

Fitness for Service of Casing materials for sour service

Challenges when operating existing wells under souring conditions in mature fields.

30.09.2024 Prepared by: Ryan Graham, Frode Bredal and Øyvind Lunde Presented by; Øyvind Lunde, Supervisor Well Integrity

Mature Fields and H_2S

- ConocoPhillips has been operating in the Greater Ekofisk Area (GEA) since 1969
- $H₂S$ was not an issue during early field life
- H igh H ₂S levels was not expected, so early well design did not include sour-service requirements
- In-reservoir $H_{2}S$ generation can be a very slow process
- Ekofisk seawater injection began in the late 1980s, H_2S concentrations became a challenge 25 years later

Recent $H₂S$ Activity and Challenges in GEA

- An isolated case of highly-increased H₂S concentrations occurred during Eldfisk S operations in 2018. Downhole conditions (temperature, sulfate supply) were optimal for SRB activity. Mechanism was outside of the normal generation process.
- This incident prompted a significant emphasis on managing H2S.
- Discovered that even wells with relatively low H₂S concentrations could end up with elevated risk for equipment failure in several operational phases.

SSC-induced failure in casing couplings

H₂S: Operational Issues and Well Integrity Challenges

• No special sour-service requirement for well components existed for wells prior to changes made in our "bases of design" in 2020-21.

- Most of our active wells were designed and built before this revision
- One of our field has lift gas that contains some H_2S , this gave us additional challenges
- Secondary barrier envelope identified to be the main concern
- Discovered that the most challenging condition was during pumping operations and longer "shut-in" periods, due to lower temperature
- Material H_2S tolerance tends to increase at higher temperatures (i.e. production) and in most cases is non existing above a certain temperature

Historic Well design • Primary Barrier 17/4 PH 0.5 psi partial pressure limit 17/4 PH 0.5 psi partial pressure limit 0.5 psi K-500 (Monel) 0.5 psi partial pressure limit K-500 (Monel) 0.5 psi partial pressure limit 316SS 2S tolerance is 0.5 psi partial pressure 13Cr L80 1.5 psi partial pressure limit 1.5 psi F6MN 1.5 psi partial pressure limit

• Secondary Barrier

Strategy for improving H_2S operability

- Build an improved monitoring tool and update/make improved procedures
- Revise well design steering documentation
- Documentation of well equipment
- Deviations with compensating measures
- Increase safe operating window to eliminate deviations and restrictions

NORSOK D-010:2021+AC2:2021

523 Well barrier requirements

5.2.3.1 Minimum number of well barrier envelopes in well construction-, production / injectionphases and after permanent P&A

The general principle is to operate with two defined well barrier envelopes against over-pressure and/or now potential. Lable 1 below states the minimum number of well barriers required for the different lifecycle phases for a well.

5.2.3.2 Well barrier selection and construction principles

The well barrier envelope shall consist of qualified WBEs, and be designed and constructed with the capability to:

- a) withstand the maximum differential pressure and temperature it can be exposed to (accounting for depletion or injection regimes in adjacent wells);
- be leak tested, function tested or verified by other methods; b)
- ensure that no single failure of a well barrier or WBE can lead to uncontrolled release of formation c) fluids and well fluids throughout the life cycle of a well;
- d) re-establish a failed well barrier or establish another alternative well barrier;
- operate competently and withstand the environment for which it can be exposed to for its intended $e)$ service life;
- f) be independent of other well barrier envelopes and avoid having common WBEs to the extent possible.

GEA H_2 S Monitoring

- Multidisciplinary H_2S group established to create new procedures and tools
- Sour service dashboard created for scalable overview of H_2S picture, from field-wide to test-specific per well
- Detailed data and calculations are displayed and mapped in configurable monitoring system
- Produced H_2S levels measured by sampling at test separator
- Gas lift system has continuous H_2S monitoring

Revised well design to make new wells more robust.

- Updated our bases of design to meet the changed well conditions in our fields
	- New design criteria with respect to H2S tolerance:
		- Primary barrier envelope: 1,5 Partial pressure
		- Secondary barrier envelope : Unlimited Partial pressure

• New requirements for documentation (DFO) on equipment to be implemented to ensure "in house" availability of key information an all our barrier elements during the well's lifetime.

H₂S: Operational Issues and Well Integrity Challenges

- Each well has hundreds of components which may be exposed to H_2S
- Identifying and classifying these components is a major task
- Components in barrier envelopes have the highest priority
- Operating limits are set in place for production (e.g. $H₂S$ partial pressures in gas lift)
- Deviations with mitigating measures are in place where barrier elements are at risk
- Wells are individually re-assessed before interventions

Costly compensating measures

- Plug setting to protect tubulars during shut in e.g., periodically maintenance shutdowns
- Reduced gaslift pressure
- GLV replacements before pumping operations and shut-in
- Liquid filling of annulus before pumping operations
- Use of scavenger to protect tubulars and other equipment during shut in and pumping
- Interventions needed for several of the compensating measures
	- Drives risk by itself
	- Costly
	- less value-added interventions

Material testing

- Increase safe operating window to be able to understand risk and minimize need for deviations and restrictions
	- Requalification of materials by laboratory testing is an effective way to raise limits
		- GEA is especially well-suited for material-testing technique
		- Consistent materials and field conditions
		- Straightforward method and application
		- Rapid results and implementation (2-4 months)
		- Very low cost compared to benefits

Re-certification of materials for sour service

- Current $pH₂S$ limits assume lowest material quality and least-favourable operating conditions
- Material-specific pH₂S limits may be increased by method defined in ISO-15156, Annex B
- Minimum of 9 tests required to recertify each material and condition (3 heats x 3 samples) Samples must represent the upper end of hardness range for each grad
- A single tensile failure on any sample/heat disqualifies a given condition
- Results apply to all casing, liner and tubing materials in each grade
- Higher material hardness = Lower H_2S tolerance

Pre-testing pH_2S limits for carbon steels

Standard NACE TM0177-A tensiles

Background: Material Testing

- Review available material certificates and identify most susceptible materials based on hardness/strength
- Start test program with most susceptible material, test three parallels and expand to two more materials if a pass is obtained.
- Increase or reduce severity to identify safe operational envelope for the subject materials based on test result outcome.
- Testing method is defined in ISO 15156-2 standard for use of carbon steels in H2Scontaining environments

SSC testing using NACE TM0177 Method A specification

Annex B (normative)

Qualification of carbon and low-alloy steels for H_2S service by laboratory testing

B.1 Requirements

This annex specifies requirements for qualifying carbon and low-alloy steels for H_2S service by laboratory testing. Requirements are given for qualifying resistance to the following cracking mechanisms.

SSC Testing: P110 and Q125

Begin testing with most-vulnerable materials under worst-case conditions for GEA

- Demonstrate that GEA downhole environment is consistent and well-monitored
- Set testing conditions to cover entire field (P99.7+)

 $\begin{array}{l} (0,1,0,2] \qquad (0,3,0,4] \qquad (0,5,0,6] \qquad (0,7,0,8] \qquad (0,9,1] \qquad (1,1,1,2] \qquad (1,3,1,4] \qquad (1,5,1,6] \qquad (1,7,1,8] \qquad (1,8,2] \nonumber \\ (0,0,1] \qquad (0,2,0,3] \qquad (0,4,0,5] \qquad (0,6,0,7] \qquad (0,8,0,9] \qquad (1,1,1] \qquad (1,2,1,3] \qquad (1,4,1,5] \qquad (1,6$ $(2.1, 2.2)$ $(2,3, 2,4)$ $[2, 2, 1]$

Phase 1, intial conditions Phase 2, two more P110 at 1 psi and redo Q125 at reduced pH2S

Phase 3, two more P110 at 1,5 psi and two more Q125 at 0,1 psi

 \bigcirc

Increased H2S partial-pressure limits for casing materials

Results

- P110 certified to 1.0 psi pH₂S at all temperatures to maximum design stress
	- *20X increase from pre-test limit*
- Q125 passed testing to 0.1 psi $pH₂S$ at all temperatures to maximum design stress

Current testing activity

- Q125 final certification
- Elevated-temperature testing (Q125 at 50 °C) New limits in ISO 15156-2

Ongoing and Potential Further Testing Work

- Elevated-temperature tests (ongoing for Q-125)
- Requalification tests for more materials (e.g. N80, proprietary material grades)
- High-pressure SSC testing to certify EPP factor

SSC testing continued to improve conditions for \sim 50 O125 wells : Test at 0,25 psi pH_2S at 50C

Q125 Casings (Excluding liner elements isolated below packer depth)

ConocoPhillips 16

ConocoPhillips 17

Going forward: Increased H_2S operational limits for wells

- Stress-modelling analysis
	- Operating conditions where components may be exposed to unacceptable SSC risk can be predicted by accurate simulation techniques (e.g. WellCat).

• Qualify a GEA-specific effective partial pressure (EPP) factor for reduced downhole H_2S reactivity (e.g. fugacity)

Summary

- Even relative low concentration of H2S can be a challenge in some operational phases/operations in wells that is not build for sour service
- Surveillance and sampling processes on all relevant wells is important
- Documentation on barrier elements (material spec etc.) is key
- Compensating measures can be very costly
- Material testing is a good way of setting/expanding the operational envelope and better understanding the risk.
- Stress modeling and Effective partial pressure methods is important tools to further understand risk and your real operational envelope

