

# Rate Transient Analysis

### 1-4: TRADITIONAL DECLINE ANALYSIS

#### 1. Traditional (Arps) Decline Curves

**EXPONENTIAL DECLINE:**

- Decline rate is constant.
- Log flow rate vs. time is a straight line.
- Flow rate vs. cumulative production is a straight line.
- Provides minimum EUR (Expected Ultimate Recovery).

**HYPERBOLIC DECLINE:**

- Decline rate is not constant ( $D < kq'$ ).
- Straight line plots are NOT practical and  $b$  is determined by nonlinear curve fit.

$b$ value	Reservoir Drive Mechanism
0	Single phase liquid (oil above bubble point)
0.1-0.4	Solution gas drive
0.4-0.5	Single phase gas
0.5	Effective edge water drive
0.5-1.0	Commingled layered reservoirs

**HARMONIC DECLINE:**

- Decline rate is directly proportional to flow rate ( $b=1$ ).
- Log flow rate vs. cumulative production is a straight line.

**SUMMARY:**

- Boundary-dominated flow only.
- Constant operating conditions.
- Developed using empirical relationships.
- Quick and simple to determine EUR.
- EUR depends on operating conditions.
- Does NOT use pressure data.
- $b$  depends on drive mechanism.

### 5-10: FETKOVICH ANALYSIS

#### 5. Analytical: Constant Flowing Pressure

**6. Analytical: Constant Flowing Pressure**

**7. Empirical: Arps Depletion Stems**

**8. Empirical: Arps-Fetkovich Depletion Stems**

**9. Fetkovich Type Curves**

**10. Fetkovich/Cumulative Type Curves**

**SUMMARY:**

- Combines transient with boundary-dominated flow.
- Transient: Analytical, constant pressure solution.
- Boundary-Dominated: Empirical, identical to traditional (Arps).
- Constant operating conditions.
- Used to estimate EUR, skin and permeability.
- EUR depends on operating conditions.
- Does NOT use pressure data.
- Cumulative curves are smoother than rate curves.
- Combined cumulative and rate type curves give more unique match (Figure 10).

### 11-14: MODERN DECLINE ANALYSIS: BASIC CONCEPTS

#### 11. Comparison of $q_D$ and $1/p_D$

**12. Equivalence of  $q_D$  and  $1/p_D$**

**13. Concept of Rate Integral**

**14. Derivative and Integral-Derivative**

**13-14: TYPE CURVE INTERPRETATION AIDS**

- Rate (Normalized):** Combines rate with flowing pressure.
- Integral (Normalized Rate):** Smooths noisy data but attenuates the reservoir signal.
- Derivative (Normalized Rate):** Amplifies reservoir signal but amplifies noise as well.
- Integral-Derivative (Normalized Rate):** Smooths the scatter of the derivative.

### 15-18: GAS FLOW CONSIDERATIONS

#### 15. Darcy's Law

**15-16: PSEUDO-PRESSURE**

Gas properties vary with pressure:

- Z-factor (Pseudo-Pressure, Figures 15 & 16)
- Viscosity (Pseudo-Pressure & Pseudo-Time, Figures 15, 16 & 18)
- Compressibility (Pseudo-Time, Figures 17 & 18)

**17-18: PSEUDO-TIME**

- Compressibility represents energy in reservoir.
- Gas compressibility is strong function of pressure (especially at LOW PRESSURES).
- Ignoring compressibility variation can result in significant error in original gas-in-place ( $G$ ) calculation.
- Pseudo-time ( $t_p$ ) corrects for changing viscosity and compressibility with pressure.
- Pseudo-time calculation is ITERATIVE because it depends on  $\mu$  and  $c$  at average reservoir pressure, and average reservoir pressure depends on  $G$  (usually known).

Note: Pseudo-time in build-up testing is evaluated at well flowing pressure NOT at average reservoir pressure.

### 19-22: FLOWING MATERIAL BALANCE

#### 19. Oil: Flowing Material Balance

**20. Gas: Determination of  $b_{ps}$**

**21. Gas: Flowing Material Balance**

**22. Procedure to Calculate Gas-In-Place**

**SUMMARY:**

- Uses flowing data. No shut-in required.
- Applicable to oil and gas.
- Determines hydrocarbon-in-place,  $N$  or  $G$ .
- Oil ( $N$ ): Direct calculation.
- Gas ( $G$ ): Iterative calculation because of pseudo-time.
- Simple yet powerful.
- Data readily available (wellhead pressure can be converted to bottomhole pressure).
- Supplements static material balance.
- Ideal for low permeability reservoirs.

### 23-32: RADIAL TYPE CURVES

#### 23. Calculations for Oil (Agarwal-Gardner Type Curves)

**23-24: RADIAL FLOW MODEL: TYPE CURVE ANALYSIS**

All radial flow type curves are based on the same reservoir model:

- Well in centre of cylindrical homogeneous reservoir.
- No flow outer boundary.
- Skin factor represented by  $r_{ws}$ .
- Information content of all type curves (Figures 23-32) is the same.
- The shapes are different because of different plotting formats.
- Each format represents a different "look" at the data and emphasizes different aspects.

Note: Gas calculations are ITERATIVE because of pseudo-time.

**25. Blasingame: Rate (Normalized)**

**26. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative**

**25-26: BLASINGAME**

- $q_D$  and  $t_D$  definitions are similar to Fetkovich.
- Normalized rate ( $q/\Delta p$  or  $q/\Delta p_i$ ) is plotted.
- Three sets of type curves:
  - $q_D$  vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (Figure 25).
  - Rate integral ( $q_{int}$ ) vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (has the same shape as  $q_D$ ).
  - Rate integral-derivative ( $q_{int}'$ ) vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (Figure 26).
- In general:  $q_{Dsc} = q_D t_{Dsc}$ ,  $t_{Dsc} = \frac{2\pi}{h} \frac{r_{Dsc}^2}{t_{Dsc}}$
- $h_{Dsc}$  is a constant for a particular well / reservoir configuration.

### 27-30: AGARWAL-GARDNER ANALYSIS

#### 27. Agarwal-Gardner: Rate (Normalized)

**27-28: AGARWAL-GARDNER**

- $q_D$  and  $t_{Dsc}$  definitions are similar to well testing.
- Normalized rate ( $q/\Delta p$  or  $q/\Delta p_i$ ) is plotted.
- Three sets of type curves:
  - $q_D$  vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (Figure 27).
  - Inverse of pressure derivative ( $1/p_{Dsc}$ ) vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (not shown).
  - Inverse of pressure integral-derivative ( $1/p_{Dsc}'$ ) vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (Figure 28).
- Notes:
  - Pressure derivative is defined as  $p_{Dsc} = \frac{d(p_{Dsc})}{d(\ln t_{Dsc})}$ .
  - Inverse of pressure derivative is usually too noisy and inverse of pressure integral-derivative is used instead.

**29. NPI: Pressure (Normalized)**

**29-30: NORMALIZED PRESSURE INTEGRAL (NPI)**

- $p_D$  and  $t_{Dsc}$  definitions are similar to well testing.
- Normalized Pressure ( $\Delta p/q$  or  $\Delta p_i/q$ ) is plotted rather than normalized rate ( $q/\Delta p$  or  $q/\Delta p_i$ ).
- Three sets of type curves:
  - $p_D$  vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (Figure 29).
  - Pressure integral ( $p_{int}$ ) vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (has the same shape as  $p_D$ ).
  - Pressure integral-derivative ( $p_{int}'$ ) vs.  $t_{Dsc}$  (Figure 30).

**30. NPI: Integral-Derivative**

**31. Rate (Normalized)**

**31-32: TRANSIENT-DOMINATED DATA**

- Similar to Figures 27 & 28 but uses  $t_D$  instead of  $t_{Dsc}$ . This format is useful when most of the data are in TRANSIENT flow.
- $q_D$  and  $t_D$  definitions are similar to well testing.
- Normalized rate ( $q/\Delta p$  or  $q/\Delta p_i$ ) is plotted.
- Three sets of type curves:
  - $q_D$  vs.  $t_D$  (Figure 31).
  - Inverse of pressure integral ( $1/p_{Dsc}$ ) vs.  $t_D$  (not shown).
  - Inverse of pressure integral-derivative ( $1/p_{Dsc}'$ ) vs.  $t_D$  (Figure 32).

**32. Integral-Derivative**

### 33-40: FRACTURE TYPE CURVES

#### 33. Rate

**33-37: FINITE CONDUCTIVITY FRACTURE**

- Fracture with finite conductivity results in bilinear flow (quarter slope).
- Dimensionless Fracture Conductivity is defined as:  $F_{CD} = \frac{k_{fr} h_{fr}}{k_{res} h_{res}}$
- Fracture with infinite conductivity results in linear flow (half slope).
- For  $F_{CD} > 50$ , the fracture is assumed to have infinite conductivity.

**34. Integral-Derivative**

**35. Elliptical Flow: Integral-Derivative**

**36. Elliptical Flow: Integral-Derivative**

**37. Elliptical Flow: Integral-Derivative**

**38-40: INFINITE CONDUCTIVITY FRACTURE**

**38. Blasingame: Rate and Integral-Derivative**

**39. NPI: Pressure and Integral-Derivative**

**40. Wattenberger: Rate**

### 41-43: HORIZONTAL WELL TYPE CURVES

#### 41. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative

**42. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative**

**43. Blasingame: Integral-Derivative**

**44. Blasingame: Rate**

**44-45: WATER-DRIVE TYPE CURVES**

**45. Agarwal-Gardner: Rate**

**Mobility Ratio ( $M$ ) represents the strength of the aquifer.**

$M = 0$  is equivalent to Radial Type Curves (Figures 25-32).



Copyright © 2018 IHS Markit

**NOMENCLATURE**

$a$ semi-major axis of ellipse	$k_h$ horizontal permeability	$q_{Dsc}$ dimensionless rate integral	$x$ fracture half length
$b$ semi-minor axis of ellipse	$k_{fr}$ fracture permeability	$q_{Dsc}'$ dimensionless rate integral-derivative	$y$ reservoir width
$b_{ps}$ inverse of productivity index	$k_{res}$ reservoir permeability	$q_{int}$ dimensionless cumulative production	$z$ well location in y-direction
$B$ formation volume factor	$K$ constant	$Q_{sc}$ dimensionless cumulative production at average reservoir pressure	$Z$ gas deviation factor at average reservoir pressure
$B_i$ initial oil formation volume factor	$L$ horizontal well length	$r_{Dsc}$ dimensionless exterior radius of reservoir	$Z_0$ initial gas deviation factor
$B_o$ oil formation volume factor	$M$ mobility ratio	$r_{ws}$ apparent wellbore radius	$\alpha$ constant
$B_{oi}$ initial oil formation volume factor	$N$ oil cumulative production	$S$ initial gas saturation	$\beta$ porosity
$c$ gas compressibility	$N_p$ oil production	$S_o$ initial oil saturation	$\mu$ viscosity
$c_g$ total compressibility	$N_{p,i}$ initial oil production	$S_w$ dimensionless pressure	$\mu_a$ aquifer fluid viscosity
$D$ nominal decline rate	$p_a$ dimensionless pressure derivative	$T$ flow time	$\mu_g$ gas viscosity
$D_e$ effective decline rate	$p_{Dsc}$ dimensionless pressure integral	$t$ pseudo-time	$\mu_{avg}$ gas viscosity at average reservoir pressure
$D_i$ initial nominal decline rate	$p_{Dsc}'$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative	$t_{Dsc}$ material balance pseudo-time	$\mu_{res}$ oil viscosity at average reservoir pressure
$F_{CD}$ dimensionless fracture conductivity	$p_{Dsc}''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}'$ dimensionless time	$\mu_{res}$ reservoir fluid viscosity
$G$ original gas-in-place	$p_{Dsc}'''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}''$ dimensionless time	
$G_p$ gas cumulative production	$p_{Dsc}''''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}'''$ dimensionless time	
$G_{p,cum}$ pseudo-cumulative production	$p_{Dsc}'''''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}''''$ dimensionless time	
$h$ net pay	$p_{Dsc}''''''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}'''''$ dimensionless time	
$k$ permeability	$p_{Dsc}'''''''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}''''''$ dimensionless time	
$k_a$ aquifer permeability	$p_{Dsc}''''''''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}'''''''$ dimensionless time	
$k_f$ fracture permeability	$p_{Dsc}'''''''''$ dimensionless pressure integral-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative-derivative	$t_{Dsc}''''''''$ dimensionless time	

Oil field units:  $q$ , (MMSCFD);  $t$  (days)

All analyses described can be performed using IHS Markit's Rate Transient Analysis software RTA.