

Polanen GT: Fracture Containment

Project: 1900011

April, 2022

Polanen GT: Fracture Containment

Authors

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Reviewed by

[REDACTED]

Release authorised by:

[REDACTED] Manager Subsurface and Engineering

Prepared for

HVC
Baanhoekweg 38
3313 LA Dordrecht
Nederland

Prepared by

PanTerra Geoconsultants B.V.
Weversbaan 1-3
2352 BZ Leiderdorp
The Netherlands
T +31 (0)71 581 35 05
F +31 (0)71 301 08 02
info@panterra.nl

This report contains analyses, opinions and/or interpretations that are based on observations and materials supplied by the client to whom, and for whose exclusive and confidential use, this report is made. The interpretations or opinions expressed represent the best judgement of PanTerra Geoconsultants B.V. (all errors and omissions excepted). PanTerra Geoconsultants B.V. and its officers and employees, assume no responsibility and make no warranty or representations, as to the productivity, proper operations, or profitability of any oil, gas, water or other mineral well or sand in connection with which such report is used or relied upon.

Nederlandse samenvatting

HVC heeft PanTerra verzocht om uit te zoeken of het mogelijk is om in Polanen te injecteren onder thermisch geïnduceerde scheurcondities in de Delft formatie, zonder verlies van containment door scheurvorming in de afsluitende laag. Dit is belangrijk om te onderzoeken vanwege de toegestane maximale injectiedruk voor geothermische operaties: 0.135 bar/m voor een uitkoeling tot 40°C, hetgeen met 1 bar verlaagd moet worden per graad uitkoeling boven de 40°C (SodM, 2013). Strikte naleving van deze richtlijn kan de injectiecapaciteit van de Polanen-injector beperken.

Het Polanen doublet ligt in het Westland, binnen het Monster 2 opsporingsvergunninggebied (Figure 1-1). Het geplande doublet bestaat uit de producerende put MON-GT-01 en de injecterende put MON-GT-02. In deze studie zijn simulaties gedaan van koud waterinjectie onder matrix condities en onder scheurvormende condities. Simulaties onder matrixcondities zijn gedaan om uit te zoeken of het mogelijk is om het beoogde debiet te bereiken zonder de richtlijnen van SodM te overschrijden. Simulaties onder scheurvormingscondities zijn gedaan voor scenario's waar het niet mogelijk is om te injecteren onder matrixcondities, en geven een indicatie van geïnduceerde scheurgroei in de bovenliggende laag voor verschillende parameters. De simulaties laten de impact van koud water injectie zien gedurende de gehele levensduur (30 jaar) van het veld.

De scheursimulaties zijn uitgevoerd met de methode van Gheissary (1998) en van den Hoek (1999, 2000). De methode is een uitbereiding van de Koning methode (1988) die ook gebruikt wordt door TNO (Veldkamp et al., 2016), en bevat meer gecompliceerde geologie met meerdere reservoirlagen en afsluitende lagen.

De putten zullen worden geboord in het West Nederland Bekken. Het reservoir dat aangeboord wordt bestaat uit fluviale zandstenen van de Delft member, op een diepte van 2276-2323 m TVD. Het reservoir wordt geschat op een dikte van 47 m, en is heel permeabel (550 mD) met een hoog netto/bruto ratio van 93% (PanTerra, 2018). De temperatuur van het reservoir is 86°C. Bovenop het reservoir zit de Rodenrijs kleisteen groep, die bestaat uit schalie en de afsluitende laag vormt voor het reservoir. De hele laag wordt geschat op een dikte van 71 m op locatie (PanTerra, 2020). Het onderste deel van deze laag is minder schalie-rijk en heeft daardoor minder goede afsluitende kwaliteiten, dit deel is aangeduid als de "waste zone".

Uit de simulaties van injectie onder matrixcondities blijkt dat als geïnjecteerd wordt met een temperatuur van 35°C (51°C uitkoeling), het maximaal toegestane debiet zonder de SodM-limiet voor injectiedruk te overschrijden ongeveer gelijk is aan 340 m³/h. Aangezien dit debiet hoger is dan het voorgenomen debiet van 310 m³/h is het theoretisch mogelijk om te injecteren onder matrixcondities.

De scheursimulaties (zie tabel hieronder) laten zien dat voor alle gesimuleerde scenario's de scheuren klein zijn (< 10 m), met slechts een paar meter penetratie in de waste zone boven de Delft formatie.

De enige uitzondering daarop is een scenario waarin gedurende 30 jaar verontreinigd water (TSS = 1ppm) wordt geïnjecteerd. Dit resulteert in een scheur van 40 m met penetratie in de waste zone en gedeeltelijke penetratie van de Rodenrijs klei. Het scenario is gebaseerd op een injector puttest in Trias Westland waarbij injectiewater werd gebruikt uit een andere bron dan de injectieformatie. Het resultaat was een skin van +5. Echter, gebaseerd op ervaringen met geothermische operaties in West Nederland, is de aanname van injectie van vervuild water over lange tijd zeer onrealistisch, omdat in al deze operaties geproduceerd water direct wordt teruggeïnjecteerd in hetzelfde reservoir. Daarom zijn chemische processen als gevolg van incompatibiliteit van het injectiewater en het formatiewater niet aanwezig. Dit blijkt ook uit het feit dat in de geothermische operaties de injectiviteit over perioden van jaren ongeveer constant blijft. Verder is het zo dat de skin die wordt waargenomen bij een puttest bij het opstarten van de put meestal kan worden toegeschreven aan formatieschade door boren of completeren van de put.

Dit rapport bespreekt ook een strategie over hoe het risico van scheurvorming met eventueel verlies van containment gemanaged kan worden. Als onderdeel van zo'n strategie wordt aanbevolen om routine Hall

plot analyses te doen, gebaseerd op dagelijkse injectie-data. Injection Fall-Off (IFO) testen kunnen nodig zijn wanneer analyse van de Hall plot de aanwezigheid van een scheur doet vermoeden, hoewel wordt aanbevolen om bij opstarten van de injector altijd (een) IFO test(en) te doen. Temperatuur logging (warm-back surveys) zijn over het algemeen niet nodig, zolang de combinatie van Hall plot / IFO aangeeft dat de gevormde scheur klein blijft.

Om mogelijke scheurvorming te voorkomen in de afsluitende laag wordt geadviseerd om voor injectie in de Delft een druk gradiënt aan te houden die lager is dan 0.158 bar/m. Dat is gelijk aan de minimum in-situ spanningsgradiënt voor West-Nederland zoals bepaald door Leak-Off Testen (LOT's). Aangezien de afsluitende laag slechts zeer beperkt wordt afgekoeld is de verwachting dat de in-situ spanning in deze laag nauwelijks zal afnemen ten opzichte van 0.158 bar/m en dat daardoor scheurvorming in deze laag niet zal optreden zolang de injectiedruk lager blijft dan 0.158 bar/m. Dat wordt bevestigd door de verschillende scenario's in dit rapport.

Nummer	Scenariobeschrijving	Resultaat na 30 jaar
1	Lage permeabiliteit (307 mD)	Scheur met een radius van 5 m met 3 m (15%) penetratie in de "waste zone" (BHIP= 0.165 bar/m)
2	Skin door vervuild injectiewater	Scheur met een radius van 45 m, volledige penetratie door de "waste zone" en doorboort 40% van het Rodenrijs schalie pakket (BHIP= 0.157 bar/m)
3	Lage in-situ stress gradiënt (0.138 bar/m)	Scheur met een radius van 10 m waarvan 8 m (40%) in de "waste zone" (BHIP= 0.129 bar/m)
4	Hoge in-situ stress gradiënt (0.178 bar/m)	Scheur met een radius van 0.8 m geen penetratie van de "waste zone" (BHIP= 0.232 bar/m)
5	Een injectie snelheid van 415 m ³ /u	Scheur met een radius van 3.5 m waarvan 2 m (10%) penetratie in de "waste zone" (BHIP= 0.168 bar/m)
6	Een thermo-elastische constante $A_T = 1.5$ bar/°C	Scheur met een radius van 4 m, 2 m (10%) penetratie in de "waste zone" (BHIP=0.150 bar/m)

Index of figures

Figure 1-1: Location of planned wells with reference to geothermal licences (purple: production licence, green: exploration licence) and nearby geothermal doublets (producers in red, injectors in blue).	10
Figure 2-1: Maximum allowable injection rate and THP <i>without allowing thermal fracturing</i> for Polanen Delft formation, as a function of THT.	12
Figure 3-1: Bowtie diagram for the formation of a sizeable fracture in the Delft formation. Please also see Figure 3-2.	13
Figure 3-2: Bowtie diagram for water & gas leakage towards ground water levels once a sizeable fracture has formed in the Delft formation. Please also see Figure 3-1.	13
Figure 3-3: Hall plot of injection data in Oman.	16
Figure 3-4: Example of derivative plot from an injection fall-off test including interpretation (Oman).	17
Figure 3-5: Example of IFO derivative plots performed over a couple of months (Siberia).	18
Figure 3-6: Principle of a warm-back survey.	18
Figure 3-7: Example of warm-back surveys performed over a couple of months (Siberia, same case as Figure 3-5).	19
Figure 4-1: Depth map of top reservoir with the well trajectories of the planned doublet and other nearby wells. White squares indicate well penetration points at top reservoir. Geothermal licences (purple: production licence, green: exploration licence) and reservoir faults (grey) are indicated.	21
Figure 4-2: Sequence stratigraphic scheme for the Lower Cretaceous of the West Netherlands Basin based on seismic and biostratigraphic data (Den Hartog Jager, 1996). The target reservoirs of the Polanen doublet are the Cretaceous fluvial sands of the Delft Sandstone Member.	22
Figure 4-3: Regional correlation panel showing the gamma ray logs (non-normalised) flattened with respect to the top Rodenrijs Member. Also shown is the INPEFA log (black curve). The inlay map shows the location of the wells used, connected by the red, dashed line.	23
Figure 4-4: Minimum in-situ stress versus depth trend in the West Netherlands Basin area based on Formation Integrity Tests (FIT) / Leak-Off Tests (Verweij et al, 2012). Red-dashed line: trend line based on leak-off tests. Black-dashed line: trend line of 0.158 bar/m.	25
Figure 4-5: Minimum in-situ stress versus depth trend in the West Netherlands Basin area based on Formation Integrity Tests (FIT) / Leak-Off Tests from wells in the neighborhood of Polanen.	26
Figure 4-6: Minimum in-situ stress gradient in the Delft sandstone and overlying layers following injection of cold (35°C) water into the Delft, as a function of time after start of injection. Sodm limit: 0.135 bar/m for cooling up to 40°C, which has to be lowered by 1 bar per degree beyond 40°C.	26
Figure 5-1: Stratigraphic scheme.	30
Figure 6-1: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for base case. Fracture remains small & entirely within the injection zone.	31
Figure 6-2: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and injection Bottom Hole Pressure (BHP) for base case.	32





Figure 6-3: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 1. Fracture remains small (5 m), it penetrates 3 m into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.165 bar/m.	33
Figure 6-5: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 1. Fracture remains small (5 m), it penetrates 3 m into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.165 bar/m.	34
Figure 6-6: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 2. Fracture of 45 m radius after 30 years of injection, penetrating into water zone and overlying Rodenrijs shale. BHIP = 0.157 bar/m.	34
Figure 6-7: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 2. Fracture of 45 m radius after 30 years of injection, penetrating into water zone and overlying Rodenrijs shale. BHIP = 0.157 bar/m.	34
Figure 6-8: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 3. Fracture with 10 m radius and 8 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.129 bar/m.	35
Figure 6-9: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 3. . Fracture with 10 m radius and 8 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.129 bar/m.	35
Figure 6-10: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 4. Fracture with 0.8 m radius which remains entirely in the Delft formation. BHIP = 0.232 bar/m.	36
Figure 6-11: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 4. . Fracture with 0.8 m radius which remains entirely in the Delft formation. BHIP = 0.232 bar/m.	36
Figure 6-12: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 5. Fracture with 3.5 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.168 bar/m.	37
Figure 6-13: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 5. Fracture with 3.5 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.168 bar/m.	37
Figure 6-14: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 6. Fracture with 4 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.150 bar/m.	38
Figure 6-15: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 6. Fracture with 4 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.150 bar/m.	38




Index of tables

Table 5-1: Overview of layers used in the model plus their physical parameters. Note that the permeability in the Delft is N/G corrected.	29
Table 6-1: Injection into Delft: Sensitivities+Results.	32

Contents

Nederlandse samenvatting	3
Index of figures	5
Index of tables.....	7
Contents.....	8
1 Introduction	10
1.1 General	10
1.2 Objectives	11
1.3 Organisation of report	11
2 Injection under matrix conditions	12
3 Description of mechanisms that can affect the integrity of the seal	13
3.1 Mechanisms and risks	13
3.2 Management of risks	15
3.2.1 Hall plot	15
3.2.2 Injection fall-off (IFO) test	16
3.2.3 Temperature log (warm-back survey)	18
3.2.4 Summary.....	19
4 Description of the seal and uncertainties	20
4.1 Geological structure and stratigraphy	20
4.1.1 Geological structure	20
4.1.2 Stratigraphy	21
4.2 In-situ stress estimate	24
4.3 Physical rock parameters.....	27
4.3.1 Permeability	27
4.3.2 Thermo-elastic constant.....	27
4.3.3 Poro-elastic constant.....	28
4.3.4 Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio	28
5 Description of the fracture model and uncertainties	29
5.1 Model description	29
5.2 Model uncertainty	29
5.3 Base case/simplified stratigraphy.....	29
5.4 Investigated scenarios	30
6 Modelled expected fractures and uncertainties	31
6.1 Computations of induced fracture dimensions	31
6.1.1 Injection into Delft: Base case	31
6.1.2 Injection into Delft: Sensitivities.....	32
7 Leakage through pre-existing fractures	39
8 Conclusions	40
9 References	41

Appendices.....	42
Appendix A - Short description plus validation of fracture simulator	42
A.1 Description of fractured water injection model.....	42
A.2 Validations.....	43
A.2.1. Validations against other simulators.....	43
A.2.2. Validations against field observations.....	45
A.2.3. Conclusions from validations.....	52
Appendix B - Full input for base case.....	55



1 Introduction

1.1 General

HVC requested PanTerra to investigate whether it would be possible to inject under induced (thermal) fracturing conditions in Polanen. The aim is to inject into the Delft formation, without loss of containment by fracturing into the overlying cap rocks and avoiding possible injection water and/or shallow gas leakage towards ground water. The current maximum allowable matrix injection pressure for geothermal operations *without thermal fracturing* is 0.135 bar/m. This bottom hole pressure corresponding to 0.135 bar/m is allowed for injection temperatures up to 40°C and the bottom hole pressures has to be lowered by 1 bar per degree beyond 40°C (SodM, 2013). Adherence to this guideline may limit injection capacity of the Polanen injector.

The Polanen doublet (see Figure 1-1) is situated in the municipality of Westland. The planned doublet, consisting of producer MON-GT-01 and injector MON-GT-02, is located within the Monster 2 exploration license, northwest to several other geothermal doublets (HON-GT, PLD-GT). The target reservoir is the Delft Sandstone Member, which also is the main target of the other doublets in this region.




Figure 1-1: Location of planned wells with reference to geothermal licences (purple: production licence, green: exploration licence) and nearby geothermal doublets (producers in red, injectors in blue).

In the current study, simulations of cold water injection under both matrix and fracturing conditions have been carried out. Simulations of injection under matrix conditions have been carried out to estimate whether (to which extent) it is possible to achieve target injection rate whilst adhering to the SodM guideline. For situations where matrix injection is not possible, simulations under induced fracturing conditions have been carried out to estimate the degree of induced fracture growth into the overlying caprock for a range of uncertain parameters. Both types of simulations result in recommendations for a safe injection policy including a program of monitoring and control. Both matrix and fracture simulations cover the impact of cold water injection over the entire field life period of 30 years.

Fracture simulations have been performed using the methodology of Gheissary (1998) and van den Hoek (1999, 2000). This is an extension of the Koning method (Koning, 1988) that is also used by TNO (Veldkamp et al., 2016), including more complicated geologies with multiple layers of reservoir and cap rock.

1.2 Objectives

Within the SodM protocol for maximum injection pressures (SodM, 2013), the intention of limiting the pressure is to safeguard the environment of the injection well. The principle of ‘containment’ and ‘confinement’ describes the limits of the sphere of influence of the doublet. In the licensed volume (the container) it is acceptable that on a limited scale (by temperature effects) fractures are induced to layers other than the formation in which injected. However, it must be demonstrated that the integrity of the overlying layers that have been defined as seals (confinement) is not affected. Also the induced fractures, and thus the flow of injected cold water, have to remain within the areal limits of the permit.

More recently a “toezichtsignaal Integriteit van het geothermisch reservoir en de afsluitende lagen” (SodM, 2020) was published by SodM in which it was explicitly stated that induced fractures shall not at all penetrate from the reservoir into adjacent cap- or baserock. However, it is noted that deviations from the methodology can be allowed if operations can be performed safely.

The current work is aimed at investigating whether in the presence of induced (thermal) fractures, the injected water in Polanen is still contained as mentioned in the SodM protocol (2013) and the “toezichtsignaal”. This applies to injection into the Delft formation.

In summary, the objectives of the current study are:

1. Prevent the risk of unacceptable/ uncontrolled induced fracture growth into the cap rock, by:
2. Establishing responsible limits for injection parameters in relation cap rock and reservoir
3. Providing methodologies to monitor whether the operation is still safe (in view of uncertainties)
4. Provide mitigation methods in situations where there are indications for unacceptable fracture growth

1.3 Organisation of report

The report is organised as follows.

Chapter 2 provides a baseline estimate of whether it will be possible to achieve target injection rate under matrix injection conditions over the entire field life.

Chapter 3 describes the mechanisms that can affect the integrity of the seal when injecting under induced fracturing conditions.

2 Injection under matrix conditions

For Polanen, the reservoir temperature is 86°C at a true vertical depth (TVD) of 2276 m. Using the SodM criteria as mentioned above, the maximum allowable injection rate and tubing head pressure (THP) that avoids thermal fracturing are given in Figure 2-1.




Figure 2-1: Maximum allowable injection rate and THP *without allowing thermal fracturing* for Polanen Delft formation, as a function of THT.

The figure shows that with an injection temperature of 35°C (51°C cooling), the maximum allowable injection rate is around 340 m³/hr. This is slightly above the intended target injection rate of 310 m³/hr. Therefore, in theory it should be possible to inject under matrix conditions. However, in view of uncertainties, e.g. related to formation permeability and/or injection water quality, maintaining matrix injection during the entire field life cannot be fully guaranteed.

3 Description of mechanisms that can affect the integrity of the seal

3.1 Mechanisms and risks

The risk of affecting seal integrity can be subdivided into two risks:

1. The risk of creating a sizeable induced fracture in the reservoir rock (Delft)
2. Once a sizeable fracture has been created, the risk of upward fracture growth into the seal and possibly beyond, with the ultimate consequence of leaking water and (shallow) gas getting into contact with the ground water.

Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2 show bowtie diagrams for both of these risks. Please note that both diagrams are linked.




Figure 3-1: Bowtie diagram for the formation of a sizeable fracture in the Delft formation. Please also see Figure 3-2.




Figure 3-2: Bowtie diagram for water & gas leakage towards ground water levels once a sizeable fracture has formed in the Delft formation. Please also see Figure 3-1.

In general, the following mechanisms could affect integrity of the seal:

1. Large induced fractures carry a greater risk to grow significantly upwards into the seal. Large induced fractures are primarily a consequence of low $k.h$ of the formation in relation to target injection rate (Figure 3-1). A first indication of this risk is provided by a figure of the type of Figure 2-1: if the maximum allowable injection rate for matrix injection (i.e. for injection pressure below the SodM limit) is significantly below the target injection rate, this may be an indication of large induced fractures when injecting at target rate. One option in a situation like this one is to reduce injection pressure to a value below the SodM limit, but, as discussed in the introduction, this may render a project uneconomical.
2. Another mechanism that can contribute to large(r) fractures is a low fracturing pressure (Figure 3-1). This can be the consequence of a low virgin minimum in-situ total stress (mostly significantly below the value of 0.158 bar/m for an extensional regime), often in combination with significant cooling (with respect to reservoir temperature) and hard rock (meaning a high value of the thermo-elastic constant A_T). The fracturing pressure for cold water injection can be established by a step rate test. Also, analysis of operational injection data can provide an idea of whether one is injecting under induced fracturing conditions, and if yes, the fracturing pressure. This will be further discussed in the chapter about monitoring below.
3. Poor injection water quality is well-known to be a cause of large induced fractures (Figure 3-1). This is particularly pronounced for injection disposal of produced water. However, in the Dutch geothermal operations, water is injected back into the same reservoir without exposure to air, and therefore formation plugging by 'poor' quality water (including chemical incompatibility effects) is mostly absent. This has been verified by long-term injection monitoring in a number of Dutch geothermal operations.
4. Finally, large induced fractures can be the result of local reservoir pressurisation around the injector (Figure 3-1). This will typically happen when there is poor reservoir connectivity (e.g. sealing fault) between injector and producer of a doublet. Such a poor reservoir connectivity should have been established upfront by interference testing.
5. Large fractures as described above are a 'requirement' in order to have significant growth into the seal. However, even in the case of large fractures, growth into the seal may be very limited provided there is a good stress contrast between those layers (Figure 3-2). For example, when the cap rock consists of (e.g. Zechstein) salt, the stress contrast is mostly sufficiently large to prevent any substantial upward fracture growth. Very often the cap rock consists of shale. Although shales generally have a higher virgin horizontal stress than sandstones (because of higher Poisson's ratio), the resulting stress contrasts between sand and shale is often not enough to contain the fracture to the sandstone. Moreover, sand-shale stress contrasts are generally very uncertain and cannot be reliably obtained except by proper in-situ measurements (e.g. microfrac test). Therefore, in simulations we generally take the conservative value of zero sand-shale stress contrast.
6. Injection of cold water into a sandstone will lead to rapid cooling of this sandstone, whereas the overlying shale remains at virgin temperature. Therefore, even in the absence of any virgin sand-shale stress contrast, the cooling-induced stress contrast can help partial fracture containment to the sandstone reservoir (Figure 3-2). However, over time, the bottom part of the overlying shale will start

to cool as well owing to thermal diffusion, and this may lead to additional fracture extension into the bottom part of the shale (Figure 3-2). Typically, for 30-year injection about 30 m at the bottom of the caprock shale has been cooled and may also be fractured. This provides an upper limit to the upward fracture growth for large induced fractures, provided the cooling provides for enough stress contrast between sand and shale.

7. Apart from in-situ stress contrast, there may be other differences in layer properties that could (help) contain the induced fracture to the reservoir. Over the decades, there has been a lot of debate amongst experts on this point. Although the debate is still ongoing, it is generally agreed that only in-situ stress contrasts can (help) contain induced fractures with sufficient certainty. Although other physical properties (e.g. Young's modulus contrast, permeability contrast, certain properties of interfaces between layers, etc.) have been demonstrated to be effective in certain situations, the scatter in the data is too large to come up with any definitive conclusions.
8. Finally, a word about injection pressure. Generally, it can be stated that the higher the injection pressure, the higher the risk of induced fracturing. However, apart from the (conservative) SodM limit, it is not possible to define one specific injection pressure limit below which there will be no (excessive) fracturing. This is because fracturing pressure for (cold) water injection is not one steady number that will never ever change. By contrast, apart from minimum in-situ stress, temperature difference and thermo-elastic constant, it depends on the current operation (injection versus shut-in), operational history, current size of the induced fracture, and reservoir geometry. For example, under steady-state injection there is a poro-elastic contribution to the fracturing pressure that pushes it upwards, and this can be significant especially for small fractures. On the other hand, after a shut-in, the 'pressure mountain' around an injector has dissipated into the reservoir and fracturing pressure is lower. Therefore, if one wants to use an upper limit to the injection pressure for 'safe' injection, a conservative number should be used which is provided by the SodM guideline. On top of that, it is always recommended to regularly monitor and interpret injection data in order to verify whether one is injecting under matrix conditions or under fracturing conditions (see next paragraph).

3.2 Management of risks

The risk of sizeable fracture growth with possible loss of containment can be managed by a number of monitoring methods. These monitoring results can form the basis of further action (e.g. bean back) when required. In the text below, a number of monitoring methods is explained that can be performed during operation of the geothermal project. It is assumed that proper upfront data collection about the reservoir (in particular, k.h and connectivity through well test / interference test) has been carried out.

3.2.1 Hall plot

The Hall plot is a simple method to help spot changes in injectivity over time, and in particular whether induced fracturing is taking place or not. The slope of the Hall plot is an indication of the inverse injectivity. That is, a low Hall plot slope means high injectivity and vice versa. In order to observe the signature of fractured injection, one needs to plot the Hall plot and the injection rate on the same graph, see Figure 3-3 for an example. Injection under fracturing conditions can be observed from the correlation that lower injection rates lead to higher Hall plot slopes and vice versa. This can be understood by realizing that the Hall slope is roughly defined as (injection pressure) divided by (injection rate). When the injection rate is reduced, the fracture shrinks but the injection pressure remains the same (being the fracture propagation

pressure). As a result, the Hall slope will increase. Similarly, increasing injection rate will result in a lowering of the Hall plot slope. In order to help spot changes in the Hall plot slope, a derivative is also included.




Figure 3-3: Hall plot of injection data in Oman.

For geothermal operations, the Hall plot slope can also be correlated to injection temperature to spot possible fracturing: a lower (instead of higher) Hall plot slope for lower injection temperature points in this direction. This was indeed observed in a number of geothermal cases in West Netherlands. The Hall plot methodology is being routinely applied by at least one geothermal operator in the Netherlands.

3.2.2 Injection fall-off (IFO) test

Once a Hall plot analysis points convincingly in the direction of (sustained) induced fracturing, an injection fall-off test can be carried out to estimate the size (length, height) of the induced fracture. A field example (derivative plot) is shown in Figure 3-4.

The derivative plot of an IFO test has a number of characteristic features:

- Short time: Slope on a log-log plot is equal to one: “storage dominated”. For IFO, this is mainly the storage of the closing fracture. From this part, the fracture length and height are derived using the technique of *SPEPE Journal*, October 2005, 377-387.
- After the storage period, the slope of the pressure derivative curve often increases to a peak value. This is the period of a shrinking (receding) fracture which precedes complete fracture closure (see *SPEPE Journal*, February 2017, 1-17). The top of the “hump” is generally associated with complete fracture closure

- After the hump has dropped, the derivative is characterised by a horizontal line. This is called “radial flow” in the reservoir and from this part the quantity $k \cdot h$ can be derived.
- At the end of the radial flow period, it can be seen that for this field example, the pressure derivative slowly increases to a higher value. This is because the injection water displaces crude which has a lower mobility and therefore corresponds to a higher level of the horizontal line of the pressure derivative (this particular example).




Figure 3-4: Example of derivative plot from an injection fall-off test including interpretation (Oman).

The IFO method allows one to estimate the size of the induced fracture and from that, to assess whether (significant) out-of-zone growth into the caprock could have taken place or not. Figure 3-5 shows a set of IFO tests performed over a period of a few months during a waterflood operation. Clearly, the impact of fracture growth can be observed.




Figure 3-5: Example of IFO derivative plots performed over a couple of months (Siberia).

Based on (an) IFO measurement(s) (and possible trends therein), it can be decided to lower injection rate if significant fracture growth is observed.

3.2.3 Temperature log (warm-back survey)

If monitoring results appear to indicate that indeed sizeable fractures have been created, it may be required to 'explicitly' measure upward fracture growth. This can be done by means of a temperature log. The principle is explained in Figure 3-6.




Figure 3-6: Principle of a warm-back survey.

The warmback survey consists of running a temperature log (which measures the temperature profile along the borehole) at different times after injector shut-in. What will happen is that zones that have not been flooded with (cold) injection water will warm back quickly, leaving a distinct "temperature valley" where water has flooded the reservoir. The blue, pink and red curves in the right-hand log plot show the temperature profile measured at subsequent periods after shut-in, clearly illustrating the principle.

It is important to realize that a temperature log gives a far superior measurement of which zones have been flooded than a PLT. The PLT only shows where the water leaves the well, which is different from where it floods the formation. For example, the water injection can induce a fracture which propagates into an overlying zone away from the wellbore. In such a situation, the PLT will suggest that you are flooding the right zone, whilst the temperature log / warm-back survey will show you that you are flooding the wrong zone. This is actually what was observed at some stage in the BP waterfloods in the Prudhoe Bay field in Alaska.

The combination of warmback surveys and IFO is considered to be a very powerful way of monitoring induced fracture growth during waterfloods. An illustration is given in Figure 3-7, showing warm-back surveys over time for the same operation as the IFO results in Figure 3-5. Clearly, the IFO's and warm-back surveys indicate the presence of an induced fracture growing (modestly) upward from the reservoir into the overlying cap rock.




Figure 3-7: Example of warm-back surveys performed over a couple of months (Siberia, same case as Figure 3-5).

3.2.4 Summary

In summary, it is recommended to carry out Hall plot analyses on a routine basis, based on day-to-day injection data. IFO testing may be required if Hall plot analysis indicates the presence of induced fractures, though in general it is recommended to do this anyway in the early phase of the operation. Warm-back surveys will generally not be required, provided the combination Hall plot / IFO shows that induced fractures remain small.


4 Description of the seal and uncertainties

4.1 Geological structure and stratigraphy

4.1.1 Geological structure

A geological study of the subsurface of Polanen was performed in 2018 (PanTerra, 2018), based on which a SDE+ subsidy application was performed and approved. In 2020, a seismic reinterpretation was performed (PanTerra, 2020), which is the basis of current depth and thickness model. Reservoir properties are still based on the geological study of 2018.

The Polanen doublet will be situated in the West Netherlands Basin, which is an inverted rift basin (De Jager et al, 1996). Sediments in this basin range in age from Jurassic to recent and are overlying Triassic and older sediments. In the Late Cretaceous, during the deposition of the Chalk Group, the West Netherlands Basin was inverted. This was accompanied by compressional movements and resulted in convergent oblique-slip faulting, general uplift, erosion and basin inversion, which reactivated pre-existing normal faults. The major tectonic feature in the region of the license is a NW-SE trending inverted 'pop-up' anticline. The structure is bounded by two faults (Figure 4-1).






Figure 4-1: Depth map of top reservoir with the well trajectories of the planned doublet and other nearby wells. White squares indicate well penetration points at top reservoir. Geothermal licences (purple: production licence, green: exploration licence) and reservoir faults (grey) are indicated.

At reservoir level, injector MON-GT-02 is located approximately 625-725 m away from faults. Producer MON-GT-01 is planned approximately 200-500 m away from the nearest fault, a N-S oriented fault west of MON-GT-01. No faults are observed between the two wells. The two major faults bounding the structure are regarded as sealing because of their large throw. Possible subseismic faults are unlikely to be sealing since the reservoir thickness is greater than the seismic resolution.

4.1.2 Stratigraphy

The target reservoir are the Early Cretaceous fluvial sands of the Delft Sandstone Member. A schematic overview of the sequence stratigraphy of these fluviomarine deposits is depicted in Figure 4-2.




Figure 4-2: Sequence stratigraphic scheme for the Lower Cretaceous of the West Netherlands Basin based on seismic and biostratigraphic data (Den Hartog Jager, 1996). The target reservoirs of the Polanen doublet are the Cretaceous fluvial sands of the Delft Sandstone Member.

Figure 4-3 shows the gamma ray (GR) log of representative wells that are in close proximity to the planned Polanen doublet. The GR reveals the sandy intervals in the wells. The Delft Sandstone Member is overlying the alternating sands and shales of the Alblasterdam Member and is overlain by the shales of the Rodenrijs Claystone Member. Together these members form the Nieuwerkerk Formation. GR logs from previously drilled wells at the nearby MON, HON-GT and NLW-GT sites confirm all the target and sealing intervals are laterally continuous (Figure 4-3).




Figure 4-3: Regional correlation panel showing the gamma ray logs (non-normalised) flattened with respect to the top Rodenrijs Member. Also shown is the INPEFA log (black curve). The inlay map shows the location of the wells used, connected by the red, dashed line.

4.1.2.1 Reservoir: Delft Sandstone Member (SLDND)

Within the heterogeneous Nieuwerkerk Formation, the Delft Sandstone Member has the best reservoir properties. The character of the Delft Sandstone Member, however, is quite varying in terms of thickness and sand distribution. The MON-02 and MON-03 wells have relatively thin sections of the Delft Sandstone reservoir when compared to the other wells in the area. The base of the Delft Sandstone Mb as well as the Ablasserdam Mb appear to be absent in these wells. This is due to their location relative to the local half graben. The seismic shows a lot of faulting around these wells, so it is possible that part of the lower sections have been faulted out. At Polanen, the target reservoir is very permeable (550 mD) and is estimated to have a high net-to-gross ratio of 93% (Panterra, 2018). The thickness map in the area of interest shows a general thickening trend of the reservoir towards the Southeast, i.e., towards HON-GT and PLD-GT, within the target fault block (PanTerra, 2020). At Polanen, the target reservoir is estimated to be ~47m thick.

4.1.2.2 Seal: Upper Rodenrijs Claystone Member (SLDNR)

The Delft Sandstone Member is overlain by shales of the Rodenrijs Claystone Member that act as the main sealing interval for the entire Nieuwerkerk Formation. The entire Rodenrijs Claystone Member is estimated to be ~71m thick at Polanen (PanTerra, 2020).

Drilling of offset wells reveals that especially the upper part of the Rodenrijs Claystone Member consists of a good quality shaly package that is laterally continuous (Figure 4-3). This upper part is regarded as the seal, and takes up about 2/3rd of the total Rodenrijs thickness at the nearest wells at MON and HON-GT sites.


4.1.2.3 Waste zone: Lower Rodenrijs Claystone Member (SLDNR)

The lower part of the Rodenrijs Claystone Member is less shaly and likely acts as a “wastezone” as it is neither a good seal nor reservoir. It can be clearly distinguished from the Upper part of the Rodenrijs on logs due to its irregular GR signature as it consists of alternating shaly and sandy intervals. Within the wastezone some very thin sands could be encountered as seen in Figure 4-2 and illustrated in Figure 4-3. Some wellsite geologist ascribe the “wastezone” to the Alblasserdam Member if the Delft Sandstone Member, which is a clean sand package, is not present, as this zone can under these circumstances not be distinguished from the Upper Alblasserdam that has similar characteristics.

4.2 In-situ stress estimate

In-situ stress trends are mostly based on measured leak-off pressures as reported by Verweij et al. (2012). These authors distinguished a number of different geological areas within the Netherlands. For each of these areas, an in-situ stress trend map was generated. The geological area that is relevant for the current discussion is the so-called West Netherlands Basin for which the data are given in Figure 4-4. This figure displays measured Formation Integrity Tests (FIT) / leak-off pressure tests (LOT) as a function of depth in the West Netherlands platform area.

Until a depth of around 1500 m, the trend closely follows the well-known minimum in-situ stress gradient of 0.158 bar/m (0.7 psi/ft) for an extensional stress regime, whilst at greater depths it starts to bend somewhat towards higher stresses.






Figure 4-4: Minimum in-situ stress versus depth trend in the West Netherlands Basin area based on Formation Integrity Tests (FIT) / Leak-Off Tests (Verweij et al, 2012). Red-dashed line: trend line based on leak-off tests. Black-dashed line: trend line of 0.158 bar/m.

From the dataset shown in Figure 4-4, a subset was chosen from wells in the neighborhood of Polanen. The wells chosen plus the resulting stress trend are displayed in Figure 4-5. As can be seen, the baseline trend falls more or less on top of the well-known trend of 0.158 bar/m for an extensional stress regime, with a standard deviation of 0.02 bar/m.

The caprocks immediately above the target injection zone (Delft) consist of shale. As explained earlier in chapter 3, although shales generally have a higher virgin horizontal stress than sandstones (because of higher Poisson's ratio), the resulting stress contrasts between sand and shale is often not enough to contain the fracture to the sandstone. Moreover, sand-shale stress contrasts are generally very uncertain and cannot be reliably obtained except by proper in-situ measurements (e.g. microfrac test). Therefore, in the simulations presented below, we take the conservative value of zero sand-shale stress contrast as a base case.




Figure 4-5: Minimum in-situ stress versus depth trend in the West Netherlands Basin area based on Formation Integrity Tests (FIT) / Leak-Off Tests from wells in the neighborhood of Polanen.

During injection, the Delft sandstone will be flooded with cold water and therefore its horizontal stress will lower owing to the thermo-elastic effect. In the area around the injector, this (almost instantaneously) creates an in-situ stress contrast with the overlying layers, see Figure 4-6. Over time, as a result of thermal diffusion, the overlying layers will start to slowly cool as well, resulting in a (partial) lowering of the horizontal stress gradient in these layers (Figure 4-6). At the end of the field life (30 yrs), the waste zone is at almost the same stress as the Delft, whilst the overlying Rodenrijs claystone still has maintained most of its stress contrast with the Delft formation.




Figure 4-6: Minimum in-situ stress gradient in the Delft sandstone and overlying layers following injection of cold (35°C) water into the Delft, as a function of time after start of injection. Sodm limit: 0.135 bar/m for cooling up to 40°C, which has to be lowered by 1 bar per degree beyond 40°C.

One final point to be noted from Figure 4-6 is that the SodM safe injection limit (0.13 bar/m) is somewhat lower than the horizontal stress gradient after cooling (0.135 bar/m).

4.3 Physical rock parameters

4.3.1 Permeability

As mentioned in chapter 3 above, for fracture containment around an injector in a geothermal setting, the most critical physical rock parameter is permeability. High(er) permeability leads to small(er) fractures, whereas low(er) permeability leads to large(r) fractures. Resulting fracture dimensions can differ up to several orders of magnitude when going from high to low formation permeabilities.

4.3.2 Thermo-elastic constant

In response to temperature changes, the reservoir rock will tend to expand (heating) or shrink (cooling). Because in the subsurface there is no 'room' in the horizontal direction to expand or shrink ('plane strain'), this results in a change of total horizontal stress that is given by

$$\Delta\sigma_h = A_T \cdot \Delta T \quad (1)$$

where ΔT is the temperature change (negative for cooling) and A_T is the "thermo-elastic constant" (in bar/°C). Equation (1) is only valid if the entire reservoir has been cooled. When only part of the reservoir has been cooled, a geometry correction factor is applied. This geometry correction factor is also included in the fracture simulator.

The thermo-elastic constant is a material property of the rock. Under the assumption of perfectly elastic behaviour of the rock, both at matrix level and at grain level, this constant can be expressed as

$$A_T = \frac{\alpha E}{1-\nu} \quad (2)$$

where

- α is the linear thermal expansion coefficient (in °C⁻¹)
- E is Young's modulus (in bar)
- ν is Poisson's ratio (dimensionless)

suggesting that A_T is linearly proportional to Young's modulus E if the thermal expansion coefficient α is assumed equal for all types of rocks under all circumstances (stress, temperature, ...).

Not many measurements of this constant have been carried out. Koning (1988) and Perkins and Gonzalez (1985) used values for A_T in the range 0.9-1.0 bar/°C for 'medium-strength' reservoir sandstones with Young's moduli in the range 10-15 GPa. For deep, tight rocks (> 10000 ft TVD), values of A_T in the range 1.5-2.0 bar/°C have been used in a number of oil field studies with waterflooding, both in Prudhoe Bay, Alaska (Stevens et al, 2000) and in the North Sea (Svendson et al, 1991, Santarelli et al, 2008). On the other hand, in the Eider oil field, North Sea (~9000 ft TVD) a value of $A_T = 0.6$ bar/°C was derived based on step-rate tests, whilst in a carbonate / mudstone reservoir in the Middle East (~6500 ft TVD), a range of 0.4-0.9 bar/°C was measured on different core plugs. From the above we derive an average value for A_T of $\sim 1.0 \pm 0.5$ bar/°C, which may increase up to ~ 2.0 bar/°C for (very) tight rocks. In the current study a value of 1.0 ± 0.5 bar/°C is used.

4.3.3 Poro-elastic constant

In response to pressure changes, the reservoir rock will tend to expand (pressurisation) or shrink (depletion). Because in the subsurface there is no 'room' in the horizontal direction to expand or shrink ('plane strain'), this results in a change of total horizontal stress that is given by

$$\Delta\sigma_h = A_p \cdot \Delta p \quad (3)$$

where Δp is the pressure change (negative for depletion) and A_p is the "poro-elastic constant" (dimensionless). Equation (3) is only valid if the entire reservoir has been pressurised or depleted. When only part of the reservoir has been pressurised / depleted, a geometry correction factor is applied. This geometry correction factor is also included in the fracture simulator.

The poro-elastic constant is a material property of the rock. Under the assumption of perfectly elastic behaviour of the rock, both at matrix level and at grain level, this constant can be expressed as

$$A_p = (1 - \beta) \frac{1-2\nu}{1-\nu} \quad (4)$$

where


- $\beta = \frac{K_m}{K_s}$
- K_m is the bulk modulus of the rock matrix (bar)
- K_s is the bulk modulus of the solid rock grains (bar)

In practice, the above equation is only of qualitative value. Laboratory tests have shown that A_p often deviates significantly from the formula (4). Typical values are in the range 0.5-0.8. In the current study a value of 0.6 is used. Contrary to the thermo-elastic constant A_T , the value used for A_p is less critical because in a typical geothermal doublet, only a very small area around the injector is pressurised and only a small area around the producer is "depleted". On the other hand, a significant area around the injector will be cooled during the field life, thus making the parameter A_T a more critical one.

4.3.4 Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio

Fracture dimensions are only indirectly dependent on Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio, i.e. only variations in these parameters between different geological layers can help (temporarily) contain fractures. First, contrast in Young's modulus / Poisson's ratio between different layers can result in stress concentrations when the fracture tip approaches a layer boundary, and this can retard vertical fracture growth. This mechanism is included on the fracture simulator. Secondly, contrast in Young's modulus / Poisson's ratio between different layers could result in different thermo-elastic stress changes for different layers, see equation (1). One problem with simulating this effect is that the thermal expansion coefficients α for the different layers are unknown, and therefore estimation of A_T for each layer is difficult. Because of this problem, in the current study the impact of layering on A_T has not been addressed.

Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio for all layers were derived from compressional and shear sonic logs measured in Trias Westland wells GT01 and GT03.



5 Description of the fracture model and uncertainties

5.1 Model description

Fracture simulations were performed using the methodology of Gheissary (1998) and van den Hoek (1999,2000). This is an extension of the Koning method (Koning, 1988) that is also used by TNO (Veldkamp et al., 2016), including more complicated geologies with multiple layers of reservoir and cap rock. This model was extensively applied in the field, and also validated against other models and against field data (see Appendix A for a more detailed overview of the applications and validations).

5.2 Model uncertainty

The main shortcoming of the simulator is that it uses an assumed fracture shape (planar vertical fracture consisting of two vertical half-ellipses). Thus, a horizontally symmetric fracture around the injection point is assumed. In practice, this shortcoming has turned out to be of limited consequence (i.e. limited with respect to geological and parameter uncertainties), as was shown by many validations. A number of these validations is presented in Appendix A.

5.3 Base case/simplified stratigraphy

The simplified stratigraphy as used in the fracture simulations is depicted in Figure 5-1. Stratigraphic depths are taken from the planned injector MON-GT-02. An overview of the geological input parameters for the base case is shown in Table 5-1. Permeabilities for the Delft sandstone are $k = 550$ mD with $N/G = 0.93$ (Panterra, 2018). Permeabilities of all other layers are from ThermoGIS.

In the base case, injection takes place at $310 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr}$ at an injection point 2 m below the top of the reservoir (Delft).

A listing of all input parameters used for the base case is provided in Appendix B.

Table 5-1: Overview of layers used in the model plus their physical parameters. Note that the permeability in the Delft is N/G corrected.

Layer name	Depth at top (m)	Depth at bottom (m)	Stress at top (Mpa)	Stress at bottom (Mpa)	Stress gradient (kPa/m)	Form. pressure at top (Mpa)	Form. pressure at bottom (Mpa)	Form. pressure gradient (kPa/m)	Permeability (mD)	Porosity (fraction)	Young's modulus (MPa)	Poisson's ratio
North Sea	0	649	0.0	10.2	15.8	0.0	6.9	10.7	436	0.3	5913	0.19
Chalk	649	1102	10.2	17.4	15.8	6.9	11.8	10.7	1	0.05	3220	0.03
Holland	1102	1714	17.4	27.1	15.8	11.8	18.3	10.7	7	0.15	3792	0.13
De Lier sandstone / Vlieland claystone	1714	1777	27.1	28.1	15.8	18.3	19.0	10.7	1	0.15	14796	0.28
Berkel sandstone	1777	1799	28.1	28.4	15.8	19.0	19.3	10.7	2	0.15	17191	0.27
Berkel sand-claystone	1799	2192	28.4	34.6	15.8	19.3	23.5	10.7	0.1	0.2	15914	0.28
Rijswijk sandstone	2192	2205	34.6	34.8	15.8	23.5	23.6	10.7	10	0.15	18466	0.28
Rodenrijs claystone	2205	2256	34.8	35.6	15.8	23.6	24.1	10.7	0.1	0.2	5030	0.32
Waste zone	2256	2276	35.6	36.0	15.8	24.1	24.4	10.7	10	0.15	16711	0.29
Delft	2276	2323	36.0	36.7	15.8	24.4	24.9	10.7	511.5	0.17	19260	0.23
Alblasserdam	2323	2561	36.7	40.5	15.8	24.9	27.4	10.7	234	0.15	20644	0.25
Underburden	2561	10000	40.5	158.0	15.8	27.4	107.0	10.7	0.1	0.15	20644	0.25




Figure 5-1: Stratigraphic scheme.

5.4 Investigated scenarios

The following sensitivities have been addressed:

No	Description	Motivation
1	Low permeability (307 mD)	Lower bound of permeability uncertainty
2	Skin by contaminated injection water	Based on injection well test in Trias-Westland GT-04
3	Low in-situ stress gradient (0.138 bar/m)	See 4.2
4	High in-situ stress gradient (0.178 bar/m)	See 4.2
5	Injection rate 415 m ³ /hr	Upper bound of planned injection rate because of seasonal variations
6	Thermo-elastic constant $A_T = 1.5 \text{ bar/}^\circ\text{C}$	See 4.3.2

6 Modelled expected fractures and uncertainties

6.1 Computations of induced fracture dimensions

6.1.1 Injection into Delft: Base case

Results for the base case are shown in Figure 6-1 and Figure 6-2. In this case, the induced fracture initiates from the top at 2278 m (i.e., 2 m below the Top Delft as described in section 5) and grows slowly up towards the boundary with the overlying waste zone at 2276 m, although it does not grow into the waste zone. The resulting fracture after 30 years of injection is about 2 m long. This is in line with the fact that for 310 m³/hr, it is just about possible to inject under matrix conditions (see Figure 2-1). In this context, it should be remarked that the fracture propagation model does not take into account the impact of fluid loss into the formation via the wellbore. The simulated fracture of 2 m radius has approximately the same surface area (~ 25 m) as the contact area of the wellbore with the formation (~ 35 m), confirming that in the base case matrix injection is possible.

The computed bottom-hole injection pressure gradient (BHIP) is 0.160 bar/m, which is a stable value after fracture initiation. Note that this is the pressure required to propagate a fracture, and therefore is not representative for matrix injection. This fracture propagation pressure very much depends on initial (pre-injection) in-situ horizontal stress, reservoir pressure profile around the fracture (poro-elastic effect) and temperature around the fracture (thermo-elastic effect).




Figure 6-1: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for base case. Fracture remains small & entirely within the injection zone.




Figure 6-2: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and injection Bottom Hole Pressure (BHP) for base case.

6.1.2 Injection into Delft: Sensitivities

An overview of the addressed sensitivities (also see section 5 above for more information) plus a summary of the results for each sensitivity is given in the table below (Table 6-1). Figure 6-3 to Figure 6-14 show more detailed results.

Table 6-1: Injection into Delft: Sensitivities+Results.

No	Description	Results after 30 years of injection
1	Low permeability (307 mD)	Fracture with 5 m radius and 3 m (15%) penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.165 bar/m.
2	Skin by contaminated injection water	Fracture of 45 m radius, penetrates into waste zone (100%) and overlying Rodenrijs shale (40%). BHIP = 0.157 bar/m.
3	Low in-situ stress gradient (0.138 bar/m)	Fracture with 10 m radius and 8 m (40%) penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.129 bar/m.
4	High in-situ stress gradient (0.178 bar/m)	Fracture with 0.8 m radius which remains entirely in the Delft formation. BHIP = 0.232 bar/m.
5	Injection rate 415 m ³ /hr	Fracture with 3.5 m radius and 2 m (10%) penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.168 bar/m.
6	Thermo-elastic constant $A_T = 1.5 \text{ bar/}^\circ\text{C}$	Fracture with 4 m radius and 2 m (10%) penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.150 bar/m.

From the table and the results as presented in Figure 6-1 to Figure 6-14, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Except for the case of contaminated injection water (see below for discussion), induced fractures for all cases remain small (< 10 m), with only a few metre upwards penetration into the waste zone.
- The case of contaminated injection water (sensitivity 2) was based on an injection well test in Trias Westland using water not from the same formation. From this well test, a positive skin of +5 was derived. The results of this well test could be reproduced by assuming slightly contaminated injection water containing a Total Suspended Solids (TSS) concentration of 1 ppm, forming an external filtercake with a permeability of 0.35 mD. Sensitivity 2 conservatively assumes that

injection water of this low quality is injected for 30 years into the formation. However, as experience with geothermal operations in the West of the Netherlands had shown, this is a highly unrealistic assumption, since in all geothermal operations the water is injected back into the same reservoir from where it came. As a result, chemical processes resulting from incompatibility between water and reservoir do not play a role. Moreover, the skin observed in a start-up well test can be often, at least partially, ascribed to drilling- and completion-induced near-wellbore damage. We conclude that this sensitivity (no 2) is unrealistically conservative.

- Computed injection pressures for all cases are high. This is a consequence of the fact that for small fractures, the poro-elastic contribution (see 4.3.3) to the fracture propagation pressure is high. This is because the “geometry correction factor” is high if the fracture is significantly smaller than the pressure front (“pressure mountain”) penetrating the reservoir. This is confirmed by the results presented in table 6-1, where it can be seen that the injection pressure gradient is generally lower for larger fractures. It should be noted that these “high” pressures only apply to the situation of continuous injection. This means that after an extended shut-in, when the pressure mountain around the injector has been able to leak away, the initial fracture propagation pressure will be significantly lower.




Figure 6-3: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 1. Fracture remains small (5 m), it penetrates 3 m into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.165 bar/m.




Figure 6-4 Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 1. Fracture remains small (5 m), it penetrates 3 m into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.165 bar/m.




Figure 6-5: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 2. Fracture of 45 m radius after 30 years of injection, penetrating into water zone and overlying Rodenrijs shale. BHIP = 0.157 bar/m.




Figure 6-6: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 2. Fracture of 45 m radius after 30 years of injection, penetrating into water zone and overlying Rodenrijs shale. BHIP = 0.157 bar/m.




Figure 6-7: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 3. Fracture with 10 m radius and 8 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.129 bar/m.





Figure 6-8: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 3. . Fracture with 10 m radius and 8 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.129 bar/m.






Figure 6-9: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 4. Fracture with 0.8 m radius which remains entirely in the Delft formation. BHIP = 0.232 bar/m.





Figure 6-10: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 4. . Fracture with 0.8 m radius which remains entirely in the Delft formation. BHIP = 0.232 bar/m.






Figure 6-11: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 5. Fracture with 3.5 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.168 bar/m.





Figure 6-12: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 5. Fracture with 3.5 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.168 bar/m.






Figure 6-13: Fracture top and bottom as a function of time for base case; fracture contours for sensitivity 6. Fracture with 4 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.150 bar/m.





Figure 6-14: Fracture length, upward height, downward height, and Bottom Hole Injection Pressure (BHIP) for sensitivity 6. Fracture with 4 m radius and 2 m penetration into the waste zone. BHIP = 0.150 bar/m.



7 Leakage through pre-existing fractures

Apart from leakage through nearby *conductive* fractures and / or faults, leakage through pre-existing fractures can be seen as similar to leakage through fractures that have been created. This is because fractures (when they are created) are there in order to provide surface area through which water can leak away. This study shows that for Polanen, only little fracture surface area may be required in the least favorable conditions (low permeability etc) in order to create enough surface area.

In addition, in general it takes as much pressure to (partially) open closed, nonconducting fractures as there is required to create new fractures. This is because the impact of rock cohesion on fracture propagation pressure is negligible compared the in-situ stress.

In conclusion, insofar as all pre-existing fractures are closed and nonconducting, the conclusions of this report apply to these as well.

8 Conclusions

Reservoir simulations show that in Polanen, injection is expected to be possible under matrix conditions whilst adhering to the SodM guidelines for maximum injection pressure. This is because the target formation (Delft) has a good $k \cdot h$.

In order to capture possible “low” cases (e.g. low formation permeability), induced fracture simulations were carried out to estimate the size and (lack of) containment of induced fractures. These simulations show that for all sensitivities, fractures remain small (< 10 m), with only a few metre upwards penetration into the waste zone overlying the Delft formation.

The only exception to this is a scenario in which prolonged injection of contaminated water (TSS = 1 ppm) is considered. In this case a 40 m fracture with penetration into the waste zone and Rodenrijs claytone is achieved. This scenario is based on an injection well test in Trias Westland using water not from the same formation, in which a positive skin of +5 was derived. However, as experience with geothermal operations in the West of the Netherlands has shown, this is a highly unrealistic assumption, since in all geothermal operations the water is injected back into the same reservoir from where it originates. As a result, chemical processes resulting from incompatibility between injection water and reservoir do not play a role. Moreover, the skin observed in a start-up well test can be often, at least partially, ascribed to drilling- and completion-induced near-wellbore damage.

This report also discusses a strategy of how to manage the risk of induced fracture growth resulting in possible loss of containment. As part of such a strategy, it is recommended to carry out Hall plot analyses on a routine basis, based on day-to-day injection data. IFO testing may be required if Hall plot analysis indicates the presence of induced fractures, though in general it is recommended to do this anyway in the early phase of the operation. Warm-back surveys will generally not be required, provided the combination Hall plot / IFO shows that induced fractures remain small.

The overall risk of loss of containment by induced fracture growth is considered very low for Polanen.

9 References

1. Van den Hoek, P.J., 2005. Dimensions and Degree of Containment of Waterflood-Induced Fractures from Pressure Transient Analysis. SPE Reservoir Evaluation and Engineering Journal, October, 377-387.
2. Van den Hoek, P.J., 2017. A Simple Unified Pressure Transient Analysis Method for Fractured Waterflood Injectors and Minifrac in Hydraulic Fracture Stimulation. SPE Productions and Operations Journal, February 2017, 1-17.
3. Stevens, D.G. and Murray, L.R. Predicting Multiple Thermal Fractures in Horizontal Injection Wells; Coupling of a Wellbore and a Reservoir Simulator, SPE 59354 (2000)
4. Svendsen, A.P., Wright, M.S., Clifford, P.J., and Berry, P.J. Thermally induced fracturing of water injectors. 1991. SPEPE november 1991, 384-390.
5. Perkins and Gonzalez, 1985. The effect of thermoelastic stresses on injection well fracturing, SPEJ February p. 78-88.
6. Koning, E.J.L., 1988. Waterflooding under fracturing conditions, Ph.D. Thesis, Technical University of Delft..
7. Santarelli, F.J., Havmoeller, O., and Naumann M. 2008. Geomechanical aspects of 15 years water injection on a field complex: an anlysis of the past to plan the future. SPE 112944.
8. Gheissary, G. et al. 1998. Simulation of Fractures Induced by Produced Water Re-Injection in a Multi-Layer Reservoir. SPE 54735, presented at the SPE/ISRM Eurock held in Trondheim, Norway, 8–10 July
9. Van den Hoek, P.J., et al. 1999. Simulation of Produced Water Injection Under Fracturing Conditions, SPE Prod. & Facilities 14 (3) August, p. 166-176.
10. Veldkamp, J.G. et al. 2016. Thermal fracturing due to low injection temperatures in geothermal doublets. TNO Report 2015 R11739.
11. De Jager, M. A. ,Doyle, M.A., Graham, P.J. and Mabillard, J.E. Hydrocarbon habitat of the West Netherlands basin, in Geology of gas and oil under the Netherlands, H. E. Rondeel, D. A. J. Batjes and W. H. Nieuwenhuijs, Eds., Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, pp. 191-210.
12. Den Hartog Jager, D.V., 1996. Fluvio-marine sequences in the Lower Cretaceous of the West Netherlands basin: correlation and seismic expression. In: Geology of Gas and Oil under the Netherlands. Kluwer (Dordrecht): Rondeel, H.E., Batjes, D.A.J. & Nieuwenhuis, W.H. (eds), pp. 229-242.
13. Panterra, 2018. Geological report Polanen, G1421.
14. PanTerra, 2020. Polanen Seismic Interpretation 3D Depth survey R-2629, 1900011.

Appendices

Appendix A - Short description plus validation of fracture simulator

A.1 Description of fractured water injection model


The purpose of this computer program is to provide via simulation an estimate of lateral and vertical extension of waterflood-induced fractures (both for clean water and produced water injection), of vertical fracture (non-)confinement to target injection zones, of well injectivity, and of the shape and extent of flooded zones. It was developed by merging [1] existing fracturing/CRI [2] and waterflooding [3] software packages during the late nineties of last century into a combined model suited to simulate both hydraulic fracturing (HF), Cuttings Re-Injection (CRI) and Water Injection (WI).

Applications of this program throughout the years have been mainly in the arena of water injection for waterflooding, for reservoir voidage replacement and for (contaminated) water disposal [4-20]. In most of these applications, water injection simulations were carried out to assess issues around fracture containment, sweep and injectivity.

In many waterfloods, fractured water injectors are a common feature. Unintended fracturing in water injectors may occur owing to thermal effects (particularly in offshore areas) or due to pore plugging by impurities in the injection water. Intentional fracturing may be an integral part of the field development plan, since the increased injection potential may enable a significant reduction in the number of injector wells drilled. Furthermore, as a result of fracturing, water purity requirements may be relaxed providing a significant reduction in facilities costs, especially offshore. However, once fracture lengths reach a significant fraction of the well spacing they can have a significant influence on sweep efficiency. Furthermore, if the fracture does not extend over the full height of the formation, non-uniform sweep in the vertical sense may be encountered which may alter field development plans. Finally, intended or unintended fracturing may lead to out-of-zone growth, particularly when injection rates significantly exceed leakoff rates owing to low formation permeabilities and/or limited disposal storage capacity of the target injection zones. Therefore, the accurate prediction of fracture length and height is required.

Our WI/CRI injection model computes fracture dimensions, well injectivities, and flood front displacements for water injection under induced fracturing conditions. This applies both to produced water injection and to clean (e.g. sea-)water injection.

The main shortcoming of the simulator is that it uses an assumed fracture shape (planar vertical fracture consisting of two vertical half-ellipses). Thus, a horizontally symmetric fracture around the injection point is assumed. This can be a limitation in case of strong reservoir asymmetries around the injector (e.g. strong layer tilts). Also, complicated (e.g. 'donut') fracture shapes resulting from strongly differing layer properties (e.g. horizontal stress, Young's modulus) cannot be adequately modeled. Finally, tilted and/or non-planar (curved) fractures cannot be modeled. In practice, the above shortcomings have turned out to be of limited consequence (i.e. limited with respect to geological and parameter uncertainties), as was shown by many validations. A number of these validations is presented below as examples.



A.2 Validations

A.2.1. Validations against other simulators

Extensive validation [2] was carried out of our fractured WI/CRI model against a number of published results of other fracture simulators, both with a gridded fracture shape [BEM model, 21] and with fixed shapes [22-25]. These validations were carried out on the SPE benchmark set for hydraulic fracture simulators which consisted of 17 cases (called A-O, II and VI) covering contained and uncontained fracture growth (with and without gradient), low and 'high' leak-off, and Newtonian / non-Newtonian injection fluids. Results obtained were overall close to results obtained by the other models and well within the spread of the results [2]. Additional validations were carried out using the well-known HF stimulation field case of SFE-3 that was executed by the US Gas Research Institute in the early nineties [2].

For cuttings re-injection (CRI) applications the capability to simulate 'uncontained' hydraulic fracture growth is essential. Therefore, we also did benchmarks against other models for the situations of uncontained growth in the presence of an in-situ stress gradient, with or without a 'negative' stress contrast (i.e. growth from a higher stress into a lower stress zone).

An example of CRI is shown in Fig. 1 (Northern North Sea, UK sector) [2]. Clearly, our fractured WI/CRI model and the BEM model used in this study yield the highest degree of uncontained upward fracture growth. The other models show far less upward growth. This is a general shortcoming of many of the commercial hydraulic fracture simulation models, which were mostly designed for typical US-hydraulic fracture stimulation settings (strongly contained hydraulic fractures).





Figure 1. Comparison of different fracture simulators for CRI field example in the North Sea

An example for hydraulic fracture growth in the presence of negative stress contrasts is shown in figure 2 below. As can be seen on the left, the BEM model predicts a fracture with lengthwise 'bulging' in the lower stress zones whilst our fractured WI/CRI model has a fixed shape of two half-ellipses that more or less (on average) follow the contours of the BEM model. In the case on the right, the BEM model also predicts an elliptically shaped fracture, because in this case the impact of the negative stress contrasts is lower as a result of the high net pressure.







Figure 2. Hydraulic fracture growth from a higher stress zone into a lower stress zone, in the presence of low (left) and high (right) net pressures.


Finally, figure 3 shows the comparisons for a massive hydraulic fracture (MHF) treatment for the NAM offshore the Netherlands [2]. In this case, modeling was required in order to determine the optimum injection depth, and subsequently compute the optimized pump (proppant schedule).

MHF treatment NAM (Netherlands)

Fractured WI model



TERRAFRAC (BEM)



MFRAC




Figure 3: Comparison of WI/CRI fracture model with TERRAFRAC (BEM) and MFRAC for NAM offshore MHF.

A.2.2. Validations against field observations

Our fractured WI/CRI model has been applied to numerous field cases, especially for waterflooding and water injection disposal purposes. Comparison with field observations was always indirectly, e.g. by successful pump schedules based on HF designs [e.g. 2, see above], PLT's in water injectors [5], pressure transient testing [e.g. 12-16], fracture breakthrough (or the absence thereof) in nearby producers (waterflooding) [12], in-well tiltmeter measurements [14], temperature logging [16, 19, 20], and continuous monitoring plus history matching of observed injection rates and pressures.

A.2.2.1. Pattern waterflood in Oman: Field development [12]

A pattern waterflood was designed with the intent to inject highly contaminated production water into an oil reservoir with a fairly low reservoir fluid mobility. For such situations, pattern floods with close well spacing are ideally suited to optimize recovery. However, at the same time reasonable injection rates are only achievable when some degree of induced fracturing around the injector is allowed. Obviously this obliges the operator to consider an optimal operational scheme such that on one hand he profits from good injectivity whilst on the other hand, the induced fractures do not grow excessively large, either into the overlying reservoir caprock or into adjacent producer wells.

In order to gain experience with induced fracturing and use this to aid in an optimum field development program, a trial with a five-spot pattern flood was carried out. The layout is shown in figure 4 below.




Figure 4: Sub-surface map of reservoir highlighting the area of 5-spot inverted pilot in the south of the field [12].

The pilot was carried out as a step-rate test with long-duration steps in order to also observe the impact on production in neighboring producers. The plot in figure 5 shows the injection rate and duration of each step, and also the computed fracture length by our WI/CRI simulator (coupled to a reservoir simulator [15] to capture the impact on the production rates of nearby wells). As can be seen, for low injection rate (below ca 150-200 m³/d), no appreciable fractures are formed. However, as soon as one exceeds the 200 m³/d, fractures grow with lengths that “rapidly” increase with increasing injection rate. At 400 m³/d injection rate, water breakthrough was seen in adjacent producers. This is in line with the simulations in the sense that the computed fracture length (150-200 m) becomes equal to the well spacing.




Figure 5: Injection scheme during 5-spot trial plus computed fracture lengths

An important implication of this study was that the size of induced fractures could be kept in check by properly managing the injection rates over the field life. Particularly, it turned out that initially when the reservoir is filled with low-mobility oil, injection rates should be kept at a fairly low level. When gradually increasingly more oil is replaced by higher mobility (injected) water, higher injection rates can be applied without the risk of excessive fracturing.

A.2.2.2. Pattern waterflood onshore Russia (West Siberia): Pattern infill [16]

In this field, a pattern waterflood using low-quality injection water in a light oil field had been already ongoing for some time. The issue at stake here was that pattern infill drill campaigns were being planned and the question was how to manage the induced fractures by an appropriate choice of injection water quality and injection rate, see figure 6.




Figure 6: Pattern waterflood lay-out for field in Russia

In this case, fracture dimensions around the injector (no 1123) were monitored on a regular basis by means of pressure fall-off testing (→ fracture length, height) and temperature logging (fracture height). Examples of these measurements are shown in figures 7 and 8 below.




Figure 7: Example of pressure fall-off test and its interpretation




Figure 8: Examples of temperature logs over time and their interpretation

The plot in figure 9 shows the computed fracture length and height by our WI/CRI simulator, in comparison with the fracture lengths as interpreted from pressure fall-off tests. Agreement is reasonable (especially in view of the large data uncertainty), although it appears that the WI/CRI simulator is somewhat on the conservative side at later times.

The results as shown (plus many sensitivities) formed the basis for a decision on infill drilling (pattern, spacing), future injection rate and injection water quality.





Figure 9. Fracture length growth map of historical injection results : computed versus interpreted from pressure fall-off tests.

A.2.2.3. Large-scale produced water disposal (Oman): Risk of fracture containment [5,14]

Very large-scale produced water injection disposal was pioneered in the late nineties [5]. High volumes of contaminated production water had to be re-injected. A suitable injection horizon was found. However, there was a non-negligible risk that the induced fractures would grow through the overlying caprock shale into potable water-bearing shallow formations.

The basic lay-out is shown in figure 11. Unfiltered produced water is injected into the far flank of the deep formation. This is a fairly homogeneous, medium-permeability (approx. 300mD), medium-strength sandstone with a thickness of several hundreds of metres. The caprock (8 – 18m thick) at approx. 1000 m TVD, provides a sealing shale layer with extensive lateral extent. The carbonate formation above the shale layer is in contact with shallow aquifers, so it is essential that injected production water does not penetrate upwards through the caprock shale. As indicated in the figure, this requirement had an impact on the optimum injection depth.

Figure 10 shows the history-matched injection rates and pressures using the fractured WI/CRI-model, whilst the computed induced fracture is shown in Fig. 11. It is clear from this figure that the initially planned injection depth was inappropriate. Based on this study, the injection depths for all planned water injection disposal wells were moved down by about 300 m.






Fig. 10 – Observed and simulated historical injection performance for one of the pilot wells.




Fig. 11 – Overview of subsurface injection disposal horizons. Also indicated are casing shoe and induced fracture after 20 years of injection for one of the injectors [5].

After the injection disposal wells were on-stream, a number of different surveillance techniques was tried to validate / calibrate the fracture simulations (especially with respect to upward fracture height), but the initial results were fairly inconclusive [5]. Early 2007, the technique of downhole tiltmeters was successfully applied in a trial to measure induced fracture height. This technique has been well-proven for propped fracture applications in tight rocks but applications in medium- to high-permeability waterflood applications had been limited. Because none of the disposal wells had nearby observation wells, it was decided to use the technique of “treatment well tilt” in which the tiltmeters are deployed in the injection well itself. This allows for “optimal” measurement of fracture height (maximum tilt signal), although

fracture length cannot be measured in this way. The tiltmeter measurements were combined with pressure fall-off tests after each injection cycle to interpret fracture lengths.

Figure 12 shows the injection / shut-in sequence during the tiltmeter trial. From the horizontal scale of this graph it can be seen that the well had already been injecting ca 4 years prior to the trial. Figure 13 shows an example of a raw tiltmeter signal alongside an “ideal” signal for the case of one planar vertical fracture. As can be seen, ideally the locations of fracture top and bottom are identified from the maxima in the tilt signal, but in our case four (instead of two) of such maxima were observed, leading to some ambiguity in the interpretation of fracture height. In the interpreted results we took this into account by indicating a range for fracture height rather than one value. Finally, Figure 14 shows an example of one of the injection fall-off test results. These results show a pronounced storage-dominated flow period, which is indicative of a large induced fracture [25].

Figure 15 shows a summary of the interpreted fracture heights and lengths from tiltmeter and fall-off tests, together with the fracture dimensions as computed by our WI/CRI fracture simulator, for 4 years injection history, plus the injection cycles as depicted in Fig 12. During the latter of these injection cycles, no reliable tiltmeter signals could be obtained owing to their detachment from the borehole wall (casing). As can be seen from Fig. 15, the computed and measured results are in fairly good agreement, especially when considering the large uncertainties both in the measurements and computations.

Fig. 15 also shows that the maximum total fracture height during the injection trial is far less than the 300 m that was based on earlier simulations (see discussion above, and figure 11). However, this turned out to be mainly the result of two essential differences between the trial on one hand and continuous injection on the other hand: (1) During continuous injection, rates of ca 20,000 m³/d are applied, which was never achieved during the trial, and (2) the limited duration of the trial resulted in induced fractures which were still growing under the influence of transient pressure build-up in the reservoir. Without these two effects, induced fractures are likely to grow towards ca 300 m height, as is illustrated in Fig. 16 which shows the computed result of continuous injection for 4 years at 20,000 m³/d.

Summarizing the above discussion, the simulated sizes of the induced fracture were confirmed by surveillance data (tiltmeter, fall-off), endorsing the policy of perforating water disposal wells at least 300m below the caprock.




Fig. 12. Oman water disposal well: Injection cycles of tiltmeter test.




Fig. 13. Oman water disposal well: Example of tiltmeter data.




Fig. 14. Oman water disposal well: Example of pressure fall-off test data.




Fig. 15. Oman water disposal well: Summary of tiltmeter test results. Colored curves represent computed results: Length (L), Hup (=upward fracture height), and Hdown (downwards fracture height). H=total fracture height = Hup+Hdown.




Fig. 16. Oman water disposal well: Computed fracture dimensions for high-rate disposal injection.

A.2.3. Conclusions from validations.

The above paragraphs have illustrated a number of cases where the performance of our WI/CRI fracture simulator was validated both against other simulators and against field data. Overall, the agreement is acceptable, especially in view of the large input data uncertainties for field cases.


There are a number of important points that one has to bear in mind when using this model (or other models with similar functionality) for field applications. First, because of limited data and limited understanding of the subsurface, simulation results can vary widely. Therefore, regular surveillance / monitoring will always be a requirement. Such surveillance results can be history-matched and subsequently used to update the input data. Secondly, it is vital that the user has a proper qualitative 'physical' understanding of the results from a simulator – i.e. there should be no using hydraulic fracture simulators in 'black box' mode. Trying to understand the results from hydraulic fracture simulators can often be quite challenging, but it does help to track deficiencies in the input data, in the understanding of the subsurface, and/or the hydraulic fracture simulator itself.

REFERENCES

1. G.Gheissary, P.A. Fokker, P.J.P. Egberts, F.J.T. Floris, G. Sommerauer and C.J. Kenter. Simulation of Fractures Induced by Produced Water Re-Injection in a Multi-Layer Reservoir. SPE 54735, presented at the SPE/ISRM Eurock '98 held in Trondheim, Norway, 8–10 July 1998.
2. P.J. van den Hoek. New 3D model for optimised design of hydraulic fractures and simulation of drill cuttings re-injection. SPE 26679, presented at SPE Offshore Europe, Aberdeen (1993).
3. Koning, E.J.L., Waterflooding under fracturing conditions, Ph.D. Thesis, Technical University of Delft, 1988.
4. Van den Hoek, P.J., Matsuura, T., De Kroon, M., and Gheissary, G.: "Simulation of Produced Water Injection Under Fracturing Conditions", SPE Prod. & Facilities 14 (3) August 1999, p. 166-176.
5. P.J. van den Hoek, G. Sommerauer, L. Nnabuihe, and D. Munro. Large-scale produced water re-injection under fracturing conditions in Oman. SPE 87267 (ADIPEC 0963), presented at Abu Dhabi Petr. Conference (2000).
6. P.J. van den Hoek, Z.I. Khatib, and G.J. Siemers. Causes of Injectivity Problems During Fractured Water Disposal and Their Remediation. SPE 74416, presented at SPE IPCEM, Villahermosa (2002).

7. M. Bai, S. Green, and P.J. van den Hoek. A parametric analysis of deep injection for waste disposal using a 3-D hydraulic fracture simulator (presented at NARMS conference, Toronto, 2002).
8. J.C. Noirot, P.J. van den Hoek, Dirk Zwarts, Hans Petter Bjoerndal, SPE, Rik Drenth, R. Al Masfry, B. Wassing, J. Saeby, M. Masoori, and A. Zarafi. Water Injection and Water Flooding Under Fracturing Conditions. SPE 81462, presented at SPE MEOS, Bahrain (2003).
9. S. Sathyamoorthy, P. Priyandoko, K.B. Flatval, A. Bulang, P.J. van den Hoek, and Y. Qiu. Radical Approach to Water Injection Scheme for Barton. SPE 84885, presented at SPE improved oil recovery conference in Asia Pacific, Kuala Lumpur (2003).
10. K.I. Ojukwu and P.J. van den Hoek. A New Way to Diagnose Injectivity Decline During Fractured Water Injection By Modifying Conventional Hall Analysis. SPE 89376, presented at SPE/DOE conference on improved oil recovery, Tulsa (2004).
11. B. Hustedt, Y. Qiu, D. Zwarts, and P.J. van den Hoek. Modeling Water-Injection Induced Fractures in Reservoir Simulation. SPE 95726, presented at SPE ATCE, Dallas (2005).
12. J. Sæby, H.P. Bjørndal, and P.J. van den Hoek. Managed Induced Fracturing Improves Waterflood Performance in South Oman. IPTC-10843, presented at IPTC, Doha (2005).
13. Hustedt, B., Qiu, Y., Zwarts, D., van Schijndel, L., and P.J. van den Hoek. The Impact of Water-Injection Induced Fractures on Reservoir Flow Dynamics: First Applications of a New Simulation Strategy. IPTC-10689, presented at IPTC, Doha (2005).
14. P.J. van den Hoek, B. Hustedt, M. Sobera, H. Mahani, R.A. Masfry, J. Snippe and D. Zwarts. Dynamic Induced Fractures in Waterfloods and EOR, SPE 115204, presented at the 2008 SPE Russian Oil & Gas Technical Conference and Exhibition held in Moscow, Russia, 28–30 October 2008.
15. B. Hustedt, D. Zwarts, H.-P. Bjoerndal, R. Masfry, and P.J. van den Hoek. Induced Fracturing in Reservoir Simulations: Application of a New Coupled Simulator to Waterflooding Field Examples. SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering Journal, Vol. 11 (June 2008), p. 569-576.
16. A. Aniskin, I. Chmuzh, R. Sakhibgareev. Waterflood induced fracturing in the West Salym field. SPE 136560, presented at the 210 SPE Russian Oil & Gas Technical Conference and Exhibition held in Moscow, Russia, 26-28 October 2010.
17. Van den Hoek, P.J., Al-Masfry, R., Zwarts, D., Jansen, J.D., Hustedt, B., and Van Schijndel, L. Waterflooding Under Dynamic Induced Fractures: Reservoir Management and Optimization of Fractured Waterfloods. SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering Journal, October 2009, p.671-682.
18. M. Khodaverdian, T.G. Sorop, P.J. van den Hoek, S.Sathyamoorthy and E. Okoh. Injectivity and fracturing in unconsolidated sand reservoirs: Waterflooding case study, offshore Nigeria. Paper Arma 10-139, prepared for presentation at the 44th US Rock mechanics Symposium and 5th US-Canada Rock mechanics Symposium, Salt Lake City, June 27-30, 2010.
19. M. Zwaan, R. Hartmans, S. Schoofs, B.R. de Zwart, G. Rocco, R. Adawi, F. Saadi, K. Shuaili, J. Lopez, J. Ita, T. L'Homme, T. Sorop, Y. Qiu, P.J. van den Hoek, F. Al-Kindy, S. Busaidi, and J. Fraser. EOR Field Management Through Well-Planned Surveillance. SPE 154620, presented at the SPE EOR Conference at Oil and Gas West Asia, Muscat, Oman, 16-18 April 2012.
20. A. Petrik and P.J. van den Hoek, Multi-zone Waterflood Top Seal Integrity Assurance: insights from advanced Pressure Fall Off analysis using Smart Well and DTS technologies offshore Sakhalin, Russia. SPE-181985, presented at the SPE Russian Petroleum Technology Conference and Exhibition held in Moscow, Russia, 24–26 October 2016.
21. Dougherty, R.L. & Abou-Sayed, A.S., Evaluation of the influence of in-situ reservoir conditions on the geometry of hydraulic fractures using a 3D simulator. SPE 13275 (1984).

22. Meyer, B.R., Three-dimensional hydraulic fracturing simulation on personal computers: Theory and comparison studies. SPE 19239 (1989).
23. Advani, S.H., Khattab, H. & Lee, J.K., Hydraulic fracture geometry modelling predictions and comparisons. SPE 13863 (1985).
24. Bouteica, M.J., Hydraulic fracturing model based on a 3-D closed form: tests, analysis of fracture geometry and containment. J. SPEPE, November 1988, p. 445.
25. Cleary, M.P., Barr, D.T. & Willis, R.M., Enhancement of real-time hydraulic fracturing models with full 3-D simulation. SPE 17713 (1988).
26. Van den Hoek, P.J. Dimensions and Degree of Containment of Waterflood-Induced Fractures from Pressure Transient Analysis, SPERE, October 2005, 377-387.



Appendix B - Full input for base case

Company name HVC
 Well name MON-GT-02
 Location Polanen / Monster
 Date 2022
 Description HVC Polanen well MON-GT-02


INPUT

GEOLOGICAL MODEL

DepthTop (m)	LayerName
0	North Sea
648.5	Chalk
1102	Holland
1714	De Lier sandstone / Vlieland claystone
1777	Berkel sandstone
1799	Berkel sand-claystone
2192	Rijswijk sandstone
2205	Rodenrijs claystone
2256	Waste zone
2276	Delft
2323	Alblasserdam
2561	Underburden

DepthTop (m)	DepthBottom (m)	LayerHeight (m)	StressTop (MPa)	StressBottom (MPa)	StressGrad (kPa/m)
0	648.5	648.5	0	10.25	15.8
648.5	1102	453	10.25	17.4	15.8
1102	1714	612.9	17.4	27.09	15.8
1714	1777	63	27.09	28.08	15.8
1777	1799	22	28.08	28.43	15.8
1799	2192	392.6	28.43	34.63	15.8
2192	2205	13	34.63	34.84	15.8
2205	2256	51.2	34.84	35.65	15.8
2256	2276	20	35.65	35.96	15.8
2276	2323	46.8	35.96	36.7	15.8
2323	2561	238	36.7	40.46	15.8
2561	1e+004	7439	40.46	158	15.8

FormPresTop (MPa)	FormPresBot (MPa)	FormPresGrad (kPa/m)
0	6.939	10.7
6.939	11.79	10.7
11.79	18.34	10.7
18.34	19.02	10.7
19.02	19.25	10.7
19.25	23.45	10.7
23.45	23.59	10.7
23.59	24.14	10.7
24.14	24.36	10.7
24.36	24.86	10.7
24.86	27.4	10.7
27.4	107	10.7



ROCK PROPERTIES

DepthTop (m)	Permeability (md)	Porosity (-)	YoungModulus (MPa)	PoissonRatio (-)	FracToughnes (MPa*SQRT(m))
0	436	0.3	5913	0.19	0.1
648.5	1	0.05	3220	0.03	0.1
1102	7	0.15	3792	0.13	0.1
1714	1	0.15	1.48e+004	0.28	0.1
1777	2	0.15	1.719e+004	0.27	0.1
1799	0.1	0.2	1.591e+004	0.28	0.1
2192	10	0.15	1.847e+004	0.28	0.1
2205	0.1	0.2	5030	0.32	0.1
2256	10	0.15	1.671e+004	0.29	0.1
2276	511.5	0.17	1.926e+004	0.23	0.1
2323	234	0.15	2.064e+004	0.25	0.1
2561	0.1	0.15	2.064e+004	0.25	0.1

FORMATION PARAMETERS

Porosity-elastic constant	0.6 -
Thermo-elastic constant	100 kPa/°C
GeoThermal gradient	0.03 °C/m
Reservoir temperature	86 °C
Heat capacity of rock	2560 kJ/(m³*°C)
Connate water saturation	0 -
Residual oil saturation	0 -
Total reservoir compressibility	5e-007 1/kPa
Formation fluid viscosity	0.45 mPa*s
Endpoint rel. perm. of oil	1 -
Endpoint rel. perm. of water	1 -

INJECTION FLUID & FILTER CAKE

Inj. water viscosity at inj. temp.	1.02 mPa*s
Inj. water viscosity at res. temp.	0.53 mPa*s
Inj. water heat capacity	4200 kJ/(m³*°C)
Inj. water density	1.105 g/cm³
Damage factor	0.1 -
Permeability	0.01 md

FRACTURE DIMENSIONS

Init. fracture height upwards	0.29 m
Init. fracture height downwards	0.29 m
Init. fracture depth (TV)	2278 m
Init. fracture length	0.29 m
Drainage radius	780 m

WELLBORE HYDRAULICS

S# Description (-) (-)	DepthBotAH (m)	DepthBotTV (m)	SectLengthAH (m)	SectLengthTV (m)
0 0	0	0	0	0
1 9 5/8 ID 8.25	2278	2278	2278	2278

S# Description (-) (-)	DepthBotAH (m)	InnerDiam (mm)	OuterDiam (mm)	FrictionMult (-)
0 0	0	0	0	1
1 9 5/8 ID 8.25	2278	0	209.6	1

Init. fracture depth 2278 m

INJECTION CYCLES

InjTime (mon)	InjDuration (mon)	InjRate (m ³ /hr)	SolidsLoadng (vol ppm)	OilLoading (vol ppm)	InjWatSurfT (°C)
0	360	310	0	0	35
<hr/>					
InjWatBHT (°C)					
35.6					

