

CO₂-ASSISTED GRAVITY DRAINAGE EOR: NUMERICAL SIMULATION AND SCALING MODELS STUDY

A thesis

Submitted in the fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Petroleum Engineering

By

Prashant Jadhwar

B. Eng. in Petroleum Eng., University of Pune, India
M. Eng. in Petroleum Eng., University of Pune, India
M. Phil. in Petroleum Eng., Heriot-Watt University, UK



Australian School of Petroleum
Faculty of Engineering, Chemical and Mathematical Sciences (ECMS)
The University of Adelaide, Australia

September 2010

ABSTRACT

Increasing demand of the oil and gas have given rise to surge in drilling and exploration activities to recover oil from other unexplored oil-bearing formations (such as offshore) as well as in the efforts to improve and/or modify the existing methods of the enhanced oil recovery to recover the residual oil left-behind by the applied EOR method. Nearly one-third volume of the original oil in place (OOIP) is left-behind by the current EOR technologies. Estimated 2 trillion barrels of this volume is lucrative to cater the energy needs of the respective countries. Gas injection EOR method is a major contending process in exploitation of this resource, and its application is on the rise since last decade. Continuous gas injection (CGI) and water-alternating gas (WAG) injection are the most notable and commonly field-implemented horizontal displacement type gas injection EOR processes. The limitations of CGI are the severe gravity segregation and poor sweep efficiencies. Although the reservoir sweep efficiencies are improved with the WAG, review of 59 field projects suggest that they yield only maximum of 10% incremental oil recoveries due to the detrimental effects of increased water saturation to diminish gas injectivity, reducing oil mobility, decreased oil relative permeability and oil bypassing due to gravity segregation. Conversely, vertical downward oil-displacement gas driven gravity drainage EOR methods uses the gravity forces to its advantage for enhancing the oil recovery. Gravity drainage EOR methods have been applied to dipping and reef type reservoirs in the field projects and reported to yield high incremental oil recoveries.

In this study, the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR method is investigated in the non-dipping reservoir through the 3D reservoir simulations and scaling and the sensitivity analysis. Both the compositional and pseudomiscible black-oil numerical reservoir simulations are conducted in the 50 and 35 °API gravity oil-reservoirs respectively. Main objectives of this research are to (i) develop a better production strategy for the oil recovery optimization (ii) investigate the options to optimize oil recovery in the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR process (numerical simulation studies) (iii) to develop a set of scaled models sufficient to completely scale the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR process through the scaling and sensitivity studies.

Original contributions of this research are (i) First comprehensive demonstration of the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR method application in 50 °API gravity oil-reservoir, (ii) Development and verification of a new hypothesis of the horizontal gas floodfront in

the top-down CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR process, (iii) Development of a general process selection map for the preliminary choice between the immiscible and miscible process, (iv) Grid size effect studies: Changes in both the x and y grid-dimensions has no impact on the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage oil recovery, (v) Grid thickness effect studies: Thin layers, even in the upper layers, facilitates the optimum CO₂-assisted gravity drainage oil recovery (vi) Heterogeneity in permeability effect: Presence of heterogeneity in permeability ($k_v / k_v = 0.001$) improves the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage oil recovery performance (95.5% incremental oil recovery) thereby reducing the number of pore volumes and the operational time. It has been found that recovery further improves when the molecular diffusion effects are taken into account, (vii) Heterogeneity in porosity: Porosity values increasing downwards, such as in the overturned faults, promotes the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage mechanism to yield better oil recovery performance, (viii) Clear identification of the overall mechanisms and the supporting micro-mechanisms through the parametric analysis of the reservoir simulation results, (ix) Development of a new correlation (combination number, $N_{\text{Jadhawar and Sarma}}$) that encompasses the traditional process affecting multiphase operational parameters in the form of the dimensionless groups. It is further validated using the field projects including the data from the Oseberg field, Norway. Excellent logarithmic correlation match is obtained between the new combination number, $N_{\text{Jadhawar and Sarma}}$, and the oil recoveries from both the immiscible and miscible reservoir simulations as well as the field projects. New combination number, $N_{\text{Jadhawar and Sarma}}$, is a useful tool to predict CO₂-assisted gravity drainage oil recoveries, and (x) Development of a set of the additional scaled models sufficient to completely scale the CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR process are proposed and validated.

DEDICATION

I wholeheartedly dedicate this PhD research-work to my beloved brother Late Pravin, who will not be able to see the day of my memorable success for which we strived since our childhood. His unselfish character of offering the helping hand whenever needed, passionate and vibrant support to me and my family will be remembered until the last breath of my life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my deepest gratitude towards my principal supervisor Professor (Dr) Hemanta Sarma for his meaningful discussions, insightful suggestions, longstanding support and guidance throughout the PhD project. I gratefully acknowledge his contribution in teaching and imbibing the peculiarities of the research project, research-ethics, minute technical aspects of the research project, social aspects, constant encouragement and mentoring during the difficult end-phase of my PhD research. Thank you for believing me and creating self-belief in me. His positive goodwill towards me and my family is sincerely appreciated. His caring character will be cherished throughout the all walks of life.

I gratefully appreciate my close friend Dr Madhav Kulkarni for the week-end telephone conversations that further helped to improve my understanding of the project. His contribution will also be remembered in the long-way. I also appreciate my friend Dr. Mohan Kolhe for reviewing thesis for language, formatting etc in the last leg.

I would like to thank Mr Anjani Kumar, Mr Satya Singh, Mr Ron Kutney and Mr Don Dexter of the Computer Modelling Group for their valuable help and technical suggestions regarding the CMG's IMEX and GEM simulators, as well as multiphase properties simulation program WinProp.

I also thank Dr Motiur Rahman, Dr Ric Daniel and Dr Manucher Haghighi for their support during my PhD studies. I certainly do appreciate the moral support and the useful inputs from my colleagues and friends, Bernardus Wahyuputro, Dr Saju Menacherry, Syamol Das, Dr Jan Bon, Jacque Sayers and Zeeshan Mohiuddin.

This acknowledgement cannot be complete without mentioning an outstanding and caring support from my wife Mrs Jyoti. Unbelievably she has been my effective mentor in all aspects all along my PhD studies. Moreover, unselfish questions of my daughter Manasi about the timeline of finishing my PhD studies energized me to deliver the PhD thesis at the earliest. Thanksgiving to them in this regard is rarest opportunity.

Without the blessings of my parents, this work could not have been complete. Lots of thanks to them for showing me this beautiful world and providing the timely advises.

Thanks to my elder sister, brother-in-law and their sons for taking care of my parents since the sad demise of my beloved younger brother, Pravin in the last leg of my PhD.

This PhD research could not have been reality without the Santos postgraduate scholarship from the Australian School of Petroleum towards the tuition fees, the living cost and the health insurance. I sincerely thank and gratefully appreciate Prof Steve Begg, Dr Andy Mitchell and Maureen for all the possible help and support in this regard. Also thanks to Maxine for providing administrative support and Ian West for IT support during the candidature. I also gratefully acknowledge my supervisor Prof Hemanta Sarma for financing three conferences expenses through his CIPR funds, which helped further to hone my presentation skills at the International levels.

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

The work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institutions and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent for this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subjected to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

Prashant Jadhawar
Australian School of Petroleum
The University of Adelaide
Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.

PUBLISHED PAPERS FROM THIS WORK

Journal Papers

1. Jadhawar, P.S. and Sarma, H.K., **2010**. *Improved Production Strategy for Enhancing the CO₂-Assisted Gravity Drainage Oil Recovery*, Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering (JPSE) (Under review).
2. Jadhawar, P.S. and Sarma, H.K., **2010**. *Improved Production Strategy for Enhancing the CO₂-Assisted Gravity Drainage Oil Recovery*, SPE Reservoir Evaluation and Engineering (Under review).
3. Jadhawar, P.S. and Sarma, H.K., **2010**. *Numerical Simulation and Sensitivity Analysis of Gas-Oil Gravity Drainage Process of Enhanced Oil Recovery*, Journal of Canadian Petroleum Technology, Calgary, Canada; 49 (2), 64-70; February.

Conference Presentations

4. Jadhawar, P.S. and Sarma, H.K., **2010**. *Improved Production Strategy for Enhancing the Immiscible and Miscible CO₂-Assisted Gravity Drainage Oil Recovery*, to be presented at the SPE 2010 International Oil and Gas Conference and Exhibition China (IOGCEC), Beijing, China, June 8-10.
5. Jadhawar, P.S. and Sarma, H.K., 2008a. *CO₂-Assisted Gravity Drainage Enhanced Oil Recovery (GAGD-EOR) in Australian Reservoirs: Reservoir Simulation and Scaled Model Studies*, 2008 AIE Postgraduate Student Energy Awards Sydney, Australia; Nov 18.
6. Jadhawar P.S., Sarma H.K. 2008. *Scaling and Sensitivity Analysis of Gas-Oil Gravity-Drainage EOR*. Presented at the 2008 SPE Asia Pacific Oil & Gas Conference and Exhibition Perth, Australia, 20–22 October.
7. Jadhawar P.S., Sarma H.K. 2008. *Numerical Simulation and Sensitivity Analysis of Gas-Oil Gravity Drainage Process of Enhanced Oil Recovery*, Canadian International Petroleum Conference, Calgary, Canada, June 17-19.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
DEDICATION	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	V
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	XIV
LIST OF TABLES	XXII
NOMENCLATURE.....	XXIV
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 MOTIVATION.....	3
1.3 KNOWLEDGE GAP.....	4
1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY	4
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	5
1.5.1 Numerical Simulation Studies:	5
1.5.2 Scaling and Sensitivity Studies:.....	6
1.6 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY (EOR).....	9
2.2 GAS INJECTION EOR METHODS	10
2.2.1 Classification of Gas Injection EOR Methods.....	11
2.2.2 Choice of the Injection Gas.....	12
2.2.3 CO ₂ EOR: Mechanisms and Processes	13
2.2.4 Summary of the Worldwide CO ₂ -EOR Projects.....	15
2.2.5 Australian CO ₂ -EOR Potential	16
2.3 CO₂-ASSISTED GRAVITY DRAINAGE EOR PROCESS	18
2.3.1 Gravity Drainage: Process Definition and Classification	18
2.3.2 Process Description.....	20
2.3.3 Gravity Drainage: Fundamental Concepts and Models	22
2.3.4 Operational Parameters affecting CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR Processes	25
2.3.4.1 Gas injection and oil production rates	26

2.3.4.2	Gravity vs. viscous vs. capillary force effects	30
2.3.4.3	Type of injection and production wells, well patterns and grid block size.....	31
2.3.4.4	Grid size and thickness (layers).....	33
2.3.4.5	Wettability and spreading coefficient	33
2.3.4.6	Immiscible vs. miscible displacement	35
2.3.4.7	Relative permeability	38
2.3.4.8	Secondary vs. tertiary gravity drainage EOR process	39
2.3.4.9	Diffusion and Dispersion.....	40
2.3.4.10	Porosity heterogeneity	41
2.3.5	Screening Criteria: Gravity Drainage Oil Recovery Process.....	42
2.3.6	Field Projects through Reservoir Simulation Studies	42
2.4	SCALING AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	48
2.4.1	Dimensional Analysis	49
2.4.2	Scaled Models in Porous Media	49
2.4.3	Scaled Models: Gravity Drainage Process.....	52
2.5	SUMMARY	54
3	METHODOLOGY	56
3.1	RESERVOIR MODEL CONSTRUCTION.....	56
3.2	PRODUCTION STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT	58
3.3	OIL RECOVERY OPTIMIZATION STUDIES	60
3.3.1	Mechanisms Identification and the General Process Selection Map Development.....	60
3.3.2	Effect of Grid Size through Grid Refinement Studies	61
3.3.3	Effect of Miscibility Development	62
3.3.4	Effect of Molecular Diffusion.....	63
3.3.5	Effect of Heterogeneity in Permeability and Porosity	63
3.3.6	Effect of Mode of Gas (CO ₂) Injection.....	64
3.4	SCALING AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	65
4	RESERVOIR MODEL CONSTRUCTION.....	68
4.1	RESERVOIR MODEL DESCRIPTION.....	68
4.2	RESERVOIR FLUID MODELS	69
4.2.1	Pseudomiscible Black Oil Model: 35 °API Oil.....	69
4.2.2	Compositional Fluid Model: 50 °API Oil from Australian Reservoir	70
4.3	MINIMUM MISCIBILITY PRESSURE (MMP)	77
4.4	ROCK-FLUID PROPERTIES.....	77
4.5	PRODUCTION STRATEGY: WELL PATTERNS	78

4.6	MODEL INITIALIZATION PROCEDURE	79
4.7	SUMMARY	80
5	PRODUCTION STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT	81
5.1	PRODUCTION HISTORY	81
5.1.1	Production History - 35 °API oil: Primary Depletion and Waterflooding...	81
5.1.2	Production History - 50 °API oil: Primary Depletion	83
5.2	PRODUCTION STRATEGY: INJECTION RATE OR OIL PRODUCTION RATE CONSTRAINT?	84
5.2.1	Critical and Stable Gas Injection Rate	84
5.2.2	Effect of Gas Injection and Oil Production Rates: 35 °API Reservoir	85
5.2.3	Effect of gas injection and oil production rates: 50 °API reservoir	90
5.3	TYPE OF CO₂ INJECTION WELL - VERTICAL VS. HORIZONTAL.....	91
5.3.1	35 API Reservoir: Irregular Well Pattern	92
5.3.2	50 API Reservoir: Regular Well Pattern (RWP)	93
5.4	WELL PATTERNS: IRREGULAR VS. REGULAR.....	99
5.4.1	Secondary Immiscible CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR.....	100
5.4.2	Secondary Miscible CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR	106
5.4.3	Mechanisms Contributing the Enhanced Oil Recovery	110
5.5	EFFECT OF CONNATE WATER SATURATION.....	114
5.6	EFFECT OF CAPILLARY PRESSURE.....	117
5.7	SUMMARY	120
6	OIL RECOVERY OPTIMIZATION	121
6.1	MECHANISMS IDENTIFICATION AND GENERAL PROCESS SELECTION MAP DEVELOPMENT: CO₂-ASSISTED GRAVITY DRAINAGE EOR PROCESS.....	121
6.1.1	Overall Mechanisms: Immiscible and Miscible Process	127
6.1.2	Contributing Mechanisms: Immiscible CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR Process	131
6.1.3	Contributing Mechanisms: Miscible CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR Process	133
6.1.4	General Process Selection Map: Immiscible vs. Miscible CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR Process	140
6.2	GRID REFINEMENT STUDIES: 50 °API RESERVOIR.....	142
6.2.1	Effect of Grid Size (x and y-dimensions)	143
6.2.2	Effect of Grid Thickness (layer)	147

6.2.3	Immiscible vs. Miscible Gravity Drainage Recovery with the New Optimized Grid (50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft)	151
6.3	EFFECT OF HETEROGENEITY	155
6.3.1	Permeability Heterogeneity	155
6.3.2	Porosity Heterogeneity.....	158
6.4	EFFECT OF MOLECULAR DIFFUSION/DISPERSION	161
6.4.1	Homogeneous Reservoir ($k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	161
6.4.2	Heterogeneous Reservoir ($k_v/k_h = 0.001$).....	167
6.5	EFFECT OF MODE OF CO₂ INJECTION: SECONDARY VS. TERTIARY RECOVERY	169
6.5.1	Tertiary CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR Process: Immiscible and Miscible Recovery	169
6.5.2	Secondary vs. Tertiary CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage EOR Process Comparison	175
6.5.2.1	Immiscible process performance	176
6.5.2.2	Miscible process performance	179
6.5.2.3	Comparative analysis.....	182
6.6	VOIDAGE REPLACEMENT DURING CO₂-ASSISTED GRAVITY DRAINAGE OIL RECOVERY	183
6.6.1	New concepts: Critical (i_{gc}) and stable (i_{gs}) Gas Injection Rates; Critical Voidage Replacement Ratio (VRR _C).....	184
6.7	SUMMARY	185
7	SCALING AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	186
7.1	IDENTIFICATION OF OPERATIONAL MULTIPHASE PARAMETERS CONTROLLING THE CO₂-ASSISTED GRAVITY DRAINAGE OIL RECOVERY..	186
7.2	SCALED MODEL STUDIES: 50 °API RESERVOIR.....	188
7.2.1	Capillary Number (N _C)	191
7.2.2	Bond Number (N _B)	193
7.2.3	Gravity Number (N _G).....	195
7.2.4	Combination Models: Evaluation of the Existing Numbers	197
7.2.5	New Proposed Model, its Physical Significance and Validation.....	200
7.3	SCALING AND SENSITIVITY BASED ON THE DEVELOPED SCALING GROUPS: 50 °API RESERVOIR	204
7.3.1	Sensitivity Studies.....	207
7.3.2	Gravity Number Group	208

7.3.3	Pressure Group.....	211
7.3.4	Mobility Ratio Group.....	212
7.3.5	Residual Oil Saturations	214
7.3.6	Validation of the Scaling Groups.....	215
7.4	SUMMARY.....	218
8	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	219
8.1	PRODUCTION STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT	219
8.2	OIL RECOVERY OPTIMIZATION STUDIES	221
8.2.1	Mechanisms Identification and the General Process Selection Map Development.....	221
8.2.2	Effect of Grid Size through the Grid Refinement Studies	224
8.2.3	Effect of Miscibility Development	225
8.2.4	Effect of Molecular Diffusion.....	228
8.2.5	Effect of Heterogeneity in Permeability and Porosity	229
8.2.6	Effect of Mode of Gas Injection	230
8.3	CONCLUDING COMMENT ON THE OIL RECOVERY MECHANISMS	233
8.4	SCALING AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	234
9	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	238
9.1	CONCLUSIONS	238
9.2	FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....	241
	REFERENCES.....	243
	APPENDIX-A	256
	APPENDIX-B	257
	APPENDIX-C	259
	APPENDIX-D	260
	VITA.....	262

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1: CO ₂ EOR resources in US (left) depicting current active projects (Moritis, 2008); and in Australia outlining the potential for CO ₂ EOR (Bradshaw <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	16
Figure 2-2: Oil demand and Supply in Australia (Lund, 2006).....	17
Figure 2-3: Conceptual CO ₂ -Assisted Gravity Drainage process (Jadhawar and Sarma, 2008)	21
Figure 4-1: Hypothetical 3-D reservoir model representing the gas, oil and water zone thickness.....	68
Figure 4-2: Composition and phase diagram of 35 °API gravity reservoir oil depicting the saturation pressure and temperature, and the initial reservoir condition.	70
Figure 4-3: Composition and phase diagram of 50 °API gravity reservoir oil.....	71
Figure 4-4: Preliminary match of the reservoir oil properties viz. (a) relative volume (b) GOR and Bo (c) Oil and gas specific gravity (d) Gas compressibility factor (e) oil viscosity (f) gas viscosity.....	74
Figure 4-5: EOS predicted match of the reservoir oil properties viz. (a) relative volume (b) GOR and Bo (c) Oil and gas specific gravity (d) Gas compressibility factor (e) oil viscosity (f) gas viscosity.....	76
Figure 4-6: Relative permeability curves obtained from Stone-II correlations (a) water-oil (b) gas-oil.....	78
Figure 4-7: Capillary pressure curves adapted from Ren (2002).....	78
Figure 4-8: (A) and (C) - <i>Irregular</i> well patterns; (B) and (D) - Regular Well patterns of vertical /horizontal CO ₂ injection wells and horizontal oil production wells...	79
Figure 5-1: Primary depletion and waterflood performance for 35 API reservoir	82
Figure 5-2: Effect of grid size on GOR and WOR	82
Figure 5-3: Oil saturation at the start CO ₂ flood (Case-II)	84
Figure 5-4: CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR performance in four gas injection (i_g) and oil production rate (q_o) combinations	86
Figure 5-5: Oil saturations in layer-6 and 7 at the start; 65 years later and at the end of CO ₂ flood in Case-II	87
Figure 5-6: Average reservoir pressure during CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process for all the cases.....	88

Figure 5-7: Effect of the varying oil production rates at constant gas injection rates on the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recovery.....	90
Figure 5-8: Comparison: Effect of the varying gas injection rate vs. oil production rate on the field oil recovery (% OOIP).....	91
Figure 5-9: Effect of the horizontal versus vertical gas injection wells on CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recovery in 35 °API reservoir oil.....	93
Figure 5-10: Vertical vs. horizontal CO ₂ injection well effect (q _o and GOR) on CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recovery in the immiscible process.....	94
Figure 5-11: Vertical vs. horizontal CO ₂ injection well effect (q _o and GOR) on the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recovery in miscible process.....	95
Figure 5-12: Effect of vertical versus horizontal CO ₂ injection wells in the <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process: Cumulative oil recovery (N _p).....	96
Figure 5-13: Effect of vertical versus horizontal CO ₂ injection wells in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process: Cumulative oil recovery (N _p).....	97
Figure 5-14: Average reservoir pressure in the <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process during injection well type studies.....	98
Figure 5-15: Average reservoir pressure in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process during injection well type studies.....	98
Figure 5-16: Effect of well pattern - irregular vs. regular in immiscible CO ₂ flood on q _o and GOR in 4 combinations of I _g and q _o	102
Figure 5-17: Effect of well pattern (irregular vs. regular) in immiscible CO ₂ flood on water cut % and N _p in 4 combinations of I _g and q _o	103
Figure 5-18: Effect of well pattern - irregular vs. regular (immiscible CO ₂ flood) on (A) q _o vs. N _p ; and (B) incremental oil recovery vs PV _{CO₂inj}	104
Figure 5-19: Effect of well pattern on the reservoir pressure (P _R) in (C) IWP (D) RWP .	105
Figure 5-20: Effect of well pattern - irregular vs. regular (miscible CO ₂ flood) on (A) q _o and (B) GOR in 4 combinations of I _g and q _o ; and (C) gas saturation front not fingering through the oil zone.....	107
Figure 5-21: Effect of well pattern in miscible CO ₂ flood - IWP vs. RWP: (A) q _o vs N _p and (B) Field oil recovery for the respective pore volumes of CO ₂ injected in 4 combinations of I _g and q _o	108
Figure 5-22: Average pressure distribution in (A) irregular well pattern and (B) regular well pattern.....	109

Figure 5-23: Gas saturation and the respective oil saturation and the viscosity profile in the <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ flood.....	111
Figure 5-24: Gas saturation and the respective oil saturation and the viscosity profile in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ flood.....	113
Figure 5-25: Viscosity changes during miscible CO ₂ flood (Case-IV)	114
Figure 5-26: Comparison of GAGD-EOR performance at three S _{wc} values: 0.08, 0.15 and 0.22.....	116
Figure 5-27: Effect of Capillary pressure in (irregular well pattern) on - q _o , GOR and water cut (%).....	118
Figure 5-28: Effect of Capillary pressure in (irregular well pattern) - q _o vs. N _p (top); and Field recovery (%OOIP) vs HCPVinj, % (bottom).	119
Figure 6-1: Comparison of the incremental immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recovery in rate-constraints from Case-I to Case-IV	123
Figure 6-2: Comparison - Incremental CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recoveries in both the immiscible and miscible process from Case-V to Case-VII.....	125
Figure 6-3: Gas-oil ratio (GOR) comparison from Case-IV through Case-VII during operation of the immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	126
Figure 6-4: Water breakthrough in all the seven immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage floods.	127
Figure 6-5: Profile of the oil rate, GOR and average reservoir pressure in (A) immiscible and (B) miscible process (Case-V)	129
Figure 6-6: Average reservoir pressure comparison in Case-IV through Case-VII (A) immiscible and (B) miscible process	130
Figure 6-7: Existence of oil film flow demonstrated by the oil drainage behind the CO ₂ floodfront in CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (A) immiscible: Case-V and (B) miscible: Case-VII.....	132
Figure 6-8: Mechanisms other than the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage in the blocks (25,14,6), (25,14,7) and (25,14,8) in the top-down miscible process.....	134
Figure 6-9: Oil recovery mechanisms other than the gravity drainage mechanism in blocks (25, 14, 6), (25, 14, 7) and (25, 14, 8) in top-down CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	136
Figure 6-10: Miscible recovery contributing mechanisms in CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process in the block (21,20,7).....	138

Figure 6-11: Comparative oil saturation in layer-6 and layer-7 (Areal view) in the year 2126 in immiscible and miscible flooding (Case-VII)	139
Figure 6-12: 3D representation of the oil recovered in immiscible and miscible process of Case-VII rate-constraint.....	139
Figure 6-13: General selection map for immiscible versus miscible process - Case-I through Case-VII	140
Figure 6-14: Effect of grid size on the incremental EOR, GOR and water cut, % in Case-VII.....	145
Figure 6-15: Effect of grid size on the incremental EOR, GOR and water cut, % in Case-IV	146
Figure 6-16: Effect of grid layer thickness on the incremental EOR (%), Gas-Oil Ratio (GOR) and water cut (%) in Case-VII well rate-constraint combination	148
Figure 6-17: Effect of grid thickness on the incremental EOR (%), GOR and water cut (%) in Case-IV	149
Figure 6-18: Incremental oil recovery (%) in the (A) respective pore volumes of CO ₂ injected (fraction) and (B) years taken for this PV _{CO₂} injection for all three grid sizes in Case-IV	151
Figure 6-19: Immiscible vs. miscible process performance in CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$)	152
Figure 6-20: Mechanistic performance of the immiscible vs. miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	153
Figure 6-21: Average reservoir pressure in immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	154
Figure 6-22: Comparison of permeability heterogeneity ($k_v/k_h = 1.0$ and 0.001) effect on performance of <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft).....	157
Figure 6-23: Average reservoir pressure in miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process in homogeneous ($k_v/k_h = 1.0$) and heterogeneous ($k_v/k_h = 0.001$) reservoir (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft).....	158
Figure 6-24: Effect of porosity heterogeneities on CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR performance in set-I & set-II compared to base Case-III	160

Figure 6-25: Effect of porosity heterogeneity on CO ₂ -assisted oil gravity drainage oil recovery in Setting-I and Setting-II	161
Figure 6-26: Effect of molecular diffusion in miscible process (Case-IV; optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 0.001$)	163
Figure 6-27: Effect of molecular diffusion in the miscible process (Case-IV) using optimized grid ($k_v/k_h = 1.0$); Gas saturation, oil viscosity and saturation at the middle of 24 th layer block (21, 14, 24)	164
Figure 6-28: Effect of molecular diffusion in immiscible process (Case-IV, optimized grid, $k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	166
Figure 6-29: Effect of diffusion in heterogenic reservoir ($k_v/k_h = 0.001$; optimized grid) (Case-IV).....	168
Figure 6-30: Immiscible vs. miscible process performance in the <i>tertiary</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$)	171
Figure 6-31: Average reservoir pressure profile during <i>tertiary</i> mode immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$)	172
Figure 6-32: Oil viscosity, gas and oil saturation profile during <i>tertiary</i> mode immiscible/miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$)	173
Figure 6-33: Effect of diffusion phenomenon on the incremental EOR in the <i>tertiary</i> mode immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	175
Figure 6-34: Secondary vs. Tertiary <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process performance comparison (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	177
Figure 6-35: Effect of Secondary vs. Tertiary mode CO ₂ injection on <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$)	178
Figure 6-36: Effect of the secondary vs. tertiary mode of CO ₂ injection in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	180
Figure 6-37: Effect of secondary vs. tertiary mode of CO ₂ injection on average reservoir pressure in miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	181

Figure 6-38: Comparison of average oil saturation at the end of secondary and tertiary mode CO ₂ injection in both the immiscible and miscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (optimized grid: 50 × 30 × 30: 120 ft × 80 ft × 50 ft; $k_v/k_h = 1.0$).....	182
Figure 7-1: Tornado diagram depicting the relative dominance of multiphase parameters operational in the CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process.....	187
Figure 7-2: Effect of Capillary number on oil recovery in <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Green squares: N _C from field projects. Green hollow diamonds: N _C from this study	192
Figure 7-3: Effect of Capillary number on oil recovery in <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Red Squares: N _C from field projects. Red Hollow diamonds: N _C from this study	192
Figure 7-4: Effect of N _B on oil recovery in the immiscible CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Green Squares: N _B - field projects. Green Hollow diamonds: N _B - this study	194
Figure 7-5: Effect of N _B on oil recovery in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Red Squares: N _B - field projects. Red Hollow diamonds: N _B - this study	195
Figure 7-6: Effect of Gravity number on oil recovery in <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Green squares: N _G from field projects. Green hollow diamonds: N _G from this study	196
Figure 7-7: Effect of Gravity number on oil recovery in <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Red Squares: N _G from Field projects. Red Hollow diamonds: N _G from this study	197
Figure 7-8: Effect of the combination model of kulkarni (2005) on oil recovery in the <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Green squares: N _K - field projects. Green hollow diamonds: N _K - this study	198
Figure 7-9: Effect of the combination model of kulkarni (2005) on oil recovery in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Red squares: N _K - field projects. Red hollow diamonds: N _K - this study	199
Figure 7-10: Effect of combined model of Rostami (2009) on oil recovery in <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Green squares: N _{Rostami} - field projects. Green hollow diamonds: N _{Rostami} - this study	199
Figure 7-11: Effect of combined model of Rostami (2009) on oil recovery in <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Red squares: N _K - field projects. Red hollow diamonds: N _{Rostami} - this study	200

Figure 7-12: Effect of viscosity ratio on the oil recovery in <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR .	201
Figure 7-13: Effect of new scaled model on oil recovery in the <i>immiscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Green squares: N _{Jadhawar and Sarma} - field projects. Green hollow diamonds: N _{Jadhawar and Sarma} - this study	203
Figure 7-14: Effect of new scaled model on oil recovery in the <i>miscible</i> CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Red squares: N _{Jadhawar and Sarma} - field projects. Red hollow diamonds: N _{Jadhawar and Sarma} - this study	204
Figure 7-15: Total superficial velocity (u_T) vs dimensionless recovery (R_D).....	209
Figure 7-16: Effect of the i_g based N_g on the dimensionless CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage oil recovery	210
Figure 7-17: Dimensionless oil recovery performance of CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process over the respective Pore values of CO ₂ injected: Gravity number (i_g based)	210
Figure 7-18: Dimensionless oil recovery performance of CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process over the respective Pore values of CO ₂ injected: Pressure based Gravity number	211
Figure 7-19: Effect of pressure group on EOR performance in the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process. Other scaling group values are kept constant.....	212
Figure 7-20: Effect of water-oil mobility ratio (M_{wo}) on EOR performance in CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process. Other Scaling group values are kept constant.	213
Figure 7-21: Effect of gas-oil mobility ratio (M_{wo}) on EOR performance in the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage process. Other Scaling group values are kept constant.	213
Figure 7-22: Sensitivity of the residual oil saturations to water (S_{orw}) on the oil recovery performance in the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	214
Figure 7-23: Sensitivity of the residual oil saturations to gas (S_{org}) on oil recovery performance in the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	215
Figure 7-24: Dimensionless oil recovery performances of 3 sample reservoirs. Very similar recoveries represent successful scaling of the CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	217
Figure 8-1: Summary of the final incremental EOR obtained in all the cases of immiscible and miscible - secondary / tertiary mode CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR Methods.....	226

Figure 8-2: Final incremental EOR obtained in all the *no-diffusion* cases of immiscible and miscible - secondary / tertiary mode CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR
Methods.....227

Figure 8-3: Final incremental EOR obtained in all the *diffusion* cases of immiscible and miscible - secondary / tertiary mode CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR
Methods.....229

Figure 8-4: Incremental EOR (%) in all the *no-diffusion* and *no-diffusion* cases of CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR Methods231

Figure 8-5: Incremental EOR (%) in all the cases of CO₂-assisted gravity drainage EOR Methods at (A) 2.5 PV_{CO₂inj} and (B) 1.5 PV_{CO₂inj}232

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Classification of gas injection methods.....	12
Table 2-2: Status of World CO ₂ -EOR projects.....	15
Table 2-3: Classification of gravity drainage processes	19
Table 2-4: Summary of the gas injection rate (critical and stable) equations.....	28
Table 2-5: Screening Criteria for gas assisted gravity segregation processes	42
Table 2-6: Summary of 11 commercial gravity drainage field projects	48
Table 2-7: Dimensionless numbers in gravity drainage process	53
Table 3-1: Summary of the parametric research plan.....	57
Table 4-2: HC-HC interaction coefficients of 50 °API gravity oil EOS model	77
Table 4-3: Reservoir Volumetrics.....	80
Table 5-1: Gas injection (ig) & oil production (q _o) rate settings	85
Table 6-1: Rate constraints of the wells.....	122
Table 6-2: Details of grid thickness (layers) and grid size studies for both the Case-VII and Case-IV	143
Table 6-3: Porosity heterogeneity settings.....	158
Table 7-1: Ranges of the parameters (CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process) values used in the risk analysis.....	187
Table 7-2: Dimensionless numbers used in evaluation of CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process.....	189
Table 7-3: Key dimensionless numbers calculated using results of this reservoir simulation study in the CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process and the gravity drainage field data ...	191
Table 7-4: Dimensionless Groups obtained through Buckingham-Pi Analysis	206
Table 7-5: Dimensionless groups used in scaling the immiscible CO ₂ -assisted gravity drainage EOR process (35 API reservoir)	207
Table 7-6: Multiphase operational parameters considered for the sensitivity analysis of CO ₂ -GAGD EOR process. Group value of one of the scaling group is varied while keeping others constant.....	209
Table 7-7: Dimensional properties of three sample reservoirs	216
Table 7-8: Dimensionless group values of 3 sample reservoirs, calculated using data in Table 7-7	217
Table 8-1: Summary of final incremental EOR in all the secondary and tertiary CO ₂ - assisted gravity drainage EOR methods	225

Table A-I: PVT properties of 35 °API gravity reservoir oil256

Table A-II: End-point saturations used in the Stone-II model to generate relative permeability curves256

NOMENCLATURE

Nomenclature and units used throughout this thesis are as follows:

ENGLISH

Symbol	Description
B_o	Formation Volume Factor of the oil, Res bbl/STB, [L^3/L^3]
B_g	Formation Volume Factor of the gas, SCF/STB, [L^3/L^3]
B_{solvent}	Formation Volume Factor of the solvent [L^3/L^3]
g	Acceleration due to gravity, ft/s^2 [L/T^2]
H	Thickness of the reservoir, ft [L]
i_g	Rate of gas injection, SCFD
k_v	Vertical permeability, mD, psia [L^2]
k_h	Horizontal permeability within the reservoir, mD, psia [L^2]
k_{ro}	Permeability to oil of the porous medium, mD, psia [L^2]
k_{rg}	Permeability to gas of the porous medium, mD, psia [L^2]
k_{rw}	Permeability to water of the porous medium, mD, psia [L^2]
L	Characteristic length of reservoir or Well spacing, ft [L]
M	Mobility ratio
M_{wo}	Water-oil mobility ratio, bbls [L^3]
M_{go}	Gas-oil mobility ratio, bbls [L^3]
N_B	Bond number, dimensionless
N_B	Capillary number, dimensionless
N_G	Gravity number, dimensionless
N_{Kulkarni}	Kulkarni number, dimensionless
N_{Rostami}	Dimensionless number of Rostami et al.
$N_{\text{Jadhawar and Sarma}}$	Capillary number, dimensionless
N_p	Cumulative oil production, bbls [L^3]
N_{gI}	Gravity number based on the gas injection rate, dimensionless
N_{gP}	Gravity number based on the pressure difference between the gas injection and oil production wells, dimensionless
P_{avg}	Average reservoir pressure, psia [M/LT^2]
P_c	Capillary pressure, psia [M/LT^2]
P_{inj}	Gas injection pressure, psia [M/LT^2]
P_{prod}	Oil recovery (producing) pressure, psia [M/LT^2]
P_{MM}	Minimum miscibility pressure, psia [M/LT^2]

NOMENCLATURE

ΔP	Difference of pressure between the gas injection pressure and oil recovery pressure, psia [M/LT ²]
ΔP_R	Change in the reservoir pressure, psia [M/LT ²]
PV_{CO_2inj}	Pore volume of the CO ₂ injected, psia [M/LT ²]
q_o	Rate of the oil production, bpd, [L ³ /T]
R_L	Effective Aspect ratio, dimensionless
R_s	Solution gas-oil ratio
R_D	Dimensionless recovery
S_o	Spreading Coefficient
S_{orw}	Residual oil saturation to water (water-oil system)
S_{org}	Residual oil saturation to gas (gas-oil system)
S_{wc}	Connate water saturation
t	Time [T]
t_D	Dimensionless time
T	Temperature, °F [θ]
u_c	Critical Velocity, ft/D, [L/T]
u_T	Average superficial velocity, ft/s, [L/T]
W	Width (diameter of core) of the reservoir, ft [L]

GREEK

ρ_o	Density of reservoir fluid (oil), lb/ ft ³ [M/L ³]
ρ_g	Density of the gas, lb/ ft ³ [M/L ³]
$\Delta\rho$	Difference of the density between the reservoir fluid (oil) and the injected gas, lb/ ft ³ [M/L ³]
λ_{ro}	Mobility of oil within the porous medium
λ_{rg}	Mobility of gas within the porous medium
λ_{rw}	Mobility of water within the porous medium
ϕ	Porosity, fraction
α	Angle of dip (tilt) of a particular reservoir section with respect to the horizontal
μ_o	Viscosity of the oil, cP [M/LT]
μ_g	Viscosity of the gas, cP [M/LT]
$\mu_{solvent}$	Viscosity of the solvent, cP [M/LT]
σ_{wg}	Water-gas interfacial tension, dyne/cm, [M/T ²]
σ_{go}	Gas-oil interfacial tension, dyne/cm, [M/T ²]
σ_{ow}	Oil-water interfacial tension, dyne/cm, [M/T ²]

Subscripts

x	x-direction
y	y-direction
z	z-direction
V	Vertical
H	Horizontal
s	Solution
g	Gas
o	Oil
s	Solvent

ACRONYMS

Acronym	Description
B-L	Buckley-Leverett
CCE	Constant Composition Expansion
CVD	Constant Volume Depletion
DL	Differential Liberation
EOR	Enhanced Oil Recovery
FVF	Formation Volume Factor
GOC	Gas-Oil Contact
GOR	Gas-Oil Ratio
GRR	Gravity Drainage Reference Rate
HC	Hydrocarbon gas
HZGI	Horizontal Gas Injection
Imm	Immiscible
IWP	Irregular Well Pattern
Misc	Miscible
MMP	Minimum Miscibility Pressure
PVT	Pressure, Volume, Temperature
RWP	Regular Well Pattern
Sec	Secondary CO ₂ injection
Tert	Tertiary CO ₂ injection
VGI	Vertical Gas Injection
VRR	Voidage Replacement Ration
WOC	Water-Oil Contact