Multi-Objective Optimisation Techniques in Reservoir Simulation

Mike Christie Heriot-Watt University

Outline

- Introduction
- Stochastic Optimisation
- Model Calibration
- Forecasting
- Reservoir Optimisation
- Summary

Outline

- Introduction
- Stochastic Optimisation
- Model Calibration
- Forecasting
- Reservoir Optimisation
- Summary

Mathematics of Flow in Porous Media

- Conservation of Mass
- Conservation of Momentum
 replaced by Darcy's law

$$\mathbf{v} = -\frac{k(\mathbf{x})}{\mu} \nabla p$$

- Conservation of Energy

 most processes isothermal
- Equation of State

Equations governing flow

• Parabolic equation for pressure

$$c\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{k(\mathbf{x})}{\mu_o} \left(\frac{k_{ro}(S)}{\mu_o} + \frac{k_{rw}(S)}{\mu_w} \right) \nabla p \right)$$

• Hyperbolic equation for saturation

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial \left(\rho_o x_i S_o + \rho_g y_i S_g\right)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left(\rho_o x_i \mathbf{v}_o + \rho_g y_i \mathbf{v}_g\right) = 0$$

Data Collection





Model Calibration: Teal South







Range of Possible Values for Unknown Parameters



Outline

- Introduction
- Stochastic Optimisation
- Model Calibration
- Forecasting
- Reservoir Optimisation
- Summary

Particle Swam Optimization (PSO)

- A swarm intellegence algorithm (Kennedy & Eberhart, 1995).
- Particles are points in parameter space.
- Particles move based on their own experience and that of the swarm.
- PSO equations

$$v_{i}^{k+1} = \omega v_{i}^{k} + c_{1} r_{1} \left(p_{i}^{best} - x_{i}^{k} \right) + c_{2} r_{2} \left(g_{best}^{k} - x_{i}^{k} \right)$$
$$x_{i}^{k+1} = x_{i}^{k} + v_{i}^{k+1}$$

- r₁, r₂ are random vectors
- ω is the inertial weight
- c₁, c₂ are the cognition and social acceleration components

Dominance and Pareto Optimality

Solution x₁ dominates solution x₂, if :
1. x₁ is no worse than x₂ in all objectives, and
2. x₁ is strictly better than x₂ in at least one objective



MO Particle Swam Optimization (PSO)

• MOPSO equations

$$v_{i}^{k+1} = \omega v_{i}^{k} + c_{1}r_{1}\left(p_{i}^{best} - x_{i}^{k}\right) + c_{2}r_{2}\left(g_{best}^{k} - x_{i}^{k}\right)$$

$$x_{i}^{k+1} = x_{i}^{k} + v_{i}^{k+1}$$

- r₁, r₂ are random vectors
- ω is the inertial weight
- c₁, c₂ are the cognition and social acceleration components
- Pbest and Gbest now sampled from Pareto archive

Why Use Multi-Objective?

• Sum of objectives – limited exploration of Pareto front

Example minimising two objectives



Figure from Hajizadeh, PhD Thesis (Chapter 6, Figure 12), Heriot-Watt, 2011

Outline

- Introduction
- Stochastic Optimisation
- Model Calibration
- Forecasting
- Reservoir Optimisation
- Summary

Model Calibration

- Called 'History Matching' in oil business
- Synthetic example
 IC Fault Model
- Real example
 - Zagadka Field

IC Fault Model

- Synthetic 2D Model
- 2 Wells: 1 Inj, 1 Prod
- 6 Layers
- 1,3,5 Poor Sand (blue)
- 2,4,6 Good Sand (red)
- 1 Fault
- 3 Uncertain Inputs:
 - 1. $k_{high} = [100, 200] \text{ mD}$
 - 2. $k_{low} = [0,50] \text{ mD}$
 - 3. throw = [0,60] ft



* Data from Z. Tavassoli, Jonathan N. Carter, and Peter R. King, Imperial College, London

IC Fault Model

Observed

 $k_{high} = 131.6 \text{ mD}$ $k_{low} = 1.3 \text{ mD}$ throw = 10.4 ft

Misfit Definition:

$$M = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p} \sum_{t} \frac{(sim - obs)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}$$

$$\sigma = 0.03 \times obs$$

p: oil/water rates

• Simulator controlled to match B the wells

Truth Profile (Observed)



IC Fault Model Misfit Surface

Database (DB) 159,661 uniformly generated models



Convergence Speed – 20 Runs



Zagadka Field

- Waterflood/aquifer support
- 95 wells in 10 groups
- 15 years history
- Compartmentalized



Model 4 Convergence (PSO)



Model 4 Field Level History Match

- Match with PSO (single objective)
- 250 simulations (overnight, 12 core workstation)



Match on Group Rates – Single Objective



Multi-Objective vs Single Objective



Multi-Objective Trade Off

• MO balances changes to fit one quantity vs another



MO Not Always Faster than SO

• Study on EoN field



Histogram of 10 Final Misfits



Outline

- Introduction
- Stochastic Optimisation
- Model Calibration
- Forecasting
- Reservoir Optimisation
- Summary

Forecasting with MO

- Generic Bayesian integral $J = \int g(\mathbf{m}) P(\mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{m}$ eg mean oil rate = $\int Q_o(\mathbf{m}) P(\mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{m}$
- MC approximation $J = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{g(\mathbf{m}_{k}) P(\mathbf{m}_{k})}{h(\mathbf{m}_{k})} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} g(\mathbf{m}_{k}) P(\mathbf{m}_{k}) dV_{k}$
- Resample to calculate $P(\mathbf{m}_k)dV_k$

Calculating Weights for Sample

• Gibbs sampler

– Assume misfit constant in Voronoi cell



Single & Multi Objective HM for PUNQ-S3



Based on real field

An industry standard benchmark

Multiple wells and production variables

Algorithm used: PSO

SO vs. MO – Forecasting



Outline

- Introduction
- Stochastic Optimisation
- Model Calibration
- Forecasting
- Reservoir Optimisation
- Summary

Field Development Optimisation

• Based on Scapa field

- Original HM done as part of MSc project
- HM to field rates (from DECC website)
- Wells are different from real field
 - 4 injectors, 4 producers

Field Level History Match

Match to first 10 years of history

 Remaining data used to check forecast





Optimisation

- Multi-Objective
 - Maximise cumulative oil (FOPT)
 - Minimise maximum water rate (FWPR)
- Optimisation variables
 - Well locations (16 variables i, j for each well)
 - Injection well rates

Field Development Optimisation (Scapa)



Optimise Field Development Plan



Scapa: Optimise Mid-Life Infill Wells



Optimisation Under Uncertainty



PUNQ-S3

Multiple HM models

Optimise infill wells

Optimisation Under Uncertainty



Infill Well Location Optimisation under Uncertainty for PUNQ-S3

Summary

• History Matching

- Multi-objective may increase convergence speed, but not always
- Forecasting
 - Multi-objective provides greater coverage of pareto front; can lead to better forecasts
- Optimisation
 - Explore the full range of trade-offs
 - Can include uncertainty

Acknowledgements

- EoN for funding the SO vs MO comparison
- BG, EoN, JOGMEC, RFD for funding the uncertainty group at HW
- Schlumberger for licences of ECLIPSE
- RFD for licences of tNavigator