

# Improving knowledge about Earth subsurface, based on anisotropic depth imaging. Case of land, full azimuth seismic survey for unconventional hydrocarbons exploration in Poland.

Wojciech Kobusinski, Geofizyka Toruń S.A.

*Anisotropy, depth imaging, full azimuth, fractures, heterogeneity, illumination, stress, tomography, unconventional*

## Abstract

An innovative, practical workflow for estimation of azimuthal anisotropy parameters from seismic data is presented. The workflow is based on the state-of-the-art applications which are able to deliver precise information about subsurface azimuths of seismic rays and successfully use them. A series of 3D full azimuth modules: RMOs (residual moveouts) picking, anisotropic tomography, pre-stack depth migration, and QC are examples. Such approach enables to overcome many limitations, inaccuracies, and shortcuts related to workflows based on time-domain imaging, processing data in sectors, and analyses in post-stack domain. The main product of full azimuth PreSDM (pre-stack depth migration) - 3D continuous full azimuth angle domain reflection gathers (CRP) are among the other benefits, and are source of information about azimuthal anisotropy. Attributes of azimuthal anisotropy are calculated from both kinematic and dynamic parameters of the events in CRP gathers. Products of the workflow comprise also diffraction and specular stacks obtained from the other result of the full azimuth PreSDM - 3D directional gathers. The illumination gathers, the next result of migration are used to correct relative amplitudes for irregular number of ray hits which reach each sample of CRPs. Effectiveness of the full azimuth applications in model building procedure, in comparison to effectiveness of standard applications is demonstrated. Presented are differences between results of PreSTM (pre-stack time migration) and PreSDM, in quality of imaging and lateral positioning of events in case of simple geology. It is shown that taking into account anisotropy, improves seismic imaging, well ties, AVO/AVA analysis, and delivers information about seismic anisotropy, which, for geologists and drilling engineers, is an indicator of stress and fracture directions.

## Introduction

Shales are important source of unconventional hydrocarbons. Seismic data play a substantial role in unconventional prospects, particular in identification of sweet spots. Traditionally, they are used to interpret structural horizons, delineate seismic scale discontinuities, and to extract many valuable attributes.

But seismic data can also be used for horizontal well planning, and to support procedure of hydraulic fracturing. In these procedures, understanding magnitude of stress and its orientation is critical.

Nowadays, state-of-the-art methods of seismic data processing make it possible to extract from seismic data many pieces of information not used so far - e.g. azimuthal anisotropy and diffraction image. It is connected with the possibility to identify structures much smaller than the seismic wavelength, based on theories developed in theoretical physics: effective medium and scattering of seismic waves.

Seismic azimuthal anisotropy can be an indicator of orientation of stress and fractures. Directions of fractures' strike as well as maximum and minimum stress can be determined in the case of P-waves, based on phenomena of azimuthal variation of kinematic (travel time, NMO velocity) and dynamic (amplitude) attributes of the events in full azimuth CRP gathers.

The range of information about in-situ stress and fractures obtained from analysis of full azimuth CRPs is an

information which corresponds with range of seismic survey. Other methods, e.g. core analysis, results of microimager, and dipole sonic, deliver very local information.

At this time, most of workflows for analysis of azimuthal anisotropy are based on imaging seismic data in sectors in time domain (3D PreSTM), and sometimes scan only stacked data for parameters of azimuthal anisotropy. Such approaches have much more limitations and assumptions than imaging data in depth domain (3D PreSDM), where pre-stack data are analyzed in full range of angles and azimuths. All limitations, assumptions and shortcuts in algorithms and workflows decrease resolution, quality, and reliability of results.

Reliable analysis of stress and fracture directions must be based on seismic data with neither distorted nor falsified information about amplitudes and RMOs. Obtaining such data is possible only with accurate anisotropic velocity model. Time imaging in most of the cases is not able to deliver such a model.

With conventional seismic techniques (migration, tomography), information from different azimuths belonging to the same image point is averaged, so the information about azimuths is lost. Processing and imaging data in sectors selected arbitrarily is a kind of shortcut - the integrity and resolution of the result is compromised. Assumption that surface azimuth is the same as subsurface one is not necessarily true.

Analysis of pre-stack data in full range of azimuths (AVAaz, RMOaz) can deliver more reliable data than analysis of seismic attributes estimated from sectorized stacked data.

Experience shows that presented method is superior to arbitrary sectoring and time imaging.

Depth imaging delivers 3D CRPs in continuous range of true subsurface azimuths and reflection angles. Then, other applications (e.g. 3D full azimuth anisotropic tomography, 3D RMO picking, RMOaz inversion, AVAaz inversion) use these data to update anisotropic velocity model and for azimuthal anisotropy analysis.

Analysis of azimuthal anisotropy is being performed based on both kinematic and dynamic attributes.

## Theory

The theory of propagation elastic waves in elastic, anisotropic media was formulated in 19<sup>th</sup> century. At the turn of 20<sup>th</sup> century this theory was introduced to seismology by the creator of the first chair of geophysics in Europe (Kraków, Poland): Maurice P. Rudzki. The concept that fractures and stress lead to seismic anisotropy, which in turn can be a source of information about them, was formulated in the late seventies of 20<sup>th</sup> century (Helbig K., Thomsen L., 2005). From that time, the theory became mature and was confirmed by many numerical and laboratory studies as well as many seismic projects (Liu E., Martinez A., 2013).

The concept of the presented workflow was widely described by Z. Koren and I. Ravve (Koren Z., Ravve I, 2011, Ravve I., Koren Z., 2011).

All work, has been carried out with Paradigm's EarthStudy 360 system and GT in-house solutions.

## Geological setting

The area of study is located in Europe, the Baltic Basin, in the northern part of Poland - Fig.1. The geological structure of the region is not very complex with two main structural levels: Old Paleozoic (Cambrian to Silurian sediments) and Permian - Mesozoic. Mentioned stages are separated by Variscan hiatus (Devonian and Carbon). Old Paleozoic and basement formations are of interest for shale exploration.

## Data acquisition

The location of the 3D seismic survey was chosen after careful examination of the results of previous 2D surveys, and was also based on the first vertical exploration well. The well, ended up in Cambrian deposits, drilled over 1800 m of Silurian and more than 60 m of Ordovician strata, brought a significant amount of core, geochemical, petrophysical and geophysical data, which confirmed the presence of unconventional gas. The 3D seismic survey generally followed "full-azimuth" geometry, having the following parameters: orthogonal layout, receiver interval 40 m, receiver line interval 200 m, source point interval




Fig. 1: Location of 3D seismic survey (green circle) acquired for the purpose of unconventional gas exploration.

40 m, source line interval 280 m, symmetrical split spread, active channels per line 154, live channels 4620, patch length 6120 m, patch width 5800 m, maximum offset 4285 m, bin size 20x20 m and nominal fold 165 (Dalecka A., Rudzki M., 2013).

## Methodology

Building correct, anisotropic (VTI / TTI), model of the medium is a fundamental task, which enables to define reliable parameters of azimuthal anisotropy in the next steps. Presented depth imaging workflow consists of 3 stages to depict differences in the results obtained with standard (which are blind to azimuth) and advanced (continuous full azimuth angle domain) applications.


The first and second stages were accomplished with standard applications, which do not retain and do not use azimuthal information. In the first one, the isotropic model, and in the second one, anisotropic VTI (vertical transverse isotropy) model, were built respectively.

In the third stage the most advanced, full azimuth applications were used to build final anisotropic VTI model and perform final, full azimuth angle domain PreSDM. Comparison of the final results from second and from third stages enabled to assess effectiveness of the full azimuth applications.

The preconditioned gathers from time domain processing, and horizons interpreted on results of PreSTM, were used to build initial isotropic depth model - Fig.2.

The procedure of velocity model update was carried out iteratively through PreSDM, RMOs (residual moveouts) determination along horizons, and global tomography.


Because of the problem with NMO stretching on high velocity gradient boundary, evident from the offset domain PreSDM output, the layer stripping approach to update Tp2-Z3 interval was necessary (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> stages).




**Fig. 2:** Seismic horizons used for initial depth model building.

The problem of NMO stretching was reduced with angle domain PreSDM, and then tomography approach was possible (3<sup>rd</sup> stage) - Fig.3.

The isotropic model building procedure requests only one parameter to be provided - interval velocity model, which flattens events in CRP gathers in the near and middle offset range - Fig.4. The final results of isotropic PreSDM expose effects related to occurrence of VTI anisotropy (which at this stage was not taken into account) hockey sticks in CRP gathers, and substantial misties of




**Fig. 3:** Comparison of signal stretching by A) 3D Kirchhoff offset domain PreSDM and B) 3D CRAM - common reflection angle domain pre-stack depth migration.




**Fig. 4:** Isotropic model - instantaneous velocity.

seismic horizons with well tops - Fig.5.

To eliminate those problems of seismic image, which affect the incorrect vertical and lateral positioning of seismic features, as well as deteriorate focusing of the seismic events, the anisotropic VTI model was built. Building of such a model consisted in determination of 3 parameters instead of 1 for isotropic model - vertical instantaneous velocity, interval delta and interval epsilon - Fig.6.




**Fig. 5:** Results of final (1<sup>st</sup> stage) isotropic Kirchhoff PreSDM. A) CRP gather, B) stack.



**Fig. 6:** Parameters of VTI anisotropic model: A) compressional velocity, B) interval delta, C) interval epsilon.

Based on VTI anisotropic model, the final Kirchhoff 3D PreSDM was run. The procedure of building final VTI model using standard depth imaging tools, which do not take azimuths into account, was finished (2<sup>nd</sup> stage). The seismic horizons were tied to well tops - Fig.7.



**Fig. 7:** Results of final (2<sup>nd</sup> stage) VTI anisotropic Kirchhoff PreSDM. A) CRP gather, B) stack.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> stage, based on final VTI model from the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, state-of-the-art, 3D, full azimuth, anisotropic, angle domain pre-stack depth migration (ES360 Imager) was run.


Full azimuth, reflection angle CRP gathers obtained from ES360 Imager, revealed oscillations of events with azimuth - Fig. 8 and 9.

Such oscillations can be caused by azimuthal anisotropy as well as by heterogeneities of medium, which were not identified and included in anisotropic model.


The VTI model was updated iteratively on the basis of advanced, full azimuth tools. Possibilities of the advanced applications to work in full range of azimuths and reflection angles were utilized to improve reliability of the VTI model.

Information about RMOs picked in full range of angles and azimuths was used by 3D full azimuth global tomography, whose effectiveness is much better than effectiveness of standard blind azimuth application.

Despite of relatively small changes in VTI model, the image of oscillations in resulting CRP gathers changed substantially - Fig.9. The heterogeneities of the medium not seen by standard tools were identified and included to VTI anisotropic model. This change had fundamental impact on



**Fig.8:** A) 3D cylindrical spiral CRP gather – reflections as a function of depth azimuth and reflection angle. Presented are traces for given azimuth, and for all angles, B) the idea how 3D CRP gather is unwrapped into 2D plane, C) unwrapped “spiral” gather – 2000 traces. Color presents periodical change of azimuths.




**Fig.9:** A) example map of the velocity difference for Sb horizon before and after full azimuth anisotropic tomography, B) "spiral gather" before and C) after full azimuth anisotropic tomography and migration.

reliable determination of azimuthal anisotropy. Also, on the basis of full azimuth reflection angle CRP gathers, effective parameters of azimuthal anisotropy were determined.

Both kinematic and dynamic attributes of events were analyzed. Analysis of kinematic attributes was based on investigation of variation of RMOs with azimuth (RMOaz), and analysis of dynamic attribute on variation of amplitudes with angles and azimuth (AVAaz).

The parameters of azimuthal anisotropy determined using different attributes, show high correlation - Fig.10.




**Fig. 10:** Maps of effective parameters of azimuthal anisotropy for Or horizon. A) based on RMOs, B) based on amplitudes. Intensity is shown in colors (blue higher intensity) and length of black dashes. Azimuth of fractures' strike (direction of fast velocity) is shown as orientation of dashes. White arrows are drawn on the maps in the places of higher intensity (the same places) to compare azimuths.

Each method has pros and cons. Used together - they give better understanding of lateral distribution of stress and fractures.

The overburden of the target layer, which has orthorhombic anisotropy, consists of isotropic and orthorhombic anisotropy layers.


Removal of influence of overburden on target was performed for kinematic parameters.

Effective parameters, calculated with background VTI model, were converted with azimuth-dependent generalized Dix equation, to local parameters for layers - Fig. 11.



**Fig. 11:** Maps of parameters of azimuthal anisotropy for Sb-Or layer calculated based on kinematic attribute. A) effective parameters, B) parameters for the layer. Intensity is shown in colors (blue higher intensity) and length of black dashes - the same scale for both. Azimuth of fractures' strike (direction of fast velocity) is shown as orientation of dashes.

This procedure was done using algorithms described by Zvi Koren (Koren Z., et al., 2013).




**Fig. 12:** Directional "spiral" gathers filtering. A) original directional CRP gather, B) directional gather filtered to enhance diffractions - diffraction gather, C) directional gather filtered to enhance specularity - specular gather

ES360 Imager, in addition to obtaining full azimuth reflection angle gathers enables obtaining full azimuth directional angle gathers (Fig.12) and illumination gathers (Fig.14).

The directional gathers were used to get diffraction and specular images - stacks. The first one is an indication of small faults, channels and fracture systems which cause diffractions. The second enhances continuity of horizons - Fig.12 and Fig.13.

The illumination gathers provided information about lightening of each part of subsurface by seismic rays.



**Fig.13:** A) original directional stack, B) diffraction stack, C) specular stack. The s/n (signal to noise) ratio is shown for each stack. The stacks were created from gathers presented on Fig.12.

The information about ray hits was used to correct amplitudes connected with irregular illumination of the objects. The amplitudes of CRP gathers, after this correction were related to geology, so ready for reliable AVA/AVAaz analysis - Fig.14.

Despite of relatively simple geology, the differences in lateral positioning of the events as well as focusing of the events on stacked sections between

results of 3D PreSTM and 3D PreSDM were observed - Fig.15.

In the workflow, the analysis of illumination of target horizon for explanation of poorer image was done. The analysis revealed that poor image is related to poor illumination. Based on analysis of different acquisition geometries, it would be possible to minimize undesirable imaging effects in the future -Fig. 16.




Fig. 14: Relative amplitudes reconstruction. A) Kirchhoff PreSDM CRP gather, B) full azimuth angle domain





Fig. 15: Results of A) PreSTM and B) PreSDM.



**Fig. 16:** Analysis of target illumination. A) the place of poorer illumination, B) map of illumination (weak red, yellow, blue, strong purple) and rays connected with actual geometry.

## Conclusions

In this work, a novel approach to determination of azimuthal anisotropy parameters based on seismic data is described. A key component of this workflow is work in angle, depth domain on pre-stack gathers in full range of azimuths. Parameters of azimuthal anisotropy are calculated from both kinematic and dynamic attributes of seismic events in CRPs. It assures reliability and confidence in the final results. Knowledge about fractures can be supported by diffraction image.

Additionally, this workflow gives possibility to create specular images for comprehensive interpretation and possibility to analyze illumination of the horizons for optimal acquisition.

Parameters of azimuthal anisotropy, obtained from seismic data with the presented novel method, are consistent with results obtained using other methods (core analysis, microimager, and dipole sonic). The results are also consistent with results of microseismic monitoring.

It was shown that the described method was successfully applied to shale plays and fracture reservoirs.

But the method enables to fully exploit wide azimuth data and build high resolution anisotropic velocity models in every geology. It is advised to use it also for conventional prospection in areas of illumination ambiguities and complex wave phenomena.

## Acknowledgments

I acknowledge PGNiG Poland for permission to publish images of selected data, for encouragement, and support in implementation of that technology.

Thanks to Geofizyka Toruń S.A. for supporting this work, and Paradigm Geophysical for support in novelty application of their products.

I acknowledge also Henryk Kowalski and Michał Podolak from Geofizyka Toruń S.A., as well as Zvi Koren and Anat Canning from Paradigm for numerous discussions and their contributions to the project.

## References

- Daltka A., Rudzki M., 2013, Analysis of migration effects on anisotropy estimation for shale gas reservoirs a case study from northern Poland; EAGE 2013, Extended Abstracts.
- Helbig K., Thomsen L., 2005, 75-plus years of anisotropy in exploration and reservoir seismic: A historical review of concepts and methods; Geophysics, 70, 9ND-23ND.
- Koren Z., Ravve I., Levy R., 2013, Conversion of Background VTI Depth Model and Full-azimuth Reflection Angle Moveouts into Interval Orthorhombic Layered Parameters; EAGE 2013, Extended Abstracts.
- Koren Z., Ravve I., 2011, Full-azimuth subsurface angle domain wavefield decomposition and imaging Part 1: Directional and reflection image gathers; Geophysics, 76, S1-S13.
- Liu E., Martinez A., 2013, Seismic Fracture Characterization; EAGE 2013, ISBN 978-90-73834-40-8.
- Ravve I., Koren Z., 2011, Full-azimuth subsurface angle domain wavefield decomposition and imaging: Part 2 - Local angle domain; Geophysics, 76, S51-S64.