest gas lift mandrel, which limit further deepening to the point of injection and results in losing oil production.

Low potential wells, due to either low reservoir pressure or low productivity index, need high amount of injection gas to produce continuously. Usually these wells are circulating lift gas or producing with high injection gas rate compared with its oil production. With limited injection gas volume, these wells become not economical to produce and usually shut in. Finding a cost effective solution to produce these low rate wells is essential.

The surface facility of offshore oil field consists of many wellhead platforms connected to the main platform through oil and HPG pipelines. Oil is produced from wells on the wellhead platforms through oil pipeline to production separator on the main complex where LPG is separated and directed to a multi-stage gas compressor. Compressed gas is re-injected back to the wells through HPG network. Oil production through pipelines has to be optimized to prevent bottlenecking and flow assurance problems.

The gas lift well should be tested at different injection gas rates to create its gas lift performance curve, which can be used for gas lift optimization. In Mature fields, the surface network facility is usually not flexible for testing obligations, as only one testing line is available and test separator is usually out of service. So that optimizing well performance by testing it at different injection gas rates is very difficult.

In literature, different methods are used to optimize injection gas on a group of wells. One of the industry standard optimization software that is used to simulate well performance is PROSPER. Each well in the field is simulated separately using PROSPER and matched with actual PVT samples and well test data. Then wells are integrated with the surface network and production facility using GAP software to build an integrated asset model.

In this thesis, integrated asset model is used to optimize injection gas on each well in the network. Then the wells are evaluated for possibility of deepening the gas lift