

# Sleipner Case Study: Static modeling (PETREL software)



#### Charalampous, G.<sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup>, Fragkou, E. <sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup>, Makri, V. <sup>1</sup><sup>3</sup>, Tallarou, C. <sup>1</sup><sup>3</sup>, Telemenis, D. <sup>1</sup><sup>3</sup>, Lerat, O.<sup>4</sup>

- 1. Institute of GeoEnergy, Foundation for Research and Technology (FORTH/IG), Chania, Greece
- 2. School of Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Greece
- 3. School of Mineral Resources Engineering, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Greece
- 4. IFP Energies Nouvelles, Paris, France

# OBJECTIVES

- Identify main elements, from data to properties
- Describe the workflow for building a static model
- Parameters controlling the main methods for 3D properties distribution
- Upscaled 3D geo-model for fluid flow simulation

## METHODOLOGY





• Reservoir range (X-Y-Z: 100-400~0.2km)

TESTS





Little differences were shown on the variogram tests
Larger model ranges kept → more wells included

4

4

#### RESERVOIR UPSCALING



### DISCUSSION

Shale layers within reservoir (heterogeneities)
Smaller grid → better retaining heterogeneities
Small differences in variogram ranges → larger grid ranges kept
Major variogram direction W-E (~2xN-S) – more wells present

- Heterogeneities are retained by structure upscaling
  Perforations in sand intervals
- Overburden seal considered 100%shale for fluid flow

