



Error Model Maintenance Committee Update

Andy McGregor
H&P



Speaker Bio

- Andy McGregor
- Technical Director, H&P UK.
- Inverness, Scotland
- 25 years in navigation and positioning
- 15 years in wellbore survey
- Previously with Tech21, Weatherford, AJC
- Specialised in survey management, algorithms, error modeling,





Error Model Sub-committee Meetings

- Autumn sub-committee meeting will be in two weeks:
 - 21st October
- Since last main ISCWSA
 - Meeting specifically on depth model (12th April)
 - Several meetings of Side-track Uncertainty Working group



Depth Meeting

- Current depth model comes from work by Roger Ekseth
 - Documented in his PhD and in SPE-95611
- Simulated 14 sources of error in drill-pipe and 11 in wireline
 - Finite element breakdown of errors
- Many input parameters not well known, particularly at planning stage
- Lumped these into four terms with simple weighting functions
 - Reference (Random & Systematic), stretch, scale
 - Gave accuracy of 80% his detailed simulation
 - Considered fit for purpose (??)
- Generic models use same magnitudes for all wells globally.



Alternative Suggestion #1

- Operator should be able to specify required depth accuracy for their needs
 - Service provider have a range of options to meet that requirement
 - Underpinned by accurate uncertainty modelling.
- Models should be well specific
- Meet needs of all users
 - Not just focused on position and collision avoidance for drilling phase
 - Meet the needs of G&G
 - Well logging tools



Alternative Suggestion #2

- Current model over simplified and lumping of terms confusing
 - Contributions due measurement technology and calibration / correction mingled.
- No range of model options provided
 - Doesn't cover well variations
 - Doesn't cover depth correction options
- Proposed new structure
 - Ref stability, measurement methodology, calibration, correction model and its fit.
- Model should be based on actual measurement and well uncertainty values.
 - Unique polynomials based on specific quantities measured in well



Conclusion

- Committee decided not to change the depth model
- Existing model considered sufficient for current purposes
 - Principally collision avoidance when drilling
- Users are free to vary current magnitudes if needed.
 - Generic models are exactly that.
- Existing documentation could be expanded to assist with that
 - Make Ekseth's thesis available on website
 - Add to section to definition document
 - Example repeating his calculations determining lumped magnitudes



Handling of Errors in Side-tracks

- Collision avoidance test set includes a side-track well.
- Inconsistency in handling errors for that well.
- Setup a working group to recommend best practice.

- Writing a document describing our conclusions
- Will create test cases



Calculation of Sidetrack Relative Uncertainty

- Existing method of calculating relative uncertainty will apply.
- Repeatedly we found that there isn't much special about side-tracks.
 - Most factors apply equally well to independent offsets.
 - Simple RSSing of pedal curve radii does not manage global terms correctly
- Some confusion over how to do this.
 - Will create explicit examples/test cases for website
- Should have zero relative lateral uncertainty at the side-track point
 - Discussion about whether this requires specific handling
 - Creating a worked example to clarify.



Calculation of Relative Uncertainty

- One method is described in SPE 67616 and the Error Model Definitions document
 - Add covariance matrices
 - Subtract product of error vectors of the globally propagating sources.
- Erik Nyrnes and Jon Bang presented the Matrix method
 - an alternative to the error summation formulation in SPE 67616
- Both implementations handle Global terms correctly, and give the same results
 - Matrix method will be added to definition document as alternative.



Other Considerations

- Depth stretch
 - for drill-pipe is generally global propagation (DSTG)
 - New term for wireline depth stretch with systematic propagation (DSTS)
- Md/TVD in (DSF/DST) weighting functions is from surface (not from side-track)
 - Unless physical depth matching used (PIP tag)
- Should handle case where continuous gyro initialises above side-track point.
 - Needs care if zeroing uncertainty at side-track
- Software must ensure that any special handling ONLY applies to parent/side-track
- Clear procedures to handle expect failure of CA rule immediately after side-tracking.
 - Also expected magnetic interference.



Questions

