

Gas Lift Intermittent Program





CMS Prodex have

developed the integrated

intermittent lift software (*GLIP*) which models the complex intermittent wells operation including simulation of dynamic and highly unsteady – state conditions.

The GLIP program is a powerful and flexible tool used by petroleum engineers to analyze fluid flow in the reservoir and well bore, and to design and optimize intermittent lift operation of oil and gas wells.

Numerous information and data were collected to calibrate developed model and to modify known solutions and to get a model to fit purposes- efficient simulator of intermittent operation.

Application of the model was proved on the fields (*Mexico, Venezuela, Serbia, Hungary etc.*). Information/data were collected and used improved known and applied solutions.

GLIP structure

DES - Data Entry System

Fluid, reservoir and well data base (DB), Equipment - tubing, casing and GLV data base, Injection system, Plunger data.

Tools

PVT package, IPR model, Turner analysis, Reservoir pressure estimation depending on available data.

Intermittent gas lift design and optimization

Automatic valve spacing and testing using various models, Optimized cycles

Trouble analysis

Operating valve depth, cycle simulation (number/day, Qginj, Qliq.)

Plunger design and simulation

Cycle, slug height simulation, pressure buildup, final operating parameters



Glip

Key features

The primary objective of software/suit development was to enable comprehensive analysis of complex well behavior operating intermittently by integrating two apparently separated subsystems into unique model (reservoir/well- hydrodynamic and equipment /mechanic). Model can operate with limited number of information of the reservoir and has ability to predict the performance of well (IPR) if only one test data are available without knowing the reservoir pressure. An intermittent gas lift installation should not considered properly until a two-pen pressures recording instrument has been installed to make daily recording of the tubing and casing pressure.

A control, regulation and problem diagnosis of wells operating intermittently is possible only if measured data are available (surface and bottom). By careful analysis of the tubing and casing pressures, many troubles can be interpreted and corrected without an expense bottom-hole pressures surveys.

Additional features include the detailed analysis of the well and evaluation if the well good candidate for plunger lift application or not (Turner analysis – minimum gas velocity to lift accumulated liquid).

A multitude of design and optimization options offered in GLIP provide you with a great flexibility to analyze or design a system that matches best to yours.





The options include:

- Designing, optimization, simulation of future conditions and problem analysis of intermittent wells operations
- Simulating pressure buildup during by numerical solution of fluid inflow performance model
- Defining optimal well operating parameters
- Increasing well production efficiency.
- Eliminating requests for downhole pressure survey
- Troubleshooting analysis (Qualitative and Quantitative)
- Comprehensiveness- application in analysis of intermittent gas lift wells at given operating conditions
- Comparison of data on pressure buildup with simulated data
- Simulation of well conditions using minimal number of data (two-pen chart)



Features details

Data Entry System (DES) 🧧

GLIP uses hierarchical representation that may be visualized in the data browser. **DES** is generating data base where all data and information are organized in well-defined hierarchy with the **Data Browser**. At the top of this hierarchy structure is the system for entering, editing and deleting field, reservoir and well data.

Well data are classified to:

- General well information
- Well Geometry
- Completion data
- Fluid Properties
- Reservoir properties
- General information about surface conditions
- Measurements (production tests, trajectory and surface pressure test, downhole P&T)



File

🔲 🕦 🖶 🛣 |

🛛 Data Entry System

MSB/MZ -D/MSBExample6

General well information 👔

1 Well Info Field Name MSB MZ -D Beservoir Name MSBE xample6 Well Name GLIP Designer / Analyst 3 / 4 /2007 Created 8 /25/2007 Last Change Comment Pressure and temperature at the depth of GLV is available. The objective is define operating GLV and optimize well operation. ΟK Cancel Help

6	Well Geome	try				
ſ	General Data					
	acherarbata	Independit [
	Calculated Valu	e	Angle		•	Trajectory
			, -		_	
	Measurment	Vertical Depth	Angle (deg)	Horizontal	-	200
	Depth (m)	(m)	Angle (deg)	Distance (m)		
	100.00	100.00	5.126	0.00		
	200.00	199.60	5.126	8.94		
	300.00	299.20	2.563	17.87		_ m = 🔪 🔪
	400.00	399.10	2.563	22.34		- E.
	500.00	499.00	8.110	26.81		
	600.00	598.00	3.624	40.92		1 +200
	700.00	697.80	2.563	47.24		1400
	800.00	797.70	4.439	51.71		
	900.00	897.40	4.439	59.45		1000
	1000.00	997.10	1.812	67.19		1000
	1100.00	1097.05	1.812	70.35		
	1200.00	1197.00	2.563	73.52		
	1300.00	1296.90	5.126	77.99		2200
	1400.00	1396.50	2.563	86.92	-	0 20 40 60 10 100 120 Horizonal Disance (#)

Well Geometry

Well Info Well Geometry Fluid Properties Reservoir Completion Surface Measurements Customize Window Help

Completion data



.

Gas

mpresibility

0.905

0.91

0.911

0.914

0.92

0.922 🔻



🥒 Reservoir

Fluid Type Drive Mehanism Initial Reservoir Pressure Reservoir Pressure

Reservoir Temperature

Vertical Permeability

Horizontal Permeability

Total System Compressibilit

Oil Relative Permeability

Total Thickness

Permeability

Porosity



Bes

		👗 Fluid Prope	rties					
Dil	•	General Data	Gas Compositio	n PVT Oil-La	ы			
Solution Gas	_	Bubblepoint Pre	ssure	210	.00 bar			
113.00 bar 112.00 °C		Pressure (bar)	Solution Gas (m3/m3)	Oil Formation Volume Factor (m3/m3)	Gas Formation Volume Factor (m3/m3)	Saturated Oil Viscosity (mPa.s)	Gas Viscosity (mPa.s)	Co
3.70 mD		208.00	87.50000	1.30000	0.04500	0.650000	0.019500	
0.00 mD		200.00	84.00000	1.28000	0.05100	0.670000	0.019000	
0.00 mD		190.00	79.50000	1.27200	0.05700	0.680000	0.018700	
, 0.00 mb		188.00	78.50000	1.26900	0.05760	0.685000	0.018500	
0.164		180.00	75.00000	1.25800	0.06000	0.690000	0.018200	
0.00054 1/ba	ar	170.00	70.00000	1.25000	0.06400	0.700000	0.018000	
03		160.00	66.30000	1.24500	0.07000	0.720000	0.017700	
0.5		150.00	62.20000	1.23800	0.07400	0.740000	0.017900	
4.00 m								







Production tests



	D	ownhole	e P&T ≷	1	
roduction	Test				
Bottomhole	Liquid	Oil production	Water	Water Cut	Gas

ቅ Productio

pressure (bar)	(m3/day)	(m3/day)	(m3/day)	(frac)	(m3/day)
64.00	2.90	2.32	0.58	0.2000	920.00
					
Water Cut		0.2	000 frac	Input Type	Liquid
			OK	Cance	el Help





Tools

Static pressure estimation



In the case when static pressure is not known, the developed tool is able to determine a probable value of static pressure by using measurement data. If only one test is available (rate/pressure), model is resolving the set of IPR equations trying to find for which assumed flow exponent or laminar flow coefficients, the difference between two various methods is minimum. The process of calculation can be completely under control of system, or user can give the best estimation, and program will calculate the most probably static pressure.

If two or more test rates are known the accuracy of static pressure estimation is higher and very close to the real reservoir pressure.

Unknown inflow parameters (flow exponent, flow coefficients) can be calculated and determine uniquely.



Fluid Physical Characteristics and PVT 🛛 👗



The program establishes the valid black oil PVT correlations for oil, gas, condensates and water.

Correlations can be automatically matched with measured data. Since gas evaluation in the tubing is a constant composition process, flash data, not differential liberation, should be used for matching. The temperature and bubble point should be entered to match the data given in table.



General Dat	a							×
Reservoir S	urface							
Fluid Properties	Gas Composi	tion PVT Oil-L	.ab					. 1
Bubblepoint Pre	ssure	121	.00 bar					
Pressure (bar)	Solution Gas (m3/m3)	Oil Formation Volume Factor (m3/m3)	Gas Formation Volume Factor (m3/m3)	Saturated Oil Viscosity (mPa.s)	Gas Viscosity (mPa.s)	Gas Compresibility		
110.32	35.00000	1.16000		18.300000				
93.08	29.00000	1.13000		19.400000				
75.84	24.00000	1.11000		21.400000				
58.60	21.00000	1.09000		22.300000				
44.13	18.00000	1.08000		23.500000				
24.00	12.00000	1.06000		23.900000				
10.96	6.50000	1.05000		24.300000				
1.10	1.00000	1.04000		25.100000			-	μ
					Clo		lelp	



Correlations used for oil bubble pressure (**Pb**), solution gas (Rs) and oil formation factor (Bo) are: Standing, Lasater, Vasquez-Beggs, Glaso, MECO (Middle East Crude Oils).

PVT module calculates live and dead oil viscosity using Beggs-Robinson, Beal and Chew Connelly correlations. Calculations of density of live and dead oil are included, also.

Reservoir water 💦





Gas / Condesate 🔀 🐴



The necessary calculation properties of reservoir and dry injection gases are applied. When gas is selected as the PVT option, it is requested to enter composition either reservoir or dry injection gas, as is displayed on the input data screen.

To simulate gas behavior at various P &T conditions the analytical **Standing** and Brill - Beggs correlation user can select, or use solution of EOS, proposed by Hall and Yarborough (OGJ, June, 1973).

Fluid Physical Characteristics and PVT			
e Data PVT-Gas PVT-Oil PVT-Condensate PVT-Water Customize Win	dow Help		
] 🖪 💥 & & & & E 🗌 🔳) 🤣		
N_L/L_28/VEN_LExample3			
V PVT Gas Graphics			
Select Graph Gas Compresibility	Pressure Temperature		
Gas Compresibility	😵 PVT Gas		
	Gas Molecular Weight Gas Compresibility Gas Density Gas Formation Volume Factor Gas Viscosity	21.23 g/mol 0.87034 60.18 kg/m3 0.00265 m3/m3 0.022608 mPa.s	E.O.S Empirical Empirical
1008	Graph	_	Close Help
0.00 			

General Data Reservoir Surface Fluid Properties Gas Composition PVT Oil-Lab Molarity (%) Component Name Methane (CH4) 83.3000 Ethane (C2H6) 5,7000 2.6000 Propane (C3H8) 2.0000 i-Buthane (i-C4H10) 2.3000 n-Buthane (n-C4H10) i-Penthane (i-C5H12) 1.2000 n-Penthane (n-C5H12) 1.3000 Carbon dioxid (CO2) 1.6000 • Close Help 👯 PVT Gas 21.23 g/mol Gas Molecular Weight Gas Compresibility 0.87034 E.O.S • Standing 60.18 kg/m3 Gas Density Brill Beggs 0.00265 m3/m3 Gas Formation Volume Factor Lab.Value 0.022608 mPa.s Empirical Gas Viscosity • Graph Close Help

Glip

Inflow performance relationship



The Inflow Performance Relationship (IPR) is the production engineer's shorthand description of the performance of a well at a given reservoir pressure. IPR is the relationship between the bottomhole flowing pressure and flow rates, and it is the starting point in the analysis of a well's behavior. IPR includes the effects of both reservoir and completion efficiency. The shape of the IPR curve and the method that will be used to establish the relation between the flowing bottomhole pressures and flow rates depend on many factors, like relation between reservoir and saturation pressures (single or two-phase flow), physical characteristics of the reservoir and fluids etc. When the flowing pressure in the formation falls below the bubble point (Pb), gas comes out of solution, reduces the permeability to the oil phase, decreases the productivity index, and reduces the oil flow rate within formation. At increased production rates, Pwf decreases and more gas comes out of solution within reservoir, and the relative permeability to oil decreases.



Other factors such as increased oil viscosity, rock compressibility, and turbulence can add to these effects as wellbore pressures fall and rates increase. The IPR evaluation method selection depending on the flow type and regime as well as well geometry (vertical / slant / horizontal).

Selection of the IPR method is strongly depending on data entered in DES and data required only for IPR modeling. GLIP is controlling the availability of data, as well as the data quality. As results of such checking, the system will select only that models for which there are enough information. If there is not needed information for particular model, on report screen it can be seen that calculated AOFP is 0.

Future IPR performance can be used to design intermittent operation for expected conditions.



If trajectory data have been entered, then system is analyzing information and using build-in rules will decide which type of well was drilled through productive zone. According to results of checking and analyzes, system will recognized the well geometry and will choose the corresponding IPR models (vertical, slant or horizontal). To continue with design program is asking to select IPR method that will be used for all other purposes (design, trouble analysis and optimization).



Critical gas velocity analysis 🛛 💓



One of the most important aspects in the investigations of the liquidloading phenomena in the gas wells has been focused on how predict the critical gas flow rate or production parameters under which liquid entrainment is impossible.

Program calculates the critical /minimum gas velocity required to keep well with liquid accumulation. Two methods are used:

Turner

cmsprodex

Modified Turner method (SPE 75455)

As results of calculation program gives the dependence of critical gas velocity for various tubing size for cases, wellhead and bottomhole.

urner New Method					
elect Graph	Critical Gas Flow Rate	Solution		At Wellhead	•
	Critical Gas Flow Rate	Pressure	Gas Velocity	Gas Producti	ion (m3/day)
	Solution At Wellhead (Turner)	(bar)	(m/s)	59.004 mm	66.091 mm
26 - 1 59.004 mm (Well is)	paded) 66.091 mm (Well is loaded) 150.400 mm (Well is loade	9 13.8	0 3.2139	10187.52	12781.
LE LI		/ 14.4	2 3.1399	10411.58	13062.8
25-		/ 15.0	4 3.0704	10630.80	13337.9
24		/ 15.6	5 3.0049	10845.47	13607.3
73		/ 16.2	2.9432	11055.85	13871.
		/ 16.8	9 2.8847	11262.19	14130.
22-		17.5	1 2.8293	11464.70	14384.
E21 -		18.1	3 2.7767	11663.58	14633.6
Gas production 2831 m3/s	la/	18.7	4 2.7267	11859.02	14878.8
	καγ	/ 19.3	6 2.6789	12051.18	15119.9
ĝ19-Ē	1	19.9	8 2.6334	12240.20	15357.
	1	20.6	0 2.5898	12426.25	15590.9
"E		21.2	2.5481	12609.43	15820.0
17 -		21.8	3 2.5081	12789.89	16046.8
16 E	/ · · · / · · · /	22.4	5 2.4698	12967.72	16269.5
		23.0	2.4329	13143.04	16489.8
15 -		23.6	3 2.3974	13315.94	16706.0
14	the second s	24.3	0 2.3633	13486.51	17122.0
E.I		24.3	2.3303	13654.84	17132.



Intermittent gas lift design

Intermittent gas lift design includes the evaluation of the following parameters: valves setting depth and characteristics of gas lift valves. The setting depths and characteristics of gaslift valves can be evaluated graphically and analytically.

There are various methods for designing intermittent lift installations. Most of them fall into two basic categories:

- Design based on Intermittent Spacing Factor (constant and decrease gas lift valve surface closing pressure).
- Design based on ratio tubing and casing pressure ("Percent Load" and "Opti-flow" methods)

The spacing factor method is recommended for the wells with known inflow characteristics. This method requires the largest number of input data. The depth of the operating valve is automatically evaluated as the explicit function of the reservoir and flowing bottom-hole pressures and the static and flowing gradients.

The tubing / injection pressure method requires minimum information on the reservoir. The designer designates the operating valve taking into account the tubing / injection pressure at valve opening.



Intermittent gas lift optimization



The most important dynamic parameters that should be determined are in order to optimize the well operation are:

- The gas flow rate flowing through gas lift valve,
- The velocity of the liquid slug lifted with gas,
- The liquid volume surfacing in slug form,
- The dispersed liquid volume,
- Cycle per day
- The changes of the flowing bottom-hole pressure.

An important part of dynamic parameters consideration is evaluation of the velocity with which a gas bubble penetrates liquid above in tubing.



Intermittent Gas Lift Optimization

Expected Production Rate								
Max. Liquid Fallback								
Tubing Pressure Increment	1.00	bar						
Gas Injection Time	8.0	sec						
Adiabatic Exponent	1.29							
Change Tubing Pressure at Ope	erating Valve (bar)		0.00 🔺					
Change Average Tubing Pressu	ıre (bar)		0.01					
Change Tubing Gas Volume at 1	Standard Cond. (m	3/day)	49143.46					
Liquid Slug Flow Velocity (m/s)			5.8561					
Critical Ratio			0.54754					
Relation Tub Press/Gas Casing	Press.		0.54754					
Gas Passage Trough Operating	Valve (m3/day)		90214.27					
Gas Injection Time per Cycle (se	ec)		73.4					
Slug Lift Period (sec)			156.7					
Time to Complete Slug Lifting ar	nd Gas Inj. During (One Cycle (sec)	230.1					
Required Gas Rate per Cycle (n	n3)		76.6362					
Fluid Production per Cycles (m3	0.3823							
Cycles Frequency	68 💌							
Optimized Valve								
Optimization	ptimization Close Help							

Glip



Trouble Analysis



An intermittent gas lift installation should not considered properly until a two-pen pressures recording instrument has been installed to make daily recording of the tubing and casing pressure. By careful study of the tubing and casing pressures, many troubles may be interpreted and corrected without the expense of pressures surveys or tubing jobs.

The knowledge of well operation regulation and control in intermittent gas lift is possible only if the data for measuring tubing / casing pressures and for measuring bottom hole flowing pressure are available; this was the basis for acquiring the sufficient number of data which were the foundation of a intermittent gas lift well performance study.

Two Pen Analysis							
Select Graph	Simulated Well Performance	•		Operating Va	lve	4	
	Simulated Well Performance			Maximum Sp	acing Factor	0.	0058 bar/m
140			Current Conditions Historical Conditions Expected Condition	Surface Clos Bottom	ing Pressure at	4	14.60 bar
120			Firture Conditions Firture Conditions	Surface Ope Bottom	ning Pressure a	it 🖉	18.11 bar
(m e) #100				Slug Height I Production p	Based on Liquic er Cycle	1	14.05 m
Liess ur				Tubing Press Operating Va	ure under Ive		36.90 bar
g ming	6:00.70.00)			Total Volume Line and Anr	e of Injection Ga hulus	as 13.	4927 m3
a E eo -				Injection Gas	Volume per Cy	icle 17.	0478 m3
	6.90			Daily Gas Inj	ection Volume	204.	5740 m3
	6.28,30.30)			Initial Slug Le Operating Va	ength above Ilve	42	23.66 m
20+				Initial Slug Vi Operating Va	olume above alve	0.	8544 m3
	+ <u>1,7,7,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1,1</u>	պես		Liquid Produ	ction per Cycle	0.	2300 m3
0 i 2	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 OllProchectori≬n3kbaγ)	10		Liquid Fallba	ck	1	73.08 %
Valve Number		1	2	3	4	5	6 🔺
Valve Manufacturer		SLB (Camco)	SLB (Camco)	SLB (Camco)	SLB (Camco)	SLB (Camco) S	LB (Camco)
Gas Lift Valve Type		Bellows with n	Bellows with n	Bellows with n	Bellows with n	Bellows with n B	ellows with n
Valve Outside Diameter (mm)	38.100	38.100	38.100	38.100	38.100	38.100
Valve Name		J-20m	J-20m	J-20m	J-20m	J-20m	J-20m
Port Inside Diameter (mm	1	6.350	6.350	6.350	6.350	6.350	9.525
Seat/Bellow Area		0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.148
Discharge Coefficient		0.850	0.850	0.850	0.850	0.850	0.900
Valve Depth (m)		442.55	824.38	1178.33	1505.07	1811.44	1950.00 💌

The main objectives of intermittent well trouble analysis are:

- Depth of operating gas lift valve
- Simulation of well conditions using minimal number of data
- Surface opening and closing pressure
- Gas injection data
- Eliminating requests for downhole pressure survey
- Defining optimal well operating parameters
- Comparison of data on pressure build-up with simulated data
- Increasing well production efficiency in intermittent gas lift wells.



5000

10000

15000 Time (sec) 20000

25000

Glip

Plunger design and simulation 📗 🚺 🏠



The installations of the plungers not only increase the production, but sustain this increase over a long period. It has been observed in many cases, the rate of decline has actually changed, extending the life of the well dramatically. The basic questions that petroleum production engineers are faced when they intend to apply the plunger lift are:

1 - Is it possible makes a good well selection and where it should be applied?

2 - Is there enough pressure and gas volume?

3 - Will it run under a packer?

4 - Is sales line pressure too high?

5 - What are operating and maintenance costs?

6 - How long will it be effective?

7 - Will eventually need a pumping unit?

Knowing the answers to these questions give possibilities to identify the best candidates, operating cost and economics.





Gas Lift Intermittent Program Preassure Buildup at Surface Casing pressure buildup simulation 28.5 28.4-28.3 a²28.2) 228.1 228.1 1 228.0 27.9 27.8 27.7 -10000 acco Time (sec) 6000 Well Flowline shut-in time 300.0 sec Total required gas volume per 108.7977 m3 cycle Average liquid production per 0.3926 m3 cycle Time for slug surfacing 387.0 sec Tubing Plunger fall time 393.0 sec 15180.0 sec Cycle Time 2 3 4 5 4

cmsprodex

Plunger and slug velocity simulation / Slug buildup and cycles

Detailed plunger design



Casing pressure buildup simulation

Additional features

Unit conversion system



The built flexibility of the units system enables you to select any group of parameters and to select and define the unit of measurement. You can customize the units to suit your own personal preferences. By making selections from different categories, you can work in the units you prefer and save results in the units required by company police. GLIP offers a guick and simple conversion tool (API, SI, or customized).

If you do change units while running a session, they will remain changed permanently until you decide to change them back again.

Languages



GLIP is a multilingual program. The working language (English, Spanish, and Serbian) can be changed on-line without any additional requirements. Also, every required report will be generated in selected language without interrupting the work with program.

Reports



The flexible architecture of software enables you to customize your request and to select which information and data you want to have in report. In each GLIP module you can customize report and generate it in HTML format. As already explained above, report(s) will be generated in the currently active language.

F Set Units				Þ
Unit System Unit	Custom SI GIAPI Custom	- -	Init	-
Area	Castolin	m2		
Compresibility		1/bar		
Density		kg/m3		
Depth, Length		m		
Diameter		mm		
Formation Fact	or	m3/m3		
Gas Rate		m3/day		
Oil Rate		m3/day		
Permeability		mD		
Pressure		bar		-
	ОК	Cancel		Help







What is coming next?

• Include pattern recognition and neural network modeling

As intermittent operation is fully unsteady state process using predictive features of neural network tools, diagnosis capabilities of the model could be significantly improved. Recognition of typical two-pen chart shapes (casing and tubing pressures at surface)

• New research and test data to include slippage effect and fallback

Operating depth of gas entering, liquid fallback, plunger rising and falling velocity should be deeper investigated and include in model.

Build physical model with real time monitoring to simulate different conditions on field.

• Software modifications

Connect real time data with expert model.

Include new improved IPR model for gas condensate wells.

Liquid loading prediction using decline analysis

Simulation of chemicals injection for solving liquid loading

Pumping systems (sucker road, progressive cavity and electrical submersible pumps)