Ryder Scott Company Reserves Conference
May 6, 2005

"Reservoir Simulation Models and Their Use in The Estimation of Reserves"

Dean C. Rietz, P.E.

This Discussion is based on:

“The Adaptation of Reservoir Simulation Models for Use in Reserves Certification under Regulatory Guidelines or Reserves Definitions”

SPE 71430

(Palke & Rietz)

Caveats

- Defense of simulation results before regulatory bodies is somewhat “untested”
- Overlying theme is consistent with SEC guidelines- *Reasonable Certainty* – Revisions should be much more likely to be upward rather than downward

Introduction

- Regardless of the evaluation methods used, any estimate of future recovery, does not necessarily qualify as an estimate of reserves.
- Aside from economic viability, specific criteria must be met to qualify estimated recoverable volumes as reserves.
- These criteria are generally defined in the form of “Reserves Definitions”.

Prevalence of Reservoir Simulation

- A numerical model that is expected to behave like a particular oil or gas reservoir.
- After the history match is achieved, the model can be “run” to predict future performance.
- Simulation continues to become a more widely used tool.
- Simulation has also been increasingly promoted as a means to estimate reserves.

Limitations of Simulation

- Parameters uniform within grid blocks (possibly very large).
- Average block properties not accurately known.
- Undetected structural features may not be in a model.
- Geological Inaccuracies may be present
- Generally very data intensive.

Where Do Simulation and Reserves Estimation Overlap?



Reference to Simulation with Reserves

SEC and Reservoir Simulation

http://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/guidance/cfactfaq.htm

Division of Corporation Finance:
Frequently Requested
Accounting and Financial Reporting
Interpretations and Guidance

Prepared by Accounting Staff Members
in the Division of Corporation Finance
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C.

March 31, 2001

II. Guidance About Disclosures

F. Issues in the Extractive Industries

3. Definition of Proved Reserves

In a new reservoir with only a few wells, reservoir simulation or application of generalized hydrocarbon recovery correlations would not be considered a reliable method to show increased proved undeveloped reserves. **With only a few wells as data points from which to build a geologic model and little performance history to validate the results with an acceptable history match, the results of a simulation or material balance model would be speculative in nature.** The results of such a simulation or material balance model would not be considered to be reasonably certain to occur in the field to the extent that additional proved undeveloped reserves could be recognized. The application of recovery correlations which are not specific to the field under consideration is not reliable enough to be the sole source for proved reserve calculations.

SPE/WPC and Reservoir Simulation

??

In a new reservoir with only a few wells, reservoir simulation or application of generalized hydrocarbon recovery correlations would not be considered a reliable method to show increased proved undeveloped reserves. **With only a few wells as data points from which to build a geologic model and little performance history to validate the results with an acceptable history match, the results of a simulation or material balance model would be speculative in nature.** The results of such a simulation or material balance model would not be considered to be reasonably certain to occur in the field to the extent that additional proved undeveloped reserves could be recognized. The application of recovery correlations which are not specific to the field under consideration is not reliable enough to be the sole source for proved reserve calculations.

II. Guidance About Disclosures

March 31, 2001

F. Issues in the Extractive Industries

3. Definition of Proved Reserves

In a new reservoir with only a few wells, reservoir simulation or application of generalized hydrocarbon recovery correlations would not be considered a reliable method to show increased proved undeveloped reserves. **With only a few wells as data points from which to build a geologic model and little performance history to validate the results with an acceptable history match, the results of a simulation or material balance model would be speculative in nature.** The results of such a simulation or material balance model would not be considered to be reasonably certain to occur in the field to the extent that additional proved undeveloped reserves could be recognized. The application of recovery correlations which are not specific to the field under consideration is not reliable enough to be the sole source for proved reserve calculations.

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves

- The presumed “most likely” scenario is most commonly modeled with the reservoir simulator.
- Due to the specific regulatory definitions of proved reserves, “most likely” is a level of recoverable volumes that is more consistent with proved + probable reserves, rather than proved alone.
- Therefore, it is very common that results from a simulation model cannot be directly applied to the proved reserves category, even if they are passed through a cashflow analysis to prove economic viability.

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves

- It is not just original hydrocarbon in place that may not fit the definition of proved reserves.
- Models may include pressure support from aquifers or rock compressibility that are not “proved”.
- Numerous other parameters would also fall into this category.
- The key is to search for sources of reservoir drive energy that may increase recoveries beyond what would be considered proved.

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves

- Two approaches.
  - 1 - Modify so model complies with reserves definitions.
  - 2 - Modify the simulation results.

Assuming the model and the forecasts are valid

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves Method 1 – Modify Model

- Consider the case of a reservoir for which the level of the hydrocarbon-water contact has not been established from the lowest logged hydrocarbons, but from seismic flat spot or MDT determined pressure gradient level. In this situation, the hydrocarbon-water contact in the model should be (changed to) set at the lowest observed occurrence of hydrocarbons (lowest logged hydrocarbon).
- As long as the other components of the definition are also honored, the results generated from this model could be utilized in the estimation of proved reserves.
- "Good history match" is implied (will discuss later).

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves Method 1 - Modify Model

- Potentially difficult.
- Modify description / grid.
- Modify the planned wells and facilities.
- In addition to the question of constraints, substantial modifications to the original grid/description could also be required.
  - Models derived from seismic data often feature thickening between wells based on reasonable interpretation of the data. This thickening may or may not be permitted under the reserves definitions.

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves Method 2 - Modify the Results

- Appropriate modifications of the simulator results.
- Some of the rigorous nature of the simulation is lost.

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves Method 2 - Modify the Results



	ROPR 1	ROPR 2	ROPR 3	ROPR 4
DATE	STB/D	STB/D	STB/D	STB/D
1-Jan-02	1,000	0	1,500	0
1-Feb-02	970	0	1,455	0
1-Mar-02	941	0	1,411	0
1-Apr-02	913	750	1,369	2,000
1-May-02	885	728	1,328	1,940
1-Jun-02	859	706	1,288	1,882
1-Jul-02	833	685	1,249	1,825
1-Aug-02	808	664	1,212	1,771
1-Sep-02	784	644	1,176	1,717
1-Oct-02	760	625	1,140	1,666
1-Nov-02	737	606	1,106	1,616
1-Dec-02	715	588	1,073	1,567
1-Jan-03	694	570	1,041	1,520

Proved Stream

Probable Stream

Applying Simulation Results to Estimate Proved Reserves Method 2

- The solution was to separate the production streams from the various sands.
- Production streams from sands that did not qualify as proved were eliminated.
- While this approach is not terribly rigorous, it at least relies upon rate forecasts and recovery factors predicted by a well constructed model.
- This approach treats the simulated reservoirs as analogies to the actual reservoirs in terms of initial rate and recovery factor.
- This approach may meet all of the requirements of proved reserves estimation.
- The original model, although well constructed, did not.

Immature Reservoirs

- Description relies primarily on geophysical and geological data to set reservoir parameters.
- A “history match” of the model to the reservoir is easy to obtain since there are few if any performance points to be matched.
- Because it is so easy to obtain, however, the match is not very meaningful in terms of calibrating and improving the reliability of the model.

Immature Reservoirs

- “Most likely” hydrocarbons in-place generally not proved.
- Unlikely to be acceptable for proved reserves estimation.
- Models helpful in estimating hydrocarbon recovery efficiency ranges (with compliant proved recovery on the low end of the range)

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching

- History match is usually difficult to obtain.
  - Is more meaningful in terms of enhancing model reliability.

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching

- History match is important.
- Should result from logical adjustments.
- Consistent with geological and engineering evidence.
- Uncertain parameters / Sensitivity studies

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching

- History matching is generally a somewhat subjective process.
- It is unlikely that any two engineers would arrive at the exact same solution.
- It is normal that certain parameters that may have a limited impact upon the history match would have a dramatic impact upon the predictions from the same model.
  - Aquifer dimensions
  - Original hydrocarbon in-place!
- Recommend that any parameters suspected of falling into this category be tested through the use of sensitivity studies.

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching

- Consistent with traditional techniques, well established performance may override volumetric guidelines.
- Imperative that reasonable assumptions be made.

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching (Appropriateness)

- It is also important to recognize situations where the physical processes governing reservoir behavior are expected to be different in the future than they have been in the past, and to adjust expectations for the model accordingly.
  - Solution gas drive during history but model used to predict waterflood performance.
  - History match includes only vertical wells but predictions contain horizontal wells.
  - Observations from analog or nearby fields or laboratory test data could be incorporated into the model to improve the confidence when forecasting under different depletion mechanisms.

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching (Appropriateness)

- As a final check, the evaluator should verify that the transition from historical to predicted production is smooth if the model is run as a status quo, or “do nothing” case.
- An abrupt change at the end of history is indicative of an inappropriate model, even if the history match appears to be reasonable in all other respects.

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching (Appropriateness)

- How much data is enough for a good history match or what defines maturity?

- Here is an example of a good History Match but there still exists geological uncertainty


Historical Field Gas Production Rate
(2 wells)
Predicted Rate (Infinite Aquifer)
Historical Rate
Predicted Rate (Finite Aquifer)
100000
10000
1000
100
Mscf/Day
History Match - Gas Rate
01-Aug-01
01-Nov-01
01-Feb-02
01-May-02
01-Aug-02
01-Nov-02
01-Feb-03
01-May-03
01-Aug-03
01-Nov-03
01-Feb-04
Date


Historical Reservoir Pressure
Predicted Pressure (Infinite Aquifer)
Historical Pressure
Predicted Pressure (Finite Aquifer)
Reservoir Pressure Match
PSIA
12000
11500
11000
10500
10000
9500
9000
8500
8000
01-Aug-01
01-Nov-01
01-Feb-02
01-May-02
01-Aug-02
01-Nov-02
01-Feb-03
01-May-03
01-Aug-03
01-Nov-03
01-Feb-04
Date


Starsky Historical Well Tubing Pressure
Predicted Pressure (Infinite Aquifer)
Historical Pressure
Predicted Pressure (Finite Aquifer)
Tubing-Head Pressure Match
PSIA
Date
12000
10000
8000
6000
4000
2000
01-Aug-01
01-Nov-01
01-Feb-02
01-May-02
01-Aug-02
01-Nov-02
01-Feb-03
01-May-03
01-Aug-03
01-Nov-03
01-Feb-04


Hutch Historical Well Tubing Pressure
Predicted Pressure (Infinite Aquifer)
Historical Pressure
Predicted Pressure (Finite Aquifer)
Tubing-Head Pressure Match
PSIA
Date
12000
10000
8000
6000
4000
2000
01-Aug-01
01-Nov-01
01-Feb-02
01-May-02
01-Aug-02
01-Nov-02
01-Feb-03
01-May-03
01-Aug-03
01-Nov-03
01-Feb-04

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching (Appropriateness)

- How much confidence should be placed in this Model?

Mature Reservoirs & History Matching (Appropriateness)

- Hint: How well do we know the geology?


Prediction Field Gas Production Rate
Predicted Rate (Infinite Aquifer)
Historical Rate
Predicted Rate (Finite Aquifer)
100000
10000
1000
100
Mscf/Day
01-Jan-00
01-Jan-05
01-Jan-10
01-Jan-15
Date
R.F. 89%
R.F. 60%
Model Forecasts

Conclusions

- **Analogy**
- Must follow Reserves Definitions
- Models typically capture “most likely” description
- Models can be modified to comply with the definitions
- May alter the simulation output
- Immature reservoirs - hydrocarbon recovery efficiency
- **Sensitivity Studies** for Uncertain Parameters
- **Reasonable history matches**
- Status Quo Cases

Conclusions
Analogy

- *In general, simulation results should be treated as if they are actual results from an analog field.*
- *If the simulation model is very detailed, properly constructed, and well history matched, then the model can be treated as a nearly perfect analog.*
- *It is our conclusion that when incorporating simulation modeling results into reserves estimation, the model should be treated as additional data, rather than the sole source of data.*

Conclusions
Sensitivity Studies

- *Some parameters will be uncertain, even in a history matched model. These parameters may strongly influence the prediction mode results. The impact of uncertain parameter should be studied through the use of sensitivity runs.*
  - *How would you incorporate this in reserves?*
  - *Use lower end of the range, much like a probabilistic program*

Conclusions
Reasonable History Matches

- *Models of mature reservoirs should feature reasonable history matches before they are accepted for reserves purposes. The uniqueness and the quality of the history match affect the confidence to be placed in a model's ability to predict future performance, and thus dictate the model's appropriate usage in the process of estimating reserves.*

Closing Thoughts

- The reliability of the results from a model is strongly dependent on the ***understanding of the geology*** and the confidence in all of the parameters used to construct the model.
  - What is needed?
    - Reasonable Assumptions
    - Good History Match
    - Good/Reasonable Forecast
    - Sensitivity Cases
  - Documentation/Supporting Information

Final Remarks

- Defense of simulation results before regulatory bodies is somewhat “untested”
- Don’t expect to use models directly for proved reserves
- If you want to use models, provide significant supporting information
- Think of model as an analogy
- Reasonable Certainty – Revisions should be much more likely to be upward rather than downward

Questions & Comments?

dean_rietz@ryderscott.com