

Impact of Velocity Field on AVA Analysis




Figure 1: Angle information obtained using (a) seismic, (b) well-driven velocity, overlain on two offset-gathers. A segment of the velocity field around the location of the gathers is also shown for both cases. Not only does the well-driven velocity field look more meaningful in terms of being horizon constrained and its correlation with individual intervals, the angle information derived from seismic velocities is higher in magnitude than that derived from the well-driven velocities, as can be checked at the location of the white block arrows. An opposite trend is noticed at the location of the yellow arrow, which represents the zone of interest. In (a) the white arrow is well into the cyan color, and in (b) it is at the end of red color. Figure 2: An arbitrary line passing through different wells extracted from the AVO gradient volume generated when (a) seismic velocity, (b) well-driven velocity was used in the analysis. The seismic data are from central Alberta, Canada. Data courtesy of TGS, Canada.

Amplitude variation with offset or angle (AVO or AVA) has been widely used for discriminating hydrocarbons from brine-saturated rocks. Such analyses are based on Zoeppritz equations that describe the partitioning of energy at a rock interface into reflected and refracted energy components. These equations are complicated and, to get an intuitive understanding of their capabilities and limitations, various investigators and researchers have provided approximations by adopting some simplifying assumptions.

One of the earliest linear approximations to the Zoeppritz equations was provided by Shuey for angles of incidence (θ) up to 30 degrees and is given as $R(\theta) = A + B\sin^2\theta$, wherein the first term A , is called the zero-offset reflectivity or intercept stack and is a function of only P-wave velocity and density.

The second term B referred to as the gradient stack, has a dependence on P-wave velocity, S-wave velocity and density,

and thus has an appreciable influence on the seismic amplitude as a function of offset or angle. The changes noticed in the gradient stack could be indicative of the fluid content or lithology.

In actual practice, NMO-corrected prestack seismic data are conditioned for enhancing the signal-to-noise ratio and thereafter put through amplitude-variation-with-angle (AVA) analysis. As all mathematical formulation for AVA analysis is carried out in the angle of incidence domain, a significant step in the AVA workflow is to transform conditioned NMO-corrected seismic offset gathers to angle gathers. There are two options for doing this. One is to make use of the seismic velocity field obtained from processing



CHOPRA



SHARMA

the seismic data, and the other is the well-driven velocity field generated using the sonic log curves. Generally, seismic stacking velocities exhibit an increasing velocity trend, which is quite evident when overlaid on the offset

gathers for quality control purposes, as shown in figure 1a. Even when they do show variation at strong impedance-contrast geologic markers, the vertical and lateral variations may not be smooth. Segments of sections from the seismic as well as well-driven interval field are also shown in figure 1a and b, with a sonic log curve (filtered to seismic bandwidth) overlaid on them. Notice the variation in velocity on the seismic interval velocity section, both laterally and vertically is not smooth, even

though no significant geologic changes are expected. The well-driven velocity field looks more reasonable in terms of interval consistency and correlation, and so appears to be more authentic. Such a more realistic interval velocity field, when used in the AVA analysis, exhibits significant differences in the gradient attribute. Besides, the angle range computation may be different in the two cases as indicated with the two white block arrows in figure 1a and b.

Seismic Velocity Field versus Well-driven Velocity Field Computations

As stated above, intercept and gradient attributes can be computed using Shuey's approximation to Zoeppritz equations. As the intercept attribute is a function of just the impedance contrast at zero offset, no appreciable differences are seen on the

See [GeoCorner](#) page 23 ►




Figure 3: (a) Crossplot of AVA intercept versus gradient over the zone of interest when (a) seismic velocity, (b) well-driven velocity was used in the analysis. (c) When anomalous points on the crossplot are enclosed in a red polygon in (b) and back projected on the seismic section, they highlight the Duvernay zone, which is the source rock. Data courtesy of TGS, Canada.



Jorge Navarro Comet is currently vice president of the AAPG-affiliated Association of Spanish Petroleum Geologists and Geophysicists (AGGEP). He is geology manager in CEPSA where he is responsible for coordination, management and supervision of the petroleum geology studies and works in regions where CEPSA is currently active: South America, North/East Africa, Middle East, South East Asia and Spain. He is also an active member of different professional associations of petroleum geoscientists such as AAPG, EAGE, PESGB and AGGEP.

water completions of Montanazo and Lubina, both brought on stream in late 2012. Since the mid-1990s, Casablanca's production appears to be exhausted and close to an end, but the incorporation of new production, together with the recent facilities upgrades to meet the highest safety and environmental standards, including the development of the world's first safety system for early leak detection in offshore operations, has steadily extended the Casablanca platform's life since it was commissioned back in 1981. Additionally, the renewal of the exploitation license in December 2018 for 10 more years will make Casablanca reach a total of 50 years of production. Thus, it appears that we will still have Casablanca for a while! [E](#)

Historical Highlights is an ongoing EXPLORER series that celebrates the "eureka" moments of petroleum geology, the rise of key concepts, the discoveries that made a difference, the perseverance and ingenuity of our colleagues – and/or their luck! – through stories that emphasize the anecdotes, the good yarns and the human interest side of our E&P profession. If you have such a story – and who doesn't? – and you'd like to share it with your fellow AAPG Members, contact Matthew Silverman at silverman_matthew@yahoo.com.

◀ Continued from previous page

some 900 barrels of oil and 35,000 barrels of water from four active wells. The Casablanca platform also gathers, treats and exports the production coming from satellite fields such as Rodaballo, Boquerón, Chipirón, all named after local fish, and the tie-back of the deeper




Figure 4: (a) AVO modeled elastic gather for a well that traverses the Duvernay formation of interest, (b) crossplot of intercept versus gradient attributes for the modeled gather. Notice, the outlier points (indicated with the red block arrow) resemble the points enclosed in the red ellipse in Figure 3b.

GeoCorner
from page 19

intercept sections. However, as the gradient attribute is a function of the P-wave velocity, S-wave velocity and density, which in turn are a function of the various rock-fluid properties, significant differences may be seen between the gradient attribute computed using the seismic velocity field and the well-driven velocity field. In figure 2a and b we exhibit such a comparison, for data from central Alberta, Canada.

The interpretation of the intercept and gradient attributes is usually carried out by judiciously selecting the data covering the zone of interest from the two attributes and displaying them in crossplot space. While the background lithologies plot along a linear trend along a diagonal, the hydrocarbon bearing facies form a cluster separated from the background trend. Such interpretation follows the premise that data that are statistically anomalous are geologically interesting.

In figure 3 we show a comparison of crossplots between the intercept and gradient attributes, when the seismic velocity field (figure 3a) and when the well-driven velocity field are used (figure 3b). The data cluster points are colored with time. Notice that the cluster points in figure 3a fall more or less along a single trend that we understand would be the background lithology trend. In figure 3b however, in addition to the background trend, we also see some deviation of cluster points that can be picked up for further interpretation.

As an attempt to do this, we enclose a set of cluster points within a red polygon and back project them on an arbitrary vertical section as shown in figure 3c. We notice these points highlight the zone that is suspected to be the Duvernay source rock.

For confirming that it is actually so, we generated the intercept and gradient attributes on a modeled AVO elastic gather for one well, and crossplotted them as shown in figure 4. There is a striking resemblance in the points enclosed in the red ellipse in figure 3b and the outlier points coming from the Duvernay zone in the crossplot of the intercept and gradient attributes of the modeled gather in figure 4b. This lends strong support to our interpretation.

Conclusion

The use of an accurate velocity field in AVA analysis can yield amplitude variations on the gradient attribute that are easily interpretable. In the example cited, the interpretation in intercept versus gradient crossplot space showed cluster points corresponding to the Duvernay source rock and thus is interesting.

(Acknowledgement: The well data used in this work was obtained from the TGS Well Log Data Library.)

(Editors Note: The Geophysical Corner is a regular column in the EXPLORER, edited by Satinder Chopra, chief geophysicist for TGS, Calgary, Canada, and a past AAPG-SEG Joint Distinguished Lecturer.)

Call For Papers

48th ANNUAL MEETING - AAPG EASTERN SECTION

THE OHIO GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY PRESENTS

ENERGY FROM THE HEARTLAND

DoubleTree Hotel, Columbus - Worthington, Ohio

OCTOBER 12-16, 2019 COLUMBUS, OHIO




You are invited to submit an abstract for oral or poster presentation at the 2019 AAPG Eastern Section Annual Meeting. All topics of interest to the Eastern Section, the Division of Environmental Geosciences, Energy Minerals Division, Division of Professional Affairs, and Petroleum Structure and Geomechanics Division will be considered for presentation. Abstract submission deadline: **April 19, 2019**. Submit at website below.


Proposed Theme Sessions

- Applied Geophysics, Petrophysics, and Data Analytics - Basins to Pores
- Utilizing Technology in Modern Exploration & Production
- Recent Advances and Case Studies in the Recovery of Oil and Gas
- Hydrocarbon Exploration and Development from Unconventional Reservoirs
- Horizontal Wells: Design, Drilling, Completion, Hydraulic Fracturing, & Production Techniques
- Reservoir Characterization, Case Studies/Histories
- Energy Sustainability and the Environment
- Historical Perspectives on Energy Development in the Eastern USA
- Conventional Petroleum Exploration & Production in the Eastern USA
- Current Status and Future Prospects for Non-hydrocarbon Based Energy
- Case Studies & Current Research on Environmental Impacts from Hydraulic Fracturing, Wastewater Disposal, and Minerals Extraction

Technical Program Chair: John L. Wicks
Meeting Website: <https://www.esaapg.org/meetings>



16 April 2019 | Pittsburgh, PA



URTeC IS COMING TO A CITY NEAR YOU

Register Now for the URTeC Workshop in Pittsburgh, PA This April

Maximizing the Marcellus, Unlocking the Utica

URTeC is coming to Pittsburgh for a one-day workshop in the heart of the Appalachian Basin. While operators are still pushing the boundaries of the Utica play, the Marcellus is firmly established and optimization is the name of the game. This multi-disciplinary event will cover a broad range of topics from geologic characterization, inter-lateral spacing, proppant and perforation designs, and production best practices. Come hear from industry and academic professionals, make new connections, and learn current best practices to maximize your production.

Check out some of these program highlights:

- Horizontal Targeting Strategies and Challenges: Examples from the Marcellus Shale, Appalachian Basin, USA
- Far-Field Tectonic Controls on Deposition of the Ordovician Utica/Point Pleasant Play, Ohio Using Core Logging, Well Logging, and Multi-Variate Analysis
- Marcellus Shale Energy and Environment Laboratory Results: Improved Subsurface Reservoir Characterization And Engineered Completions
- Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy: An Emerging Spectroscopic Technique For Shale Rock Characterization
- Facies, Depositional Environments, Chemostratigraphy, and Reservoir Quality of the Middle Devonian Marcellus Formation, Appalachian Basin, Northeastern Pennsylvania

Topical Luncheon featuring **Shawn Bennett, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oil and Natural Gas** is included with registration to the workshop.



To view the program and register now, please visit: URTeC.org/pittsburgh2019