



Cairo University

A Hybrid Approach Based on Artificial Neural Network and Integrated Production Modeling for Gas Lift Optimization

By

Mazen Mohamed Bahaa El-Din Hussein Hamed

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
GAS PRODUCTION ENGINEERING

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

A Hybrid Approach Based on Artificial Neural Network and Integrated Production Modeling for Gas Lift Optimization

By

Mazen Mohamed Bahaa El-Din Hussein Hamed

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

GAS PRODUCTION ENGINEERING

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir

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

Dr. Ismail Mahgoub

Head of Petroleum Engineering
Department at Future university in Egypt

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

A Hybrid Approach Based on Artificial Neural Network and Integrated Production Modeling for Gas Lift Optimization

By

Mazen Mohamed Bahaa El-Din Hussein Hamed

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
NATURAL GAS ENGINEERING AND PRODUCTION

Approved by the
Examining Committee

Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir, Thesis Main Advisor, Petroleum Engineering
Professor, Cairo University

Dr. Ismail Shaaban Mahgoub, Thesis Member, Head of Petroleum Department at Future
University in Egypt

Prof. Dr. Khaled Abdel Fattah, Internal Examiner, Petroleum Engineering Professor,
Cairo University

Dr. Mohamed Ghareeb (External examiner), External Examiner, Vice President, Eastern Hemisphere,
LUFKIN company, previously and Vice President, Eastern Hemisphere SSI Artificial Lift Company
currently

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

Engineer's Name: Mazen Mohamed Bahaa El-Din Hussein Hamed
Date of Birth: 25/1/1991
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: eldinmm@gupco.net ; mazen_bahaa2000@yahoo.com
Phone: 01003684120
Address: 32,Masged Eltawheed St,Hadayek El Maadi,Cairo,Egypt
Registration Date: 01/03/2013
Awarding Date: / /201
Degree: Master of Science
Department: Gas Production Engineering



Supervisors: Prof. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir), Petroleum Engineering Professor, Cairo University

Dr. Ismail shaaban Mahgoub, Head of Petroleum Department, Future University in Egypt

Examiners: Porf. Dr. Eissa Mohamed Shokir (Thesis Advisor)

Dr. Ismail Shaaban Mahgoub (Advisor), Head of Petroleum Department, Future University in Egypt)

Dr. Mohamed Ghareeb (External examiner), External Examiner, Vice President, Eastern Hemisphere, LUFKIN company, previously and Vice President, Eastern Hemisphere SSI Artificial Lift Company currently

Prof. Dr. Khaled Abdel Fattah (Internal examiner)

Title of Thesis:

A Hybrid Approach Based on Artificial Neural Network and Integrated Production Modeling for Gas Lift Optimization

Key Words:

Integrated production Modeling; Gas lift Optimization; artificial neural network modeling; estimating well bottom hole pressure; predicting well fluid rate.

Summary:

An artificial neural network model was developed to predict the values of the bottom hole flowing pressure and the total fluid rate per each well using the available field parameters like the water cut samples, static pressure surveys, reservoir gas oil ratio, the well head temperature and pressure in addition to the gas injection rate and gas injection pressure. This developed ANN used in building accurate individual well models on PROSPER and a full field network model gathering all the individuals' models with the surface network. This creates an integrated production model aiming to perform field wide gas lift optimization.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my appreciation to Prof. Dr. Eissa Shokir for his valuable guidance, helpful suggestions, encouragement and patience during the preparation of this research. Dr. Ismail Mahgoub for his assistance.

Sincere appreciation to:

- Reservoir team at GUPCO that I am proud to be a part of that team for their co-operative manner and outstanding performance in meeting company challenges that assist us in improving our work experience as a team.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents who stands beside me giving me the continuous assistance and support through my whole life. They are the main reason for any success in my life after the God almighty. They deserve a lot, there is nothing can express my love and pride toward them.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	I
DEDICATION	VI
TABLE OF CONTENT	III
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VII
NOMENCLATURE	X
ABSTRACT	XII
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	2
2.1.WELL INFLOW AND OUTFLOW PERFORMANCE.....	2
2.1.1.Well Inflow Performance.....	2
2.1.2.Well Outflow Performance	3
2.2.GAS LIFT SYSTEM.....	8
2.2.1.Gas Lift Applications	10
2.2.2.Types of Gas Lift	10
2.2.3.Advantage of Continuous Over Intermittent Gas Lift	13
2.2.4.Gas Lift Valves	13
2.3.GAS LIFT OPTIMIZATION.....	14

2.3.1.Optimization Methods and Techniques.....	14
2.4.ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK.....	18
2.4.1.Introduction	18
2.4.2.The Power of The Artificial Neural Network.....	19
2.4.3.The Artificial Neural Network Architecture and framework	21
2.4.3.1.Activation (Transfer) Functions.....	21
2.4.3.2.FeedForward Neural Network	23
2.4.3.3.The Network Learning Process.....	24
2.5.THE BACK-PROPAGATION ALGORITHM.....	29
CHAPTER 3 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM.....	30
CHAPTER 4 BUILDING THE ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK MODEL.....	31
4.1.INTRODUCTION.....	31
4.2.DATA GATHERING.....	31
4.3.DATA QUALITY CONTROL.....	32
4.4.THE ANN MODEL MECHANISM.....	33
4.5.THE MODEL SPECIFICATION.....	34
4.6.THE MODELING TOOLS.....	34
CHAPTER5 DEVELOPMENT OF INTEGRATED PRODUCTION MODEL FOR GAS LIFT OPTIMIZATION...	38
5.1.DESCRPTION OF PRODUCTION AND SYSTEMS PERFORMANCE (PROSPER) MODEL.....	38

5.1.1.PROSPER Main Menu	38
5.2.DESCRPTION OF MULTI-WELL NETWORK GENERAL ALLOCATION PACKAGE (GAP) MODEL.....	41
5.2.1.Optimization Procedure.....	41
5.3.ESTIMATING OF OPTIMUM GAS-INJECTION RATE.....	44
CHAPTER 6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	50
6.1.THE DEVELOPED ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK MODEL.....	50
6.2.THE GAS- LIFT OPTIMIZATION USING INTEGRATED PRODUCTION MODELING.....	55
6.2.1.GAP Simulator Results.....	55
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS...	62
7.1. CONCLUSION.....	62
7.2. RECOMENDATIONS.....	63
REFERENCES.....	64
APPENDIX A.....	68
APPENDIX B.....	70
APPENDIX C.....	72

List of Table

Table 6.1: The Statistics Table of the Minimum and Maximum Values of the Developed ANN Parameters.....	50
Table B.1: The Points Used as a Secondary Test for the Developed ANN Model.....	72
Table B.2: The Absolute Error and the Relative Error for the P_{wf} and Q_f	73
Table C.1: The Output Data of the Developed ANN Model which Used in the IPM.....	75
Table C.2: The Comparison between Actual and Optimized Gas lift Rates and Oil Rates (Case No.1).....	76
Table C.3: The Comparison between Actual and Optimized Gas lift Rates and Oil Rates (Case No.2).....	77

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Example of Vogel Curve vs Approach.....	3
Figure 2.2: Different Types of Flow Regimes.....	4
Figure 2.3: Gas Lift Well Schematic.....	8
Figure 2.4: Total Gas Lift System Schematic.....	9
Figure 2.5: Continuous Gas Lift System Schematic.....	10
Figure 2.6: Gas Lifting Mechanisms.....	11
Figure 2.7: Intermittent Gas Lift.....	12
Figure 2.8: Single Well Optimization.....	15
Figure 2.9: Artificial Neural Network Components.....	18
Figure 2.10: The General Neuron Model.....	21
Figure 2.11: Threshold Activation Function.....	22
Figure 2.12: Sigmoid Activation Function.....	22
Figure 2.13: FeedForward Neural Network.....	23
Figure 2.14: Trained Neuron.....	25
Figure 2.15: Perceptron Learning Rule.....	26
Figure 2.16: Delta Learning Rule.....	27
Figure 2.17: The Three Layer Back-Propagation Neural Network.....	29
Figure 4.1: Source of Input Parameters.....	32
Figure 4.2: The inputs and the outputs of the developed model.....	33
Figure 4.3: The ANN Model types.....	34
Figure 4.4: The ANN Model Structure.....	35
Figure 4.5: The ANN Model Inputs Distribution.....	35
Figure 4.6: The ANN Model Hidden Neurons Number.....	35

Figure 4.7: The ANN Model Algorithm Choice.....	36
Figure 4.8: The ANN Model Error Histogram.....	36
Figure 4.9: The ANN Model Performance.....	37
Figure 5.1: Case for PROSPER Options Summary Window.....	38
Figure 5.2: Case for PROSPER PVT Matching Window.....	39
Figure 5.3: Case for PROSPER Equipment Data Window.....	39
Figure 5.4: Case for Continuous Gas Lift Window.....	40
Figure 5.5: Case for IPR Data Window.....	40
Figure 5.6: Case for System Options Window.....	41
Figure 5.7: Case for IPR Input Entry Window.....	42
Figure 5.8: Case for VLP Input Entry Window.....	42
Figure 5.9: Case for Well Control Entry Window.....	43
Figure 5.10: Case for VLP Generation Parameters Entry Window.....	43
Figure 5.11: Case for Network Solver Calculations.....	44
Figure 5.12: Water Cut of Each Well.....	45
Figure 5.13: Static Pressure of Each Well.....	45
Figure 5.14: Injection Gas of Each Well.....	46
Figure 5.15: Injection Gas Pressure of Each Well.....	46
Figure 5.16: Well Head Pressure of Each Well.....	47
Figure 5.17: Well Head Temperature of Each Well.....	47
Figure 5.18: Total Fluid Rate of Each Well.....	48
Figure 5.19: Bottom Hole Flowing Pressure of Each Well.....	48
Figure 5.20: Schematic for GAP Model.....	49
Figure 6.1: The ANN Model Performance through Training, Validation and Test.....	52

Figure 6.2: The Plot of the Actual Fluid Rate vs. ANN Fluid Rate.....	53
Figure 6.3: The Plot of the Actual Flowing Bottom Hole pressure vs. Values of the ANN Flowing Bottom Hole pressure.....	53
Figure 6.4: The Calculate Values of Fluid Rate vs. Measured Values.....	54
Figure 6.5: The Plot of the Actual Flowing Bottom Hole pressure vs. Values of the ANN Flowing Bottom Hole pressure.....	54
Figure 6.6: Actual vs. Optimized Oil Rate per Each Well (case #1).....	57
Figure 6.7: Actual vs. Optimized Gas Injection Rate per Each Well (Case #1).....	57
Figure 6.8: Oil Rate Gained per Each Well (case #1)	58
Figure 6.9: Saved Injected Gas Rate per Each Well (case #1).....	58
Figure 6.10: Actual vs. Optimized Oil Rate per Each Well (case #2).....	59
Figure 6.11: Actual vs. Optimized Gas Injection Rate per Each Well (Case #2).....	59
Figure 6.12: Oil Rate Gained per Each Well (case #2).....	60
Figure 6.13: Saved Injected Gas Rate per Each Well (case #2).....	60
Figure 6.14: The Oil Gain in Each Case.....	61
Figure 6.15: The Saved Gas Injection Volume in Each Case.....	61

Nomenclature

Symbols

C	Learning constant that determine the rate of learning
D	Inside pipe diameter, Inch
E	Least square error
E_K	Dimensionless kinetic-energy pressure gradient
F	Friction factor
PI	Productivity Index, BPD/PSI
P_{wf}	Well bore flowing pressure, PSI
P_r	Reservoir pressure, PSI
P_B	Bubble point pressure, PSI
PBTD	Plugged Back Total Depth, Ft
Q_{max}	Maximum liquid production, BPD
Q_f	total fluid rate of the well, BFPD
H_L	Liquid holdup
SCF/STB	Standard cubic feet/Stock tank barrel
STBPD	Stock Tank Barrel Per Day
O_i	Resulted neuron output
ID	Inner Diameter, Inch
R	Learning signal
RB/STB	Reservoir barrel/Stock tank barrel
w_i(t)	Old values of t weight vector at time level t
w_i(t + 1)	New values of weight vector at time level t+1
Δw_i	Weight adjustment
θ	Inclination angle from vertical
ρ_{mn}	Mixture density, PCF
ρ_L	Liquid density, PC
ρ_n	No-slip density,PCF
ρ_{mn}	No-slip mixture density, PCF
V_m	Mixture velocity, FT/SEC

Abbreviations

ANN	Artificial neural network
BPNN	Back propagation neural network
BHFP	Bottom-Hole Flowing Pressure
BFPD	Barrel fluid per day
BOPD	Barrel oil per day
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
FVF(B_o)	Formation Volume Factor
GOR	Gas Oil Ratio, SCF/STB
IPM	Integrated Production Modeling
PVT	Pressure, Volume, Temperature
H₂S	Hydrogen sulfide
N₂	Nitrogen
VLP	Vertical Lift Performance