DOI: 10.30632/SPWLA-5082

MULTI-DETECTOR PULSED NEUTRON TOOL APPLICATION IN LOW POROSITY RESERVOIR – A CASE STUDY IN MUTIARA FIELD, INDONESIA

Aditya Arie Wijaya, Rama Aulianagara, and Weijun Guo, Halliburton

Fetty Maria Naibaho, Fransiscus Xaverius Asriwan, and Usman Amirudin, Pertamina Hulu Sanga-Sanga

This paper was prepared for the SPWLA 61st Annual Logging Symposium held online over 6 sessions, every Wednesday from June 24 to July 29, 2020.

ABSTRACT

In mature fields, pulsed-neutron logging is commonly used to solve for remaining saturation behind the casing. For years, sigma-based saturation has been used to calculate gas saturation behind casing; however, the high dependency of sigma-to-water salinity of the formation, especially the low dynamic range at porosity near 12 p.u., has proven to be challenging in the low-porosity, gas rock. A new measurement from the third detector from a multi-detector pulsed-neutron tool (MDPNT) is proposed to provide a better estimation of the gas saturation in a low-porosity reservoir.

Two sets of independently measured sigma and the third detector were taken in a cased hole well, with a dual-tubing system of a long string and short string. For the third-detector measurement, the measurement was based on the ratio of slow capture gate and inelastic gate component from the decay curve created by the long detector. This ratio can be used to detect gas in a tight reservoir with a minimum salinity and lithology effect. This data will then be used to calculate the gas saturation from the third detector, and the result is compared to sigma-based gas saturation.

At an interval where the porosity is above 12 p.u., the sigma-based gas saturation and MDPNT-based gas saturation are very much in agreement. However, in a low porosity reservoir near 12 p.u. or below, the sigma-based measurement starts to show its limitation. Meanwhile, the MDPNT-based gas saturation clearly shows the remaining gas saturation where sigma-based measurements failed to detect. The subsequent decision was made based on the log analysis result, and perforation was done at a potential interval based on MDPNT result. The results from the production test confirm the MDPNT-based gas saturation with 700 MSCFD gas production added.

This study showcases a new technology to solve a low-porosity gas reservoir issue where a sigma-based measurement underestimate the remaining gas saturation. Using two different measurements in the same well, the results from the MDPNT measurement demonstrated a better result compare to the sigma-based measurement in low-porosity rock.

INTRODUCTION

The pulsed neutron technology has been widely used for decades in formation evaluation in cased hole conditions. It is mainly used for determining the saturation in the reservoir. The classic technologies commonly known to be used are carbon-oxygen (C/O) and sigma (∑).

The C/O method was introduced in the 1970s, and widely used as a method to identify oil in an unknown water salinity formation. Unlike the sigma method, the C/O method is not affected by the salinity of water in formation (Wijaya and Bagir, 2018).

The Sigma method uses the intrinsic value of each element in the reservoir (matrix and fluid) in capturing thermal neutron (capture cross-section or sigma). It computes hydrocarbon saturation by looking at the difference between water and hydrocarbon sigma values.

In this case study area, which is dominated by a fresh water reservoir, the low contrast sigma value of fresh water and oil causes the use of sigma method is limited to gas saturation determination. However, the accuracy of the gas saturation calculation will depend heavily on the rock lithology (especially in shaly formation), and the porosity. In a low porosity reservoir near 12 p.u. or lower, the sigma method gas saturation calculation starts to show its high uncertainty.

The third detector from MDPN tool produces a new measurement called SATG, a ratio between slow and fast capture gate. It is less affected by the effect of lithology compared to sigma method, and has better dynamic range in low porosity reservoirs.

In the case study area, these two measurements are compared side by side to see the difference in determining the gas saturation across intervals near 12 p.u. or less.

FIELD HISTORY

The Mutiara Field is part of four major fields in Sanga-Sanga block, located in East Kalimantan. Mutiara is the biggest gas and oil producing field in the Sanga-Sanga PSC (Production Sharing Contract).

This field is located in the southern area of Sanga-Sanga PSC and 50 km distance from Balikpapan city. It covers 68 square km measured area from north to south, as shown in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1: - Mutiara Field Surface Map (Kahfie, R.M., et al, 2017).

Mutiara Area compartmentalize by normal faults which is trend relatively northwest to southeast perpendicular to major thrust fault that is southwest to northeast. Its reservoir consists of channels and bars siliciclastic of middle Miocene deltaic (delta front to delta plain) with intraformational source rock that already mature since 13 Ma (based on Exploration Study, 2019). Later, this siliciclastic reservoir, composed of sand and shale intercalation, will introduce uncertainty in the sigma-based gas saturation.

Having over 50 years of active exploration and development, this field has reached its mature phase, and requires some workover jobs to maintain its gas production.

SIGMA MEASUREMENT

A pulsed neutron tool emits high energy 14 MeV neutrons that "pulse" in a specifically designated time interval. The emitted neutrons travel from the detector through the casing to the formation. The interaction of neutrons with the element atoms in the borehole, casing, cement and formation produce gamma ray particles. Depending on the interaction between neutrons and atoms in the formation; background, inelastic, capture, and activation process, each interaction will produce a different type of gamma ray.



Figure 2: - Decay curve of count rates against time with different formation fluid.

As shown in **Figure 2**, the process starts with a burst from the initial firing of the tool, shortly after the burst, the gamma ray count rate is predominantly affected by the near borehole. After several hundred microseconds, the formation component becomes the main contributor to the decay and shortly after it will return to the background rate (Imrie et al, 2019).

TYPICAL Σ VALUES

MINERAL/FLUID	Σ VALUE	MINERAL/FLUID	Σ VALUE
SANDSTONE	4.6	SALT WATER (240 kppm NaCl)	118
LIMESTONE	7.5	OIL	18.2-22 **
DOLOMITE	4.7	GAS	UP TO 14 *
ANHYDRITE	12.6	QUARTZ	4.6
GYPSUM	18.6	CHALK	7.5
FRESH WATER	22	SHALE	20-50
SALT WATER (100 KPPM NaCl)	59	HALITE	761

* THE Σ VALUE IS DEPENDS UPON RESERVOIR PRESSURE, TEMPERATURE, GAS GRAVITY AND CONDENSATE RATIO.

** THE Σ VALUE DEPENDS UPON THE GAS OIL RATIO (GOR).

THE Σ VALUE FOR THE COMMON MINERALS IS SHOWN FOR PURE MATRIX. THE VALUE WILL VARY IN REALITY DEPENDING ON THE FORMATION CONDITION, i.e. TRACE IMPURITIES, CONNATE WATER SALINITY, ETC.

Figure 3: - Typical values of Sigma for common minerals, rocks and fluids.

The sigma is defined as the capability of each mineral to capture thermal neutrons. This value is unique for each element. **Figure 3** shows typical value of common minerals, rocks and fluids.

Weijun Guo et al (2012), emphasized the limitations from sigma-based saturation calculation. The uncertainty on saturation calculation is higher if the porosity (Φ) is lower, and when the contrast between sigma water (∑w) and sigma gas (∑g) is low. In a clean reservoir with no shales, the gas saturation equation is shown below (Eq.1):

$$Sw = \frac{(\sum \log - \sum \mathrm{ma}) - \Phi * (\sum \mathrm{g} - \sum \mathrm{ma})}{\Phi * (\sum \mathrm{w} - \sum \mathrm{g})} \qquad 1$$

In the case study area, the reservoir consists of interbedded shale and sandstone. The following equation will be used in the reservoir with a shale component ~~in it~~.

$$Sw = \frac{(\sum \log - \sum \mathrm{ma}) + \mathrm{Vsh} * (\sum \mathrm{ma} - \sum \mathbf{g}) + \mathrm{Vsh} * (\sum \mathbf{ma} - \sum \mathbf{sh})}{\Phi \mathrm{e} * (\sum \mathrm{w} - \sum \mathrm{g})} \qquad 2$$

From the equation (Eq.2), it is clear that it was heavily affected by the contrast between sigma water and sigma gas, as well as the low porosity. It was also heavily affected by the volume and sigma of shale. The higher the sigma shale, the greater the effect on the water saturation calculation. This will later show the sigma-based gas saturation calculation to be highly sensitive to changes in shale volume.

SATG MEASUREMENT

In low porosity rock, sigma is not well suited to calculate an accurate gas saturation. Tight or low porosity rock typically has a porosity less than 12 p.u. (Mekic, et al., 2016). In such a low porosity, the dynamic range of 100% gas and 100% water is small, hence the low accuracy of sigma gas saturation. **Figure 4** shows the different dynamic ranges between three products of PNL measurements (C/O, Sigma, and SATG).



Figure 4: - Sigma-C/O – SATG fancharts

SATG (saturation gate) is a newly introduced ratio also from capture mode measurement, from the MDPNT. The measurement comes from the long-spacing detector and was designed to overcome the shortcomings of sigma in low porosity. The SATG is a ratio between inelastic gate and slow capture gate (Guo et al, 2012), as shown in **Figure 5**.



Figure 5: - SATG processing partitions of fast and slow capture gate, and also inelastic gate.

The SATG measurement uses a fan chart to calculate gas saturation as a function of SATG vs porosity. This fan chart is a function of borehole fluid and size, and casing size. Further study proves that the SATG method is independent of formation water salinity (Chen et al, 2015), and reduced lithology dependency as shown in **Figure 6**.



Figure 6: - Limestone and dolomite lithology plotted onto SATG gas saturation fan chart (Kwong et al. 2013)



Figure 7: - Linear relationship between shale volume and SATG measurement vs total porosity.

Although SATG has a reduced lithology dependency, the effect from lithology, especially shales, still need correction. In the case study area, the SATG measurement is underestimating the gas saturation due to high value of SATG shales. This effect is easily corrected by a linear relationship between SATG and Vsh across target interval (Mcllroy et al, 2015) as shown in **Figure 7**.

JOB PLANNING AND EXECUTION

The target interval consists of sandstone reservoirs with thick shales in between. The sandstone reservoir has porosity ranges from 8-12 p.u., and shales volume of 10-20 percent.

The well is a dual monobore design, with a short string and long string combination. The executed logging plan was to log the target interval using capture mode in the short string section.



Figure 8: - SATG Default fan chart

Specifically for the SATG measurement, a designated fan chart based on casing, borehole size, and borehole fluid is created prior to the job to provide a fast turnaround time for quick perforation decisions. The fan chart designed for this job is shown in **Figure 8**.

Supporting data for post-processing such as openhole data and formation evaluation data (tpor, epor, vshale, and water saturation) are provided prior to the job. Formation evaluation data like tpor, epor, and vshale are used as inputs in gas saturation calculation for both Sigma and SATG based measurements, while the rest is used for display purposes.

INTERPRETATION RESULT

Sigma-based gas saturation and SATG-based gas saturation are calculated independently across target intervals. The parameters for calculating the gas saturation from sigma consists of sigma water and sigma gas, which are obtained from information about the gas properties, reservoir pressure and temperature, and water salinity provided by customer. The sigma matrix and sigma shales are estimated based on acquired sigma data as shown on **Figure 9**. The Sigsolidsapp is an apparent sigma matrix which gives an estimate value of Sigma matrix at 0% shales volume, and sigma shales at 100% shales volume. According to this crossplot, the sigma matrix is 7.5 and sigma shales is 27 c.u. The sigma water of 24 c.u. and sigma gas of 3 c.u. were estimated from given water salinity (5 Kppm NaCl) and gas properties (gas gravity, formation temperature-pressure) from customer.



Figure 9: - Sigma matrix and sigma shale determination

The sigma-based gas saturation is calculated based on a fanchart created by these sigma parameters. In a water zone, the crossplot between sigma intrinsic and total porosity will fall into the sigma wet line. However, due to the low porosity of this water zone interval (2-7 p.u.), the distribution of the data points is not conclusive, and shows a high uncertainty (**Figure 10**). Looking closely, when porosity is close to 6 p.u., the data becomes better aligned with the sigma wet-line.



Figure 10: - Sigma Fan chart across water zone

The SATG-based gas saturation is calculated based on the specific fan chart. Across the water zone the distribution between SATG vs porosity should be close to the wet-line (blue line) in the fan chart. **Figure 11** shows the SATG fan chart across the water zone. The SATG fan matrix value has been adjusted from default (0.22) to 0.39. This offset was applied to better fits the wet-line in the fanchart. A linear shale correction to SATG was also applied prior to calculating the gas saturation.



Figure 11: - SATG Fan chart across water zone

Each result is presented in the plot (**Figure 12**) to show the difference in terms of calculated gas saturation across the target interval. The gas saturation by sigma is shown as a blue line and the gas saturation from SATG is shown as a red line-red-shading in the Track-9 (saturation track). Detail on each track on the plot are explained as follow:

- Track-1: correlation track, consists of GR from openhole (GR_OH) and cased hole (GR_CH).
- Track-2: depth track with dual monobore diagram.
- Track-3: deep (RO90), medium (RO30) and shallow (RO10) resistivity from openhole.
- Track-4: density (RHOB) and neutron (TNPH) from openhole.
- Track-5: inelastic (RINC) and capture ratio (RNF) from casedhole.
- Track-6: far (FCAP) and near count rates (NCAP) from cased hole.
- Track-7: sigma intrinsic/formation (SGIN), sigma at 100% wet (Sigma Wet) and sigma at 100% gas saturation (Sigma Gas).
- Track-8: SATG formation (SATG), SATG at 100% wet (SATG WET) and SATG at 100% gas (SATG GAS).
- Track-9: saturation track showing SATG-based gas saturation (SG_SATG) and sigma-based gas saturation (SG_SIGMA). Openhole saturation is also plotted for display purposes.
- Track-10: Volumetric track of shale, sand and bulk volume of fluid, based on SATG.
- Track-11: Volumetric track of shale, sand and bulk volume of fluid, based on Sigma.

Zone A3

This interval shows gas saturation from sigma at the top, around 10-20% (blue line), whereas the SATG-based shows around 40-50% gas saturation.

The A3 top section where the porosity is around 10-11 p.u., the SATG gives much higher saturation (around 40%) compared to sigma saturation (around 20%).

Interestingly, the A3 second peak of gas has a porosity of 12-15 p.u.; however the sigma was not able to calculate any gas saturation, whereas the SATG gives high saturation of gas.

Zone A5

This interval shows no gas saturation from sigma whereas the SATG-based shows 10-27% gas saturation.

Across this zone, the porosity is 8-11 p.u., therefore sigma is not suitable for this kind of reservoir.

In this low porosity reservoir, SATG was able to detect the presence of gas missed or underestimated by traditional sigma saturation methods. This was confirmed by gas production of 700 MSCF/day from the A3 and A5 zones (commingle production).



Figure 12: - Sigma vs SATG –based gas saturation.

CONCLUSIONS

In this case study, where the lithology consists of sandstone and shales, the sigma-based gas saturation is affected by shale volume, especially when sigma shale value is high.

This interval is dominated by relatively low porosity (A5 zone), where due to sigma low dynamic range in low porosity rock, the gas saturation uncertainty using sigma will be quite high.

The qualitative curves which usually can be used to indicate the presence of gas also suffer from low porosity rock, and the cross-over will not be able to differentiate between gas or low porosity rock with liquid, since the response is the same.

The results using SATG, demonstrated that the SATG gas saturation has reduced dependency on lithology and water salinity, and overall better dynamic range. This brings an additional value in evaluating low porosity reservoirs by identifying previously overlooked zones, rejuvenating production in the mature field phase.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to thank Pertamina Hulu Sanga-Sanga for permission to publish this paper and Halliburton for the full support in this paper.

REFERENCES

Wijaya, A.A., and Bagir, M., 2018. Success Novel of Integrating Pulsed Neutron and Comprehensive Production Data analysist to Optimize Well Production. The 2nd SPWLA Asia Pacific Technical Symposium.

Imrie, A., Bagir, M., Himawan, G.R., Iyer, M.S., Wijaya, A.A., 2019. Where's The Water Coming From? A Combined Formation Saturation, Production Logging, Water Flow, And Leak Detection Diagnosis Deployed On Coiled Tubing. SPE/IATMI Asia Pacific Oil and Gas Conference and Exhibition.

Guo, W., Dorffer, D., Roy, S., Jacobson, L., and Durbin, D., 2012. Uncertainty Analysis for Determining Petrophysical Parameters with a Multi-Detector Pulsed Neutron Tool in Unconventional Reservoirs. SPWLA 53rd Annual Logging Symposium.

Mekic, N., Mcllroy, C., Hill, F., and Guo, W., 2016. Multidetector Pulsed-Neutron Technology for Low-Porosity Reservoir—Interpretation Methodology. SPWLA 57th Annual Logging Symposium.

Mcllroy, C., Queirein, J., Mekic, N., and Guo, W., 2015. A New Improved Shale Correction for Pulsed-Neutron Measurements. SPE Asia Pacific Unconventional Resources Conference and Exhibition.

Chen, J., Jacobson, L., and Guo, W., 2015. A New Cased-Hole 2 1/8-in. Multi-Detector Pulsed-Neutron Tool: Theory and Characterization. SPWLA 56th Annual Logging Symposium.

Kahfie, R. M., et al. 2017. Integrated Work to Deliver 4,000 BPD Oil from Gas Dominant Field: A Case History from Rejuvenated Brown Field Gas Lift Development. SPE/IATMI Asia Pacific Oil & Gas Conference and Exhibition.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Aditya Arie Wijaya is currently a petrophysicist for Halliburton. He joined the company in 2014. His activities include openhole, casedhole formation evaluation, covering Asia Pacific region and other region of Europe, and Sub-Saharan Africa. His specialties are laminated sand-shale evaluation and casedhole formation evaluation. He holds BSc degree in Geology from Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Rama Aulianagara is currently a technical sales advisor for Halliburton. He joined company in 2006, and has vast experience in logging service. He holds BSc degree from Institute Teknologi Bandung.

Fetty Maria Naibaho is currently a geologist for Pertamina Hulu Sanga-Sanga (PHSS). She joined the company in 2013 (before name is VICO Indonesia) for planning and well operation monitoring of development and exploration wells. Her job role now is to deliver gas and liquid production from well work and intervention jobs in Southern Area (Mutiara-Pamaguan) of Production and Enhancement Team. She holds BSc degree in Geology from Institut Teknologi Bandung.

Fransiscus Xaverius Asriwan graduated from Institut Teknologi Bandung in Petroleum Engineering. He joined with Pertamina Hulu Sanga –Sanga since 2013, and has various experience in Production Engineering, Production Operation, and Well Intervention. He is currently a Petroleum Engineer, focusing on production daily monitoring, rigless program, and new technology implementation.

Usman Amirudin is currently a well intervention and completion engineer in Pertamina Hulu Sanga-Sanga. He has more than 10 years of experience in oil and gas industry in both Services and Oil Company. He holds MBA degree from Prasetya Mulya Business School.

Weijun Guo Weijun Guo is a Technical Advisor in the sensor physics group. He is leading projects on the developments of new pulsed-neutron tools, and interpretation software. After receiving his Ph.D degree from North Carolina State University, Weijun participated various projects to commercialize tools and petrophysics software. Weijun has authored many technical papers, holds 35 US patents, and taught a few short courses in SPWLA, SPE and SEG annual meetings. He serves as a technical reviewer for 4 international journals. Weijun is a SPWLA member and serves in the SPWLA Technology Committee.