

SCALING BEHAVIOUR OF THE TRANSMISSION RESPONSE OF RESERVOIR ROCK: MEASUREMENTS, THEORY AND NUMERICAL SIMULATION

ENRIQUE DIEGO MERCERAT¹, KEES WAPENAAR², JACOB FOKKEMA², GERD SWINNEN² and MENNO DILLEN²

¹Applied Geophysics Division, International Institute for Aerospace Survey and Earth Sciences, ITC, Delft, The Netherlands

²Section of Applied Geophysics, Centre for Technical Geoscience, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Introduction

A couple of years ago, ultrasonic transmission measurements have been carried out on Rotliegend reservoir sandstone samples (Den Boer, Dillen, Duijndam and Fokkema, 1996, EAGE; Swinnen, 1997, M.Sc. thesis, Leuven / Delft). The experiments were carried out for a range of different ambient pressures. Figure 1 shows the transmission responses for pressures ranging from 2 MPa (the latest arrival) to 20 MPa (the first arrival). It appeared that not only the arrival time reduces when the ambient pressure increases, but that the width of the wavelet reduces by approximately the same relative amount. In other words, the time-axis seems to be scaled by a single factor when the ambient pressure is changed from one value to another. Also the amplitude changes with changing pressure. It has been carefully checked that these time and amplitude changes are not source effects, but that it is the propagation through the sandstone that changes with changing pressure. The aim of this paper is to give a possible theoretical explanation for the observed scaling of the time axis, and to present a numerical test of the proposed scaling model.




Figure 1: *Transmission responses of Rotliegend reservoir sandstone for varying ambient pressure.*

The binary layered medium approach

We start by making a strong simplification, that is, we assume that the sandstone is horizontally layered. Although this is not very realistic, it is a suitable starting point for studying the scaling behaviour analytically. The second assumption is that the layered medium consists of only two types of material (hence the name binary layered medium); the layer thicknesses are in some way randomly distributed. The third assumption is that changes in the ambient pressure do not affect the layer thicknesses, but only the material parameters. With these assumptions the depth-dependent normal-incidence plane-wave reflectivity $r(z)$ obeys the following scaling relation

$$r_B(z) = \alpha r_A(z), \quad (1)$$

where the subscripts A and B refer to two different ambient pressure states. When the material parameters of both layer types react similarly (in a relative sense) to changes in the ambient pressure then $\alpha = 1$; when they react differently then $\alpha \neq 1$. The average slowness \bar{s} of the material obeys the following relation

$$\bar{s}_B = \beta \bar{s}_A. \quad (2)$$

It is beyond the scope of this paper to specify the scaling factors α and β and their mutual relation. For our analysis it is sufficient to assume that relations (1) and (2) hold for some value of α and β . In the following section we will evaluate the scaling behaviour of the transmission response of binary layered media analytically.

Scaling behaviour of the transmission response

The normal-incidence plane-wave transmission response of a layered medium can be expressed in the frequency domain in terms of a ‘generalized primary’ propagator $\mathcal{W}(z_1, z_0, \omega)$, according to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(z_1, z_0, \omega) &= \mathcal{P}(z_1, z_0, \omega) \mathcal{M}(z_1, z_0, \omega) \\ &= \exp\{-j\omega \bar{s} \Delta z\} \exp\{-\mathcal{A}(2\omega \bar{s}) \Delta z\}, \quad \Delta z = z_1 - z_0, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the first exponential describes the (flux-normalized) primary propagation from depth level z_0 to z_1 and the second exponential accounts for the internal multiples generated between those two depth levels. The function \mathcal{A} is the Fourier transform of the ‘causal part’ of $\mathcal{S}(z)$, according to

$$\mathcal{A}(k) = \int_0^\infty \exp\{-jkz\} \mathcal{S}(z) dz, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{S}(z)$ is the autocorrelation of the reflection function $r(z)$. Note that equation (3) is the well-known O’Doherty-Anstey relation, except that $\mathcal{A}(k)$ in equation (4) is expressed in terms of a spatial rather than a temporal autocorrelation function. The depth-time conversion takes place in equation (3), where $\mathcal{A}(k)$ is evaluated at $k = 2\omega \bar{s}$. Assuming $r(z)$ obeys equation (1), $\mathcal{A}(k)$ has the following scaling behaviour

$$\mathcal{A}_B(k) = \alpha^2 \mathcal{A}_A(k), \quad (5)$$

where the subscripts A and B refer again to two different ambient pressure states. For these two pressure states the generalized primary propagators read

$$\mathcal{W}_A(z_1, z_0, \omega) = \mathcal{P}_A(z_1, z_0, \omega) \mathcal{M}_A(z_1, z_0, \omega) = \exp\{-j\omega \bar{s}_A \Delta z\} \exp\{-\mathcal{A}_A(2\omega \bar{s}_A) \Delta z\} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_B(z_1, z_0, \omega) = \mathcal{P}_B(z_1, z_0, \omega) \mathcal{M}_B(z_1, z_0, \omega) = \exp\{-j\omega \bar{s}_B \Delta z\} \exp\{-\mathcal{A}_B(2\omega \bar{s}_B) \Delta z\} \quad (7)$$

or, using equations (2) and (5),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_B(z_1, z_0, \omega) &= \exp\{-j\beta\omega \bar{s}_A \Delta z\} \exp\{-\alpha^2 \mathcal{A}_A(2\beta\omega \bar{s}_A) \Delta z\} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_A(z_1, z_0, \beta\omega) [\mathcal{M}_A(z_1, z_0, \beta\omega)]^{\alpha^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Numerical experiments

In order to test the previous quantification of the scaling behaviour (equation (8)), we have performed numerical simulations for the transmission response through a binary layered medium. The proposed sandstone model consists of a stack of horizontal acoustic layers with just two alternating velocities, and the thickness of each bed is a random variable following an exponential distribution with mean d . The density is considered constant for both material types. The assumption is that as the ambient pressure increases one of the material changes its velocity while the other remains fixed. Thus the reflectivity and the average slowness change according to equations (1) and (2).

The total transmission response is calculated by means of forward modelling of the acoustic wave equation in the frequency domain, considering a plane-wave incident from the top and calculating the plane-wave transmitted to the bottom of the stack of horizontal parallel layers. After calculating the transmission impulse response, convolution with Ricker wavelets is carried out.

In Figure 2, transmitted zero-phase Ricker wavelets through a binary layered medium are shown. The fastest trace corresponds to the smallest impedance contrast and average slowness. The later arrivals are calculated fixing one velocity and decreasing the other, that is increasing the impedance contrast and the average slowness of the models. Note the similar scaling behaviour observed in the experimental data for different ambient pressures (Figure 1).




Figure 2: *Transmission responses (convolved with Ricker wavelet) for varying impedance contrast.*

The first and third arrivals in Figure 2 are used to check equation (8). The corresponding model parameters are shown in Table 1.

	Total path	Mean thickness (d)	No layers	Velocity 1	Velocity 2
Model A	20 cm	0.3 mm	649	3500 m/s	3200 m/s
Model B					3000 m/s

Table 1: *Model parameters*

From the model velocities and using equations (1) and (2), it is possible to calculate the scaling parameters $\alpha = 1.718$ and $\beta = 1.035$. They are used to scale the transmission response from model A to model B. The direct path delay is subtracted from both responses according to the corresponding time delay for each model. Thus equation (8) simplifies to

$$\mathcal{M}_B(z_1, z_0, \omega) = [\mathcal{M}_A(z_1, z_0, \beta\omega)]^{\alpha^2}. \quad (9)$$

The results are shown in Figures 3 and 4 both in the time and in the frequency domain.

Discussion and conclusions

Equation (8) quantifies the scaling behaviour of the transmission response. Note that in both terms at the right-hand side the frequency is scaled with the same factor β . This agrees with our earlier observation that the arrival time and the width of the wavelet scale by approximately the same




Figure 3: (Left) Transmission impulse responses (shifted by direct path time delay) for Model A, Model B and scaled version from A to B with $\alpha = 1.718$ and $\beta = 1.035$. (Right) First arrival (Model A) and third arrival (Model B) of Figure 2, and scaled version from A to B.




Figure 4: (Left) Amplitude and (Right) phase spectra of transmission impulse responses for Model A, Model B and scaled version from A to B with $\alpha = 1.718$ and $\beta = 1.035$

amount when the ambient pressure is changed. The exponent α^2 in the second term accounts for the amplitude change, but has an effect on the phase as well. Since this exponent is applied to a frequency-dependent term, there is not a simple scaling relation in the time-domain.

We have tested the scaling model of equation (8) using numerical modelling techniques and the results are favourable. The binary layered medium approach was used. Our hypothesis is that as pressure changes, some variation in the velocity of one material occurs. The α and β parameters are related with acoustic characteristics of the layered model (i.e. reflectivity and average slowness).

Although we have made a number of simplifying assumptions, it is worthwhile to use equation (8) as a first approximate model for observations like those in Figure 1. Estimating the parameters α and β from that type of measurements for a range of different ambient pressures gives valuable information about the pressure-dependent behaviour of the reservoir rock.