

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Sudan University of Science & Technology College of Petroleum Engineering & Technology Petroleum Exploration Engineering Department

Graduation Project about:

Pore Pressure Prediction Using Seismic Method in Block 15 Red Sea

توقع الضغط المسامي باستخدام الطريقة السيزمية بمربع 51 – البحر األحمر

Project submitted in partial fulfillment of requirement of the degree of B.sc (honor) in petroleum exploration engineering

Prepared by:

- 1. Mohammed Alnoor Aldegail Abdulrahman.
- 2. Sufian Hassan Mohammed Adam.
- 3. Reda Ismail Adam AbdelRahman.
- 4. Eltayeb Omer Alojaiba.

Supervisor:

Dr. Abbas Musa Yagoup.

October, 2015

Pore Pressure Prediction Using Seismic Method in block 15 Red Sea

توقع الضغط المسامي باستخدام الطريقة السيزمية بمربع 15 –البحر الأحمر

هذا المشروع مقدم إلى كلية هندسة وتكنولوجيا النفط – جامعة السودان للعلوم والتكنولوجيا كإنجاز جزئي ألحد المتطلبات األساسية لنيل درجة البكالوريوس مرتبة الشرف في هندسة استكشاف النفط

إعداد الطالب:

.5 محمد النور الدقيل عبدالرحمن. .2 سفيان حسن محمد آدم. .3 رضا إسماعيل آدم عبدالرحمن. .4 الطيب عمر العجيبة.

مشرف المشروع:

د. عباس موسى يعقوب التوقيع ..

رئيس قسم هندسة اإلستكشاف:

أ. محمد عبدهللا التوقيع ..

عميد الكلية:

د. تقوى أحمد موسى التوقيع ..

التاريخ / / 2151

اآليــــــــــــة

قال تعالى:

)قُلْ اِعْمَلُوا فَسَيَرَى اهللُ عَمَلَكُمْ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالمُؤمِنُون(

صدق الله العظيم

سورة التوبة: 501

Dedication

This project is dedicated to my father, who taught me that the best kind of knowledge is that which have a specific target. It is also dedicated to my mother, who taught me that even the largest task can be accomplished if it is done one step at a time. It's also **dedicated to the spirit of Dr. Mohammed Naeim** and to all our friends for their encouragement. Special thanks to our teachers and college.

Acknowledgments

We would like to sincerely thank our supervisor Dr. Abbas Musa for his patience, guidance and give us the opportunity to be our supervisor. We would also like to thank Sudapet Company for providing us with valuable advices their support for this project was greatly needed and deeply appreciated.

Abstract

The study has been made in the Red Sea area block15 to predict pore pressure of the formation using Eaton method which considered being one of the indirect methods of calculation and estimation of pressure. This method depends on seismic data and well data. The well selected is Talla-1 which located at the coordination of latitude °18 '50 with longitude of °38 '03. The well penetrates several formations which are Shagara, Wardan, Zeit and Dungunab formations. After calculation a plot has been created showing the relationship between pore pressure and depth which illustrate an increase of pressure with depth. Although this method provide us with information about the pore pressure but it's limited by several factors which is the quality of seismic data acquisition and processing also the complexity of subsurface structures.

التجريد

أجريت الدراسة في منطقة البحر الأحمر بمربع 15 لتوقع الضغط المسامي في الطبقات وذلك باستخدام طريقة إيتون والتي تعترب إحدى الطرق غري املباشرة يف حساب الضغوط وتقييمها والتي تعتمد على البيانات السيزمية وبيانات اآلبار حيث تم اختيار بئر -1Talla الواقع عند الإحداثيات خط العرض 50' 18 مع خط الطول 03' 38. البئر يخترق عدة تكاوين وه*ي* شجرة، وردان ، زيت و دنجناب.بعد الحسابات تم رسم علاقة بين الضغط المسامي مع العمق توضح زيادة الضغط مع العمق. على الرغم بإن هذه الطريقة تزودنا بمعلومات عن ضغط املسام ولكنها محكومة بعدة عوامل منها جودة البيانات السيزمية المتسبة والعالجة وأيضًا بالتراكيب الجيولوجية المعقدة تحت السطح.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Chapter One Introduction

Chapter One

Introduction

Drilling is a key component of the petroleum industry. Pore pressure is a property of the formation that has direct impact on drilling and completion of wells.^[3] Pore pressure which is the pressure exerted by fluids in the pores of a reservoir, normally hydrostatic pressure exerted by the column of water from the depth of the formation to sea level is a major issue faced by drillers in the exploration sector. Abnormal pore pressure can lead to very serious drilling incidents like well blowouts, fluid influx and could greatly increase non-productive drilling time if not predicted accurately while and before drilling. Seismic data has long been recognized as a mean of addressing shale pore pressure concerns without actually having a well at that particular location. The industry has limited control in the form of well logs and cores; these data provide a detailed look at a very small area. Seismic data gives a more general assessment of a larger area and, when calibrated with the existing well control provides a method for increasing the driller's confidence. Seismic data regardless of how it is processed does not directly measure pressure. Seismic interval velocities get influenced by changes rock properties and this is exhibited in terms of reflection amplitudes in seismic surveys. Consequently, velocity determination is the key to pore pressure prediction. However, when a correlation between seismic velocity and porosity can be established, then methods that can be used to estimate pore pressures are exist from the velocities. Pore pressure predictions calculated from wells and interval velocity data have been used almost exclusively to design well casings and drilling mud weight programs. However, it's also contains valuable information on how oil, gas and water is behaving in the subsurface and importantly how fluid pressures will effect top seals, fault seals and column heights in hydrocarbon prospects. Pressure information obtained while drilling may then be used to refine the acceptable region of parameter space, so that the best possible pore pressure prediction can be made ahead of the bit based on drilling information and seismic velocities. ^[8]

1.1 Basic Theories:

Prediction of pore pressure depends greatly on understanding of seismic and well characteristics for instance velocity, resistivity, and density which capture porosity changes during shale compaction under vertical loading. Pore pressure prediction's basic theory derived from Terzaghi's and Biot's effective stress law (Biot. 1941; Terzaghi 1996). This fundamental theory represents the formation pore pressure as a function of overburden stress and effective stress. Hottman and Johnson (1965) introduced the concept o f using sonic velocities; also Pennebaker (1968) used interval velocities obtained from stacking velocities. Over the years, literature has been populated with works on the use of seismic data for predrill geopressure prediction of the various possible methods, the effective stress method has become the preferred standard widely used in the industry, with the most popular method being the Eaton method (Eaton, 1975) and the Bowers method (Bowers,1995). Another method using mean stress, developed by Harrold (2000) used comparable sand and shale structures at moderately low temperatures. [3]

1.2 Previous Studies:

Many studies have been made in the Red Sea by several researchers for example:

- Aswartiz & Arden in 1960, they have described the lithological history of Red Sea Area.

- Karilla & Scarb in 1962, they have drawn lithological maps, stratigraphic and biostratigraphic of Sudanese Red Sea Shorelines. According to their efforts and investigation as geologist in Agip Company that led to drill 6 wells.

- Sisteney in 1965 was the first one to realize and estimate the matching between Miocene and Paleocene, and tried to link systematically between stratigraphy of Red Sea and Gulf of Suez.

- Qurashi in 1971 with a team from Khartoum University enhanced the stud y using gravity survey maps from Atbara to Bortsudan.

- Chevron Company in (1975-1976) enhanced the study using gravity survey maps which led to results for correction maps of Bogair anomaly of Toker Delta area.

1.3 The Objective of Study:

The main objective of this study is to illustrate the possibility of using seismic data to predict pore pressure of formation by applying Eaton Method with integrating well logs data. The predicted pore pressure using seismic interval velocities and well logs of selected offset well which is Talla-1 from block15 in the Red Sea is to be compared with real pressure detected from drilling data.

1.4 Study Area Information:

Block15 covers an area of 24,377 km2, both onshore and offshore of Delta Tokar. With maximum water depth of 760m (2500 ft). ^[12]

Fig (1.1): Map showing the location of Block 15 in northeastern of Sudan²¹

1.5 Well under study: Talla-1 Well

The well type is Exploration Wildcat located nearby line IPS92-045. The coordinates are Latitude 18° 50' 47" N and Longitude 38° 03'15" E. [12]

Fig (1.2): Geological Map showing the area of Block15^[12]

1.6 Data and Method of Analysis:

This project focuses on the prediction of pore pressure of the formations. In order to achieve that, data from the study area need to be obtained. These data according to the method are: a seismic data represented by the interval velocities of the layers and a well log data represented by the density log from which the overburden gradient will be calculated. By applying Eaton Method a plot represents the pore pressure related to the depth will be generated as a result using Excel software.

1.7 Rock Physics Depth Trends:

Velocity-depth trends are important in seismic exploration and borehole drilling for several reasons .Commonly. These have been used for detection of overpressure zones from seismic velocity (using travel time inversion).indicated by negative velocity (e.g., Herring. 1973:Japsen.dutta et al. 2002a, 2002b). These are important to detect since they can cause hazardous blowouts during drilling. Also, velocity-depth trends can be used for calculation of interval velocities and depth conversion and seismic time horizons (e.g. carter, 1989;Alchalabi,1997) In areas where few wells are drilled , one often needs to assume a velocity trends based on an interpreted geologic depth column. The trends for sands and shales can also be used to study the expected seismic signatures of sand-shale interface as a function of depth, and to identify anomalous lithologies (e.g. limestones) digenetic zones(e.g., cementation). Similarly, over compacted zones related to uplift can be recognized, and erosion thickness (i.e., missing overburden) can be estimated (e.g., Bulat and Stoker, 1987; Japsen, 1993; Al-chalabi and Rosenkranz, 2002). Finally, expected brine-saturated velocity-depth trends can be applied to detect seismic velocity anomalies related to hydrocarbons (e.g., Avseth et al., 2003).

1.8 Rock Physics Properties as a Function of Compaction:

In order to understand the expected seismic response of a siliciclastic reservoir, at any given depth, it is key interest contrast in elastic properties between shales and sands as a function of depth. However, rock physics depth trends can be very complicated, depending on mineralogy, lithology, digenesis, pore pressure, effective stress and fluid properties. In areas with good well coverage, one can establish empirical rock physics depth trends for different lithologies from statistical regressions to well-log data (Vp,Vs, and density).^[11]

In general, seismic velocities and densities of siliciclastic sedimentary rocks will increase with depth because of compaction and porosity reduction. However, the rock physics-depth trends can be rather complex because of the competing effects of porosity, pressure, mineralogy, texture and pore fluids. In fact, we may observe more than one crossover in velocity-depth trends of sand and shales. Rock physics models can be very useful in better understanding these depth trends. However, the models have to be calibrated to local geology before they can be used for further prediction of hydrocarbons and lithology. Geologic constraints include expected lithofacies and association sand and shale mineralogy to determine effective elastic moduli and densities for the solid phase, fluid properties (oil density, GOR, gas gravity, brine salinity), as well as information about pressure and temperature gradients. [11]

1.9 Pressure Effects on Velocities:

There are at least four ways that pore pressure changes influence seismic signature: $[11]$

- i. Reversible elastic effects on the rock frame.
- ii. Permanent porosity loss from compaction and digenesis.
- iii. Retardation of digenesis from overpressure.
- iv. Pore fluid changes caused by pore pressure.

Chapter Two Regional Geology of the Study Area

Chapter Two

Regional Geology of the Study Area

The Red Sea Basin area geographically includes the rifted sedimentary basins under several bodies of water, plus their tectonically related adjacent coastal regions. The first major Stratigraphic unit includes all igneous and metamorphic rocks of the "Basement Complex" which forms the Red Sea Hills and the foothills, and is generally considered to be of Precambrian age. See fig (2.1). In the "Basement Complex," Ruxton (1956) distinguished one metamorphic and two sedimentary and volcanic groups, separated by important unconformities, and affected by various kinds of intrusions.

2.1 The Basement Complex:

The term Basement Complex is normally applied to those complex of rocks of Pre-Nubian sandstone age. They are formed of metamorphic rocks, which exhibit variable degrees of metamorphism and include sediments from the Pre-Cambrian to Ordovician periods incorporated into a complex sequence of igneous intrusive and extrusive suits Robertson Research International, (RRI, 1984). The Basement Complex is considered the oldest rock unit exposed in northeastern of Sudan, which comprises the Red Sea Hills and the adjacent Nubian Desert.^[9]

Oligocene continental rifting began with subsidence, extension and normal faulting associated with the episodic and segmented movement of the Arabian Peninsula away from Africa. Magmatic expansion resulted in igneous emplacements, and isostatic compensation caused the rift shoulders to undergo uplift and local erosion into the rapidly subsiding. ^[9]

2.2 Tectonic Setting:

A 5000 Km long orogenic belt was formed due to the collision named the East African Orogeny (EAO) (Stern, 1994). The belt consists of the Arabian Nubian Shield (ANS) in the north and the Mozambique belt to the south as shown in fig (2.2) . ^[9]

Fig (2.1): Index Map of the Red Sea region showing generlized geology and discussed location (after Mitchell and others, 1992).[12]

Fig (2.2) : Geotectonic map showing the precambrian structures, the major suture and shear zones of the Arabian-Nubian Shield (ANS). (Modified after Abdelrahman, 1993 and Ali 2005)^[12]

2.3 Regional Setting: Stratigraphy

i. Abu Shagara Group of Pliocene-Pleistocene:

Lower Unit Wardan Formation of coarse grained sandstone and gravel, with limestones, shales and dolomite. Upper Unit Shagara Formation of mainly carbonates with some shales and lesser sandstone.

ii. Zeit Formation of Upper Miocene:

Predominantly coarse to fine grained sandstone interbedded with shales, less anhydrite and minor thin carbonate beds.

iii. Dungunab Formation of Middle-Upper Miocene:

Mainly massive halite with anhydrite, lesser shale and very minor sandstone Varies in thickness from near shore to deeper water area.

iv. Belayim Formation of Middle Miocece:

The on/near shore is more clastic of sandstone $\&$ shale whereas in the open marine area, carbonate facies of mainly dolomite is prevalent.

v. Kareem Formation of Lower Miocene:

Shale interbedded with halite and minor sandstone in the upper unit. Evaporitic Markha unit of halite & anhydrite with some minor shales in the Lower unit.

vi. Rudeis Formation of Lower Miocene:

Interbedded shale and sandstone with minor limestone. Onshore area dominates by sandstone.

vii. Hamamit Formation of Lower Miocene – Paleocene:

Coarse quartzitic sandstone with lenses of conglomerates with volcanic fragments and basalt lava flows.

viii. Mukawar Formation of Upper Cretaceous:

Silty shale interbedded with fine-med grained sand stone, with subordinate marls and rare limestone.

Fig (2.3): Red Sea Basin Generlized Straigraphic Column [12]

2.4 Exploration History:

Agip started exploration activities in the late 1950's and continue until 1963. Two wildcats and one appraisal wells were drilled during this period but no discovery was made. Exploration activities resumed when Chevron held the concession between (1975-1977), three wildcats were drilled, and two are discoveries (Bashayer-1A $&$ Suakin-1) and one dry well. Between (1980-1982), two non-discovery wells were drilled by TOTAL and Union Texas. Suakin-2 was the last well drilled (by IPC in 1995). The last operator in the area was RSPOC, drilled two unsuccessful exploration wells in 2009 & 2010. Geological risk ranges from 1 in 8 to 1 in 10 with seal and trap as critical geological risk elements. $[12]$

2.5 Petroleum System: Reservoir & Seal

There are two parts in Block 15:^[12]

Post Salt:

- i. Zeit Formation: Consist mainly of fair to good quality reservoir in Suakin-1 & Bashayer-1A. The porosity is between 14-22% and the quality increases towards onshore.
- ii. Dungunab Formation: Interbedded shale will provide the seal. The sealing efficiency increases toward offshore.

Pre Salt:

- i. Belayem Formation: Upper member of Hamam Faraun has good reservoir quality in Durwara-2, Suakin-2 (sandstone) & Digna-1 (dolomite-porosity 17.5%).
- ii. Rudeis Formation: Upper member has good reservoir quality in Durwara-2.
- iii. Hamamit Formation: Two intervals contain very good quality reservoirs in Durwara-2 and Suakin-2.
- iv. Mukawar Formation: Fair to good quality reservoir encountered in Maghersum-1.

v. Interbedded shale and salt will provide the seal.

2.6 Types of Traps:

There are four types of trap:- [9]

- 1. Roll-over structures as in Bashayer.
- 2. Slump structures created by down-dip sliding and crumpling of rocks in saltlubricated slide planes as in Suakin.
- 3. Rotated fault blocks.
- 4. Stratigraphic.

2.7 Stratigraphy of the Well Formations:

Four of expected formations were penetrated in Talla-1. They were Shagara, Wardan, Zeit and Dungunab formations. However, the Belayim Formation remains inconclusive as no definite litho description data. Thus, the actual top Belayim would be subjected to outcome from further study. Some intervals in Dungunab Formation were difficult to be identified and interpreted due to presence of evaporate minerals in clastic sediments. Some of the interpreted lithology did not match with the original wells site descriptions. Preliminary wireline log interpretation suggested that there was a possibility of having salt cemented clastic lithology. $[12]$

i. Shagara Formation $(51.8 - 986.8 \text{ m TVDss})$:

Shagara Formation was picked at sea bed depth which is 52mTVDss. Shagara Formation consists of marine sand/sandstone section intercalated with Claystone. The Dolomite, Anhydrite and Limestone were present as streak layers.

ii. Wardan Formation $(986.4m - 1410.8m$ TVDss):

Wardan Formation was picked at 986.4mTVDss based on the thickest Dolomite encountered. This is an indicative of different environment between Shagara and Wardan. Wardan Formation consists of Sandstone, Siltstone, Claystone, Dolomite and series of Anhydrite.

iii. Zeit Formation $(1410.8m - 2638.8m$ TVDss):

Preliminary Top of Zeit was picked at 1410.8m TVDss when the first thickest of evaporate (Anhydrite) was encountered in Talla-1 well. Generally Zeit formation consists of evaporites (Salt/Anhydrite), Sandstone, Siltstone and Shale.

iv. Dungunab Formation (2638.8m – 3336.8m TVDss):

Preliminary Top of Dungunab was picked when thick salt (~102m) was observed at 2638.8m TVDss. The Dungunab Formation is 648m thick consists of Salt and Anhydrite intercalated with Sandstone, Claystone and Siltstone.

| FORMATION | PROGNOSED DEPTH (m) | | ACTUAL DEPTH (m) | | DIF TVD |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| TOP | MDRT | TVDss | MDRT | TVDss | $(+Hi/- Lo)$ |
| Shagara | 78.2 | 49.0 | 81.0 | 51.8 | -2.8 |
| Wardan | 1067.2 | 1038.0 | 1016 | 986.8 | $+51.2$ |
| Zeit | 1869.2 | 1840.0 | 1440 | 1410.8 | $+429.2$ |
| Intra Zeit | 2251.2 | 2212.0 | 2050 | 2020.8 | -191.2 |
| Dungunab | 2460.2 | 2431.0 | 2668 | 2637.9 | -206.9 |
| Belayim | 2809.2 | 2780.0 | Not Firmed | | |
| TD | 3729.2 | 3700.0 | 3366 | 3336.8 | $+363.2$ |

Table (2.1): All the formation tops (Actual vs Prognosis) in Talla-1 are summarized as below table: [12]

Fig (2.4): Talla-1 Well Schematic^[12]

Chapter Three

Types of Pressures and Causes of Overpressure

Chapter Three

Types of Pressures and Causes of Overpressure

3.1 Types of Pressures:

The different formation pressures encountered in an area play a basic role both during exploration and exploitation of potential hydrocarbon resources reservoir. The different kinds of reservoir pressure which are usually encountered during the phase of drilling are broadly divided into three main components: [15]

- i. Hydrostatic pressure.
- ii. Overburden pressure.
- iii. Formation pressure.

3.1.1 Hydrostatic Pressure (Phyd):

It is defined as the pressure which is exerted by a column of water extending from a layer to a surface.

Hydrostatic pressure is caused by unit weight and vertical height of a fluid column.

The size and the shape of this fluid column have no effect on the magnitude of this pressure: [15]

…………………….………………. (3.1)

where: $P =$ hydrostatic pressure ρ = average density $g =$ gravity value $h =$ height of the column

The hydrostatic pressure gradient is affected by the concentration of dissolved solids and the gases in the fluid column at different or varying temperature gradients. An increase in the dissolved solids slightly increases the normal pressure gradient, while increasing amount of gases in solution and higher temperature would decrease the normal hydrostatic pressure gradient. [15]

3.1.2 Overburden Pressure (Po):

Overburden pressures are also sometimes called load, lithostatic or geostatic pressures. This pressure originates from the combined weight of the formation matrix (rock) and the fluids (water, oil, gas) in the pore space overlying the formation of interest.

$$
P_o = \frac{\text{weight} \left(\text{fluid} + \text{rock matrix} \right)}{\text{area}}
$$

but, weight of fluid = \rho V

$$
P_o = \frac{\rho_{fl} \phi (Ah) + \rho_{ma} (1 - \phi) (Ah)}{A}
$$

$$
P_o = h \left[\phi \rho_{fl} + (1 - \phi) \rho_{ma} \right] \quad \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \tag{3.2}
$$

Where:

- Po = Overburden Gradient.
- $h = Thickness.$
- \varnothing = Porosity.
- $\rho_{\rm fl}$ = Fluid Density.
- $\rho_{\text{ma}} =$ Matrix Density.

Sediment porosity decreases under the effect of compaction which proportional to the increase in overburden pressure. In the case of clays, this reduction is essentially dependent on the weight of the sediments. If clay porosity and depth are represented on arithmetical scales, the relationship between these two parameters is an exponential function. In sandstones and carbonates, this relationship is a function of many parameters other than compaction, such as diagnostic effects, sorting, and original composition. a decrease in porosity is necessarily accompanied by an increase in bulk density. ^[15]

The total of overburden pressure is supported by:

- i. Pore pressure.
- ii. Rock gain pressure.

i. Pore Pressure:

The pore pressure of a formation refers to that portion of the overburden pressure which is not supported by the rock matrix, but rather by the fluids or gases which exist in the pore spaces of the formation. $[15]$

Normal pore pressure is equal to the hydrostatic pressure of a water column from that depth to the surface. If for some reason communication between fluids contained at depth and surface fluids is interrupted, fluids will be unable to flow and normally equal the pressures within the system. Thus fluids become entrapped within the formation and, in the case of over pressured formation, the grain to grain pressure decreases as the fluids with the interstices effectively "floats" the overburden. If the pore pressure is less than normally hydrostatic pressure the formation said to be subnormally pressured. If the pore pressure at that depth exceeds the expected hydrostatic pressure for that depth the zone is termed abnormally pressured. [15]

ii. Rock Grain Pressure:

Rock grain pressure refers to a theoretical fraction of the overburden pressure which is supported by the rock matrix of the formation.

Since a rock mass is not homogeneous, pressures will not be exerted equally in all directions as is the case with fluids pressures. $[15]$

3.1.3 Formation Pressures (Pf):

 P_f is the pressure acting upon the fluids (water, oil, gas) in the pore space of the formation (pore pressure = formation fluids pressure). Expressed in psi, atmosphere or $kg\text{\textbackslash} \text{cm}^2$.

Normal formation pressure in any geologic setting will equal the hydrostatic top of water from the surface to the subsurface formation.

Normal hydrostatic reservoir pressures normally correspond to original reservoir pressures. Any deviation from the normal trend is called abnormal. [15]

3.2 Pressure Relations:

Fig (3.1): Pressure relation plotted with depth

Pressures could be differentiated from normal pressure as shown in Fig (3.1) into: [15]

- i. If $P_f > P_{hyd}$: abnormal pressure (surpressures/overpressures).
- ii. If $P_f < P_{hyd}$: subnormal pressure (sub pressures).

surpressures occurring more frequently than subpressure.

3.3 Causes of Overpressure:

Overpressures in sedimentary basins have been attributed to different mechanisms but the main ones are related to increase in stress and in-situ fluid generating mechanisms. The ability of each of these processes to generate overpressures depends on the rock and fluid properties of the sedimentary rocks and their rate of change under the normal range of basin conditions.^[7]

3.3.1 Primary Pressure Mechanisms:

Increase in stress during deposition of sediments, with the increase in vertical stress, the pore fluids escape as the pore spaces try to compact. If a layer of low permeability prevents the escape of pore fluids at rates sufficient to keep up with the rate of increase in vertical stress, the pore fluid begins to carry a large part of the load and pore-fluid pressure will increase. This process is referred to as undercompaction or compaction disequilibrium.

3.3.2 Secondary Pressure Mechanisms:

These mechanisms are also called unloading mechanisms because they tend to cause the in-situ pore pressure to increase at a fixed overburden, which results in a decrease in the effective stress on the matrix, hence the term unloading and it is include: $[7]$

i. Fluid Expansion Unloading Mechanisms:

Over pressure in the pore spaces of a formation can result by fluid expansion mechanisms as the rock matrix constrains the increased volume of the pore fluid. These include processes like heating, clay dehydration (Dutta, 1987), hydrocarbon maturation.

ii. Lateral Transfer:

When sediments under any given compaction condition has fluid injected into it from a more highly-pressured zone a fluid expansion occurs.

iii. Structural Uplift:

A very dangerous form of unloading occurs when sediments are uplifted by tectonic activity. Uplift of sediments alone will not cause unloading if the overburden load is not changed, but when the overburden is reduced during uplift either by syn-depositional tectonic processes or by erosion, the accompanying reduction in overburden results in

Chapter Three Types of Pressures and Causes of Overpressure

the original in-situ pore pressure being contained by a much lower overburden, which results in a reduction of the effective stress, and unloading. [7]

3.4 Hydrocarbon Gradient:

The presence of hydrocarbons in the pore fluid column will cause variations in the pore fluid gradients, and therefore in the magnitude of the pore pressure. [15]

3.5 Drilling problems associated with abnormal pressures:

When drilling through formation, sufficient hydrostatic mud density must be maintained to prevent: [15]

- i. The borehole collapsing.
- ii. The influx of formation fluids.

If the over balance is too great, this may lead to:

- i. Reduced penetration rates (due to cuttings hold down effect).
- ii. Lost circulation (flow of mud into formation).
- iii. Breakdown of formation (exceeding the fracture gradient).
- iv. Excessive differential pressure causing stuck pipe.

Chapter Four

Pore Pressure Prediction Methods

Chapter Four

Pore Pressure Prediction Methods

4.1. Indirect Pressure Measurements (Prediction Methods):

4.1.1 Ben Eaton Method:

Eaton Interval Velocity of seismic data;

The following observational mathematical statement was displayed by Eaton (1975) from Interval Velocity of seismic data for pore pressure prediction;

PP = OBG – [(OBG – Phyd) (V/Vn) ^ n] ……….…………… (4.1)

Where:

 $PP = P$ ore pressure.

OBG = Overburden gradient.

Phyd = Hydrostatic pressure (typically 0.45 psi/ft or 1.03 Mpa/km, reliant on the salinity of water).

 $Vn = Interval velocity at the normal trend.$

V= Interval velocity measured.

4.1.2 Eaton Resistivity:

Under compaction is the primary driver of overpressure in young sedimentary basins e.g North Sea, Gulf of Mexico. This approach is applied essentially for young sedimentary basins, where the normal shale resistivity is calculated correctly. Assuming that the normal shale resistivity is constant, is one methodology, accurate determination of the normal compaction trend line is an alternate method of determining pore pressure. [16]

Eaton (1972, 1975) gave the accompanying mathematical statement for pore pressure gradient prediction in shales utilizing resistivity log;

$$
PP = OBG - [(OBG - Phyd) (R/Rn)^{\wedge} n]
$$
................. (4.2)

Where:

 $Rn = Shale$ resistivity at ordinary (hydrostatic) pressure.

 $R = Shale$ resistivity acquired from well log.

 $n =$ an exponent which differs from 0.6 to 1.5, and normally $n = 1.2$

4.1.3 Bowers Method:

It represents a relationship between effective stress and velocity that could be utilized to associate seismic/sonic travel time to formation pore pressure. An input parameter maximum velocity depth, dmax, determines if unloading has happened or not utilizing this approach. Unloading has happened, If dmax is short of what the depth (Z) is the pore pressure can be gotten utilizing the equation: [16]

$$
PP = OBG - 1/c \ln [(Vm - Vml) / (Vm - Vp)]
$$
 (4.3)

Where:

Vm= sonic interim velocity in the shale matrix. (Vm = $14,000 - 16,000$ (ft/s))

 $Vp =$ the compressional velocity at a given depth.

 $c =$ experimental parameter that characterizes the rate of increase in velocity with effective stress (usually 0.00025).

 $dmax =$ the depth at which the unloading has happened.

OBG = overburden stress.

4.1.4 The D Exponent Methodology:

The method was proposed by Jordan and Shirley (1966) based on the bingham (1969) equation, which was developed to consider the differential pressure effect in normalizing penetration rate. [16]

The D exponent equation calculated from:

$$
D = [((\log(R/60*N)) / (\log(12W/10^{4}B))]^*(\rho_{normal}/\rho_{actual}) \dots \dots \dots \dots (4.4)
$$

Where:

 $D = D$ exponent.

 $R =$ Penetration rate (ft/h).

 $N = RPM$ (Revolutions per minute).

 $B = Bit diameter (in)$.

 $W = Weight on the bit.$

 p_{normal} = Normal Hydrostatic gradient (ppg).

 $p_{actual} =$ Current mud weight (ppg).

$$
PP = OBG - [OBG - Pn] * [D/Dn] \land b
$$
 (4.5)

Where:

 $P = P$ ore Pressure.

Pn = Normal pressure.

OBG = Overburden Pressure.

Dn = Normal trend of the D exponent.

4.1.5 Equivalent Depth Method:

The Equivalent depth approach is an example of the analysis utilizing trend line. A depth section is first assumed in this method where the pore pressure is hydrostatic, and the sediments are generally compacted due to the deliberate rise in effective stress with depth. Normal Compaction trends (NCTs) might be shown as straight lines fitted to the data over the ordinarily compacted interim after the log of a measured quality are plotted as a function of depth. Pore pressure at any depth where the measured value is not on the NCT (Normal compaction trend) could be calculated from the equation below as the value of the measured physical property is a distinct function of effective stress. [16]

Pb = Pd + (Sz – Sa) ………………………………. (4.6)

Where:

- PP_b = Pore pressure at b.
- PP_d = Pore pressure at d.

 S_b = Stress at b.

 S_d = Stress at d.

 $b =$ depth of interest.

 $d =$ depth along the normal compaction trend at which the measured parameter is the same as it is at the depth of interest Effective stress is a linear function of profundity, this is the main significant presumption needed when the equivalent depth system is utilized.

4.1.6 Ratio Method:

Here, pore pressure is computed based on the supposition that for resistivity, sonic delta-t, and density singly, the pore pressure is as a result of the norma l pressure increased (multiplied) or separated by the degree (ratio) of the measured value to the normal value for the same depth. $[16]$

$$
PP = P_{\text{hyd}} \Delta T_{\text{log}} / \Delta T n \dots \tag{4.7}
$$

PP = Phyd ρn / ρlog …………………………………………………. (4.8)

$$
PP = P_{\text{hyd}} Rn / R_{\text{log}}
$$
................. (4.9)

The subscripts n and log indicate the normal and measured values of resistivity, density, or sonic delta-t, P_{hyd} is the normal hydrostatic pore pressure and PP is the real pore pressure.

Calibration of this approach needs knowledge of the right typical value of every parameter. It is vital to perceive that in distinction of trend line systems, the ratio approach doesn't utilize effective stress or overburden explicitly thus is not an effective stress methodology. This can result in unphysical conditions, where the overburden is lower than the computed pore pressure.

4.1.7 Tau Method:

Shell proposed a pore pressure prediction technique that depends on velocity as it introduced a "Tau" variable in the mathematical statement of effective stress (Lopez et al., 2004; Gutierrez et al., 2006);

$$
Se = As^*T^*Bs
$$

Where:

As and $Bs =$ the fitting constants.

 $T =$ The Tau variable.

 $T = (C - Dt) / (Dt - D).$

 $Dt =$ the compressional travel time either from seismic velocity or sonic log.

 $C =$ the constant associated with the travel time (mudline) (typically $C = 200 \text{ ms/ft}$).

 $D =$ constant associated with the travel time (matrix) (normally $D = 50$ ms/ft).

The pore pressure can be computed from the equation below:

$$
P = OBG - As [(C - Dt) / (Dt - D)]
$$
 Bs ……………(4.11)

4.1.8 Field Method:

This is utilized for the most part when formation pressure is due to under compaction. The formation liquid underneath the boundary must support the rock matrix, formation liquids and overburden, in the event that it is assumed that compaction does not take place beneath the boundary depth. The pressure is computed as; $[16]$

$$
P = df (DB) + OVB (Di - DB) \dots
$$
 (4.12)

 $Di = depth of interest beneath the boundary, ft.$

 $DB = depth of boundary, ft.$

 $PP = pore pressure at Di, psi.$

df =density of formation liquid, psi/ft.

OVB = overburden stress gradient, psi

4.2. The Methodology

In this project the calculation will be based on Eaton Method. The Eaton method has been described as a "horizontal" pressure method because it compares an insitu physical property to a "normally-compacted" equivalent physical property at the same depth. This implies that the method is valid as long as the normal compaction trend can be constructed for all depths of interest. Before we use Equation (4.1), we need to prepare the following parameters:

4.2.1 Determination of OverburdenStress:

At a given depth, the overburden pressure is the pressure exerted by the cumulative weight of the overlying sediments. The cumulative weight of the overlying rocks is a function of the bulk density, the combined weight of matrix and formation fluids contained within the pore space.

Overburden Stress (OBG):

4.2.2 Determination of Bulk Density:

Bulk density is a function of the matrix density, porosity and pore fluid density, and can be determined from the following formula:

ρ^b = ∅ρ^f + (1−∅) ρ^m ………………………………………………. (4.15)

Where:

 ϕ = porosity.

 p_f = pore fluid density.

 ρ_m = matrix density.

Accurate determination of the overburden gradient is critical for accurate formation and fracture gradient calculations. Direct measurements of bulk density are preferable, so density values from wireline logs are extremely useful. However, this source of data is rarely available for an entire well interval. Finally, direct measurements from cuttings can be made while the well is being drilled.

4.2.3 Determination Hydrostatic Pressure:

Hydrostatic pressure is controlled by the density of the fluid saturating the formation. As the pore water becomes saline, or other dissolved solids are added, the hydrostatic pressure gradient will increase.

Phyd =
$$
0.052 * p * H
$$
 …………………(4.16)

4.2.4 The Interval Velocity and Normal trend:

The rock velocity required for pore pressure estimation is a fundamental property that mainly depends on the grains, pores and the fluid properties and their interaction as well as the extrinsic property such as formation pressure and temperature. However, the interval velocities have been used to predict the pore pressure which obtained from the below pre-stack time migration, fig (4.1) of the following information:

- i. Line: RSM07- 052,
- ii. Area: Red sea, Sudan Date Shot: 2007.
- iii. Sample interval: 4ms, samples/trace: 1750.
- iv. Source type: air gun gun depth 5m
- v. Record length: 8000ms.

Seismic velocities used during seismic processing are designed for accurate pore pressure prediction.

Interval velocities obtained from pre stack seismic data of common Depth point (CDP) gathers. A CDP gather is a collection of seismic traces for which the midpoint between the source and receiver for each Source / receiver pair in the gather lies at the same spatial location.

Interval velocities are derived from Dix's equation after picking the horizons in the semblance in the process of velocity analysis of pre stack time migrated (PSTM). The analysis showed an increase of interval velocity with depth, see figure (4.2). A normal trend of seismic interval velocities have been created and represented by a smooth curve. However lateral velocity variations resulting, for example, from dipping structures, lithology variations, salt layers of various thickness, fault blocks and variations in compaction and pore pressure cannot be accounted in the analysis.

Fig(4.1): 2D seismic line showing the layers penetrated by Talla-1 well.

 ${\rm Fig (4.2)}$: Interval Velocity increasing with depth is plotted and the normal trend of the velocity illustrated as the red curve.

Table (4.1): Values of parameters used to calculate pore pressure

4.3 The Results:

Pressure in psi

Fig(4.3): Pore Pressure Predicted using Eaton method plotted with depth

4.4 Discussion:

As shown in the results in Fig (4.3), a cross plot has been made between pressure predicted applying Eaton method using equation (4.1) with depth also a pressure values from drilling information was added to the plot to be compared with predicted values.

The required inputs have been added to excel and the output is in the last column of table (4.1) which is PP Eaton.

The prediction of pore pressure has been made at depths from 1590m to 2775m according to the available data of well logs at those depths.

Since the pressure at those depths increase smoothly there is no evidence of abnormal pressures could be encountered.

Chapter Five

Conclusion & Recommendation

Chapter Five

Conclusions & Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions:

- 1. Four of expected formations were penetrated in Talla-1. They were Shagara, Wardan, Zeit and Dungunab formations.
- 2. There are errors that can slip into the seismic data from different sources: geology, acquisition parameters and processing. From a geological perspective the problems can arise from salt, dipping beds, velocity lateral variation or thick homogeneous intervals that display no reflectivity.
- 3. The geological studies show that a salt layer was encountered at depth 2638.8m TVDss, which considered the trouble formation.
- 4. Because of the uncertainties in velocity estimation which increase with the geological complexity and depth. Therefore, the accuracy of values of pore pressure predicted is moderate but reasonable as it has been shown in the figure.
- 5. One can conclude that there is no evidence of abnormal pressure at the depths have been studied.

5.2 Recommendations:

- 1. We recommended using dense and accurate seismic velocities that are close to the formation velocities under consideration to predict pore pressure.
- 2. We recommended developing software for pressure prediction which is relatively limited to simplify the calculations.
- 3. We recommended doing more studies of pore pressures in the area studied.

References:

- 1. Bikas Kumar, Sri Niwas, Bikram K. Mangaraj, (2012). Pore Pressure Prediction from Well Logs and Seismic Data. Biennial International Conference & Exposition on Petroleum Geophysics. SPG Paper 005.
- 2. Chatterjee, Avirup, Mondal, Samit, Basu, Pramit, Patel, B.K., (2012). Pore Pressure Prediction Using Seismic Velocities for deep water High Temperature - High Pressure well in offshore Krishna Godavari Basin, India. SPE Oil and Gas India Conference and Exhibition. Paper SPE 153764.
- 3. Ekwo Ernest Uchechukwu M.Sc. Thesis. (2014). Pore Pressure Prediction: A Case Study of Sandstone Reservoir, Bredaasdorp Basin, South Africa.
- 4. G. Z. Ugwu, (2015). An overview of pore pressure prediction using seismically derived velocities. Journal of Geology and Mining Research. Vol. 7(4), pp. 31- 40.
- 5. <https://www.scribd.com/doc/57664091/17/Calculation-of-Overburden-Gradient>
- 6. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/57664091/Formation-Pressure-v2-1>
- 7. [http://csegrecorder.com/articles/view/velocity-determination-for-pore-pressure](http://csegrecorder.com/articles/view/velocity-determination-for-pore-pressure-prediction)[prediction](http://csegrecorder.com/articles/view/velocity-determination-for-pore-pressure-prediction)
- 8. Jwngsar Brahma, Anirbid Sircar, G. P. Karmakar, (2013). Pre-drill pore pressure prediction using seismic velocities data on flank and synclinal part of Atharamura anticline in the Eastern Tripura, India. Journal of Petroleum Exploration and Production Technologies Vol. 3(2).
- 9. Mohammed Salah M.Sc. Research, (2012). Interpretation of Gravity and Remote Sensing Data for Improved Geological Mapping North of Port Sudan Area.
- 10. Orapan Limpornpipat, Andrew Laird, Mark Tingay, Christopher K. Morley, Chaiwat Kaewla, Hamish Macintyre, (2011). Overpressures in the Northern Malay Basin: Part2 - Implication for Pore Pressure Prediction. IPTC SPE Paper 15350.
- 11. P. Avseth, T. Mukerji and G. Mavko, (2005) Quantitative Seismic Interpretation. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- 12. PETROServices ," TALLA-1 End of Well Report_Final", Sudan. October 2010.
- 13. PETROServices . "Talla-1 Final Pressure Data". Khartoum, Sudan. October 2010.
- 14. BPC processing center, Pre-stack time migration, Khartoum, Sudan. 2006.
- 15. [http://ocw.utm.my/file.php/61/To_upload_OCW_Formation_pressures.pdf.](http://ocw.utm.my/file.php/61/To_upload_OCW_Formation_pressures.pdf)
- 16. Jagadeesh Kilaparthi, 2013. The Implementation of a Pore Pressure and Fracture Gradient Prediction Model for the North Sea Centeral Judy and Jade Fields. Department of Geography, Environment and Society, Coventry University
- 17. Sayers, C.M., Johnson, G.M., Denyer, G., (2000). Predrill Pore Pressure Prediction Using Seismic Data. SPE Drilling Conference - New Orleans, Louisiana. Paper SPE 59122.
- 18. Wawan A. Behaki, Aldyth Sukapradja, Ronald C. Siregar, Radig Wisnu Y., Setiabundi Djaelani, Benny A. Sjafwan, (2012). 3D Pore Pressure Prediction Model in Bentu Block – Central Sumatra Basin. AAPG International Convention and Exhibition, Singapore. Article 41105.
- 19. Yully P. Solano, Rodolfo Uribe, Marcelo Frydman, Nestor F. Saavedra, Zuly H. Calderon, (2007). A modified Approach to Predict Pore Pressure Using the DExponent Method: An Example from The Carbonera Formation, Colombia.