Progress Report (Baker-Atlas)

A Fully Automatic Goal-Oriented *hp*-Adaptive Finite Element Strategy for Simulations of Resistivity Logging Instruments.

David Pardo (dzubiaur@yahoo.es), C. Torres-Verdin, L. Demkowicz, L. Tabarovsky, A. Bespalov

Collaborators: Science Department of Baker-Atlas, J. Kurtz, M. Paszynski

February 22, 2005

Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences (ICES) The University of Texas at Austin

OVERVIEW

1. Overview

2. Mathematical Formulation of Electrodynamic Problems

- Maxwell's Equations and Boundary Conditions
- Variational Formulation
- Axial Symmetry

3. Error Estimation: Towards Certified Solutions

- Control of Modeling and Discretization Errors
- Automatic Built-in Error Estimation
- Benchmarking Problems
- 4. Numerical Results
- **5. Conclusions and Future Work**

MAXWELL'S EQUATIONS (FREQUENCY DOMAIN)

Time Harmonic Maxwell's Equations:

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -j\omega\mu\mathbf{H}$$
$$\nabla \times \mathbf{H} = (\sigma + j\omega\epsilon)\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{J}^{imp}$$

Reduced Wave Equation:

E-Formulation

H-Formulation

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \left(\frac{1}{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \boldsymbol{E}\right) - (\omega^2 \epsilon - j\omega\sigma) \boldsymbol{E} = -j\omega \boldsymbol{J}^{imp} \quad ; \quad \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \left(\frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \boldsymbol{H}\right) + j\omega\mu \boldsymbol{H} = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} \boldsymbol{J}^{imp}$$

Boundary Conditions (BC):

• Perfect Electric Conductor Surface:

$$\mathbf{n} \times \boldsymbol{E} = 0 \qquad \qquad ; \qquad \qquad \mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{H} = 0$$

• Idealized Antennas (Impressed Surface Electric Current):

$$\mathbf{n} \times \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \boldsymbol{E} = -j\omega \mathbf{J}_{S}^{imp}$$
; $\mathbf{n} \times \boldsymbol{H} = \mathbf{J}_{S}^{imp}$

MAXWELL'S EQUATIONS (FREQUENCY DOMAIN)

Variational formulation

The reduced wave equation in Ω ,

E-Formulation:
$$abla imes \left(\frac{1}{\mu} \nabla imes E\right) - (\omega^2 \epsilon - j\omega\sigma)E = -j\omega J^{imp}$$

H-Formulation: $abla imes \left(\frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} \nabla imes H\right) + j\omega\mu H = \nabla imes rac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} J^{imp}$

Variational formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}\text{-Formulation:} & \left\{ \begin{aligned} \mathsf{Find} \ \mathrm{E} \in H_D(\operatorname{curl};\Omega) \ \mathsf{such that:} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\mu} (\nabla \times \mathrm{E}) (\nabla \times \bar{\mathrm{F}}) \ dV - \int_{\Omega} (\omega^2 \epsilon - j\omega\sigma) \mathrm{E} \cdot \bar{\mathrm{F}} \ dV = \\ & -j\omega \int_{\Omega} \mathrm{J}^{imp} \cdot \bar{\mathrm{F}} \ dV + j\omega \int_{\Gamma_N} \mathrm{J}^{imp}_S \cdot \bar{\mathrm{F}} \ dS \quad \forall \, \mathrm{F} \in H_D(\operatorname{curl};\Omega) \\ & \mathsf{H}\text{-}\mathsf{Formulation:} \right. \\ \left\{ \begin{aligned} \mathsf{Find} \ \mathrm{H} \in \tilde{\mathrm{H}}_S + H_D(\operatorname{curl};\Omega) \ \mathsf{with} \ \tilde{\mathrm{J}}^{imp}_S = \mathrm{n} \times \mathrm{H}|_S \ \mathsf{and} \ \mathsf{such that:} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\nabla \times \mathrm{H}) (\nabla \times \bar{\mathrm{F}}) \ dV + j\omega \int_{\Omega} \mu \mathrm{H} \cdot \bar{\mathrm{F}} \ dV = \\ & \int_{\Omega} \nabla \times (\frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} \mathrm{J}^{imp}) \cdot \bar{\mathrm{F}} \ dV \quad \forall \, \mathrm{F} \in H_D(\operatorname{curl};\Omega) \end{aligned} \right. \end{aligned}$$

MAXWELL'S EQUATIONS (FREQUENCY DOMAIN)

Variational formulation in cylindrical coordinates

Using cylindrical coordinates $(
ho, \phi, z)$:

$$\begin{split} & \mathsf{Formulation:} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Find} \ E_{\phi} \in \tilde{H}_{D}^{1}(\Omega) \ \text{such that:} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\mu} (\frac{\partial E_{\phi}}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \bar{F}_{\phi}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho^{2}} \frac{\partial (\rho E_{\phi})}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial (\rho \bar{F}_{\phi})}{\partial \rho}) \ dV - \int_{\Omega} k^{2} E_{\phi} \cdot \bar{F}_{\phi} \ dV = \\ & -j\omega \int_{\Omega} J_{\phi}^{imp} \cdot \bar{F}_{\phi} \ dV + j\omega \int_{\Gamma_{N}} J_{\phi,S}^{imp} \cdot \bar{F}_{\phi} \ dS \quad \forall \ F_{\phi} \in \tilde{H}_{D}^{1}(\Omega) \ . \\ \\ \mathsf{E}_{\rho,z}\text{-}\mathsf{Formulation:} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Find} \ \mathbf{E} = (E_{\rho}, 0, E_{z}) \in \tilde{H}_{D}(\mathsf{curl}; \Omega) \ \mathsf{such that:} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\mu} (\frac{\partial E_{\rho}}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \bar{F}_{\rho}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial E_{z}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial \bar{F}_{z}}{\partial \rho}) - k^{2} \int_{\Omega} E_{\rho} \bar{F}_{\rho} + E_{z} \bar{F}_{z} \ dV = -j\omega \int_{\Omega} J_{\rho}^{imp} \bar{F}_{\rho} + J_{z}^{imp} \bar{F}_{z} \ dV + \\ & j\omega \int_{\Gamma_{N}} J_{\rho,S}^{inp} \bar{F}_{\rho} + J_{z,S}^{imp} \bar{F}_{z} \ dS \quad \forall \ \mathbf{F} = (F_{\rho}, 0, F_{z}) \in \tilde{H}_{D}(\mathsf{curl}; \Omega) \ . \\ \\ H_{\phi}\text{-}\mathsf{Formulation:} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Find} \ H_{\phi} \in f_{1}(J_{\rho,S}^{imp}, J_{z,S}^{imp}) + \tilde{H}_{D}^{1}(\Omega) \ \mathsf{such that:} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\frac{\partial H_{\phi}}{\partial z} \frac{\partial \bar{F}_{\phi}}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\rho^{2}} \frac{\partial (\rho H_{\phi})}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial (\rho \bar{F}_{\phi})}{\partial \rho}) \ dV - j\omega \int_{\Omega} \mu H_{\phi} \cdot \bar{F}_{\phi} \ dV = \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\frac{\partial J_{\rho}}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial J_{z}^{imp}}{\partial \rho}) + \tilde{H}_{D}(\mathsf{curl}; \Omega) \ \mathsf{such that:} \\ \\ H_{\rho,z}\text{-}\mathsf{Formulation:} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Find} \ H = H_{\rho}, 0, H_{z} \ f_{2}(J_{\phi,S}^{imp}) + \tilde{H}_{D}(\mathsf{curl}; \Omega) \ \mathsf{such that:} \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\frac{\partial J_{\rho}}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial J_{z}^{imp}}{\partial \rho}) - \frac{\partial J_{z}^{imp}}{\partial \rho} - \frac{\partial J_{\rho}}{\partial \rho} \right) dV - j\omega \int_{\Omega} \mu H_{\phi} \cdot \bar{F}_{\phi} \ dV = \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\frac{\partial J_{\rho}}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial J_{z}^{imp}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial J_{z}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial (\rho \bar{F}_{\rho})}{\partial \rho}) - j\omega \int_{\Omega} \mu (H_{\rho} \bar{F}_{\rho} + H_{z} \bar{F}_{z}) \ dV = \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\frac{\partial J_{\phi}}{\partial z} \bar{F}_{\rho} + \frac{\partial H_{z}}{\partial \rho} \frac{\partial \bar{F}_{z}}{\partial \rho}) - j\omega \int_{\Omega} \mu (H_{\rho} \bar{F}_{\rho} + H_{z} \bar{F}_{z}) \ dV = \\ & \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\sigma + j\omega\epsilon} (\frac{\partial J_{\phi}}{\partial z} \bar{F}_{\rho} + \frac{\partial (\rho J_{\phi} J_{\phi})}{\partial \rho} \bar{F}_{z}) \ dV \quad \forall \ \mathbf{F} = (F_{\rho}, 0, F_{z}) \in \tilde{H}_{D}(\mathsf{curl}; \Omega) \ . \end{array} \right\}$$

TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Sources of Error



Geometry and BC's The Code (Bugs) Discretization

The University of Texas at Austin

Coupling Physics

Material Coefficients

22 Feb 2005

TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Sources of Error

Computational Problem

Approx. Geometry Maxwell's Equations Perfect Instruments Boundary Conditions



Solution is Not Exact Due to Errors in:

- Mathematical Modeling
- Geometry and BC's
- The Code (Bugs)
- Discretization



22 Feb 2005

TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Sources of Error

Computational Problem

Approx. Geometry Maxwell's Equations Perfect Instruments Boundary Conditions



Solution is Not Exact Due to Errors in:

- Mathematical Modeling
- Geometry and BC's
- The Code (Bugs)
- Discretization



TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Avoiding Errors in the Code Using Benchmarking Examples

Solutions in a Homogeneous Lossy (1 Ω m) Media (2 Mhz)Solenoid AntennaToroid Antenna



22 Feb 2005

TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Sources of Error

Computational Problem

Approx. Geometry Maxwell's Equations Perfect Instruments Boundary Conditions



Solution is Not Exact Due to Errors in:

- Mathematical Modeling
- Geometry and BC's
- The Code (Bugs)
- Discretization



TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Avoiding Errors in the Code Using Benchmarking Examples

Solutions in a Homogeneous Lossy (1 Ω m) Media (2 Mhz) in Presence of a Conductive Mandrel

Solenoid Antenna

Toroid Antenna



Magnetic Field

The University of Texas at Austin

8

TOWARDS CERTIFIED SOLUTIONS

Summary

Computational Problem

Approx. Geometry Maxwell's Equations Perfect Instruments Boundary Conditions



Solution is Not Exact Due to Errors in:

- Mathematical Modeling
- Geometry and BC's
- The Code (Bugs)
- Discretization

THROUGH CASING RESISTIVITY INSTRUMENTS



Axisymmetric 3D problem.

Five different materials.

Size of computational domain: SEVERAL MILES.

Material properties varying by up to TEN orders of magnitude (1000000000!!!).

Objective: Determine Second Difference of Potential Receiving Electrodes.

Logging Through Casing (Benchmark Problem) Rock Formation: Homogeneous Media



The second vertical difference of the Electric Potential is proportional to the formation conductivity.

Final Log Obtained by Our Finite Element Software





Approximation Error





Damaged Casing



In the presence of damaged casing, the use of calibrated instruments is essential.

THROUGH CASING RESISTIVITY INSTRUMENTS



Axisymmetric 3D problem.

Toroid Antennas.

Size of computational domain: SEVERAL MILES.

Different frequencies.

Material properties varying by up to NINE orders of magnitude (1000000000!!!).

Objective:DetermineFirst Difference of Electric andMagnetic Fields.

First Difference of Electric Field at Different Frequencies



Toroid antennas are more sensitive to the rock formation resistivity when located on the borehole's wall

First Difference of Magnetic Field at Different Frequencies



Electromagnetic Fields at Different Frequencies



Electromagnetic Fields are almost constant for frequencies below 1 kHz. A sudden drop in the amplitude occurs at frequencies above 20 kHz.



Final Log Obtained by Our Finite Element Software



If the transmitter antenna is located on the surface of a cased well, the received EM signal within the borehole is too weak.

Final Log Obtained by Our Finite Element Software



Magnetic Field

Electric Field

If the transmitter antenna is located on the surface of a cased well, the received cross-well EM signal is too weak.

Final Log Obtained by Our Finite Element Software



If the transmitter antenna is located on the surface of a cased well, a 60 meters layer of water cannot be detected by using cross-well EM signals.

Final Log Obtained by Our Finite Element Software



If the transmitter antenna is located downhole a cased well, it is feasible to perform meaningful cross-well EM measurements.





E_{ϕ} (normalized) for a solenoid antenna



Frequency: 2 Mhz

First Difference of E_{ϕ} (normalized) for a solenoid antenna



Frequency: 2 Mhz

The University of Texas at Austin

High Performance Finite Element Software

First Difference of E_{ϕ} (normalized) for a solenoid antenna



Frequency: 2 Mhz, NO MAGNETIC BUFFER

First Difference of H_{ϕ} (normalized) for a toroid antenna



Frequency: 2 Mhz

The University of Texas at Austin

High Performance Finite Element Software

First Difference of E_z (normalized) for a toroid antenna



The University of Texas at Austin

29

CONCLUSIONS

- It is possible to simulate a variety of EM logging instruments by using the self-adaptive goal-oriented hp-FEM.
- For TCRT, preliminary simulations suggest to
 - 1. Place antennas on the borehole's wall,
 - 2. use calibrated instruments,
 - 3. use low frequencies (typically below 5 kHz),
 - 4. use downhole antennas for cross-well EM measurements, and
 - 5. avoid the use of cross-well EM measurements for assessment of water injection.

• For LWD instruments, preliminary simulations suggest to

- 1. Use both solenoid and toroid antennas,
- 2. use magnetic buffers to amplify EM signals, and
- 3. compute first differences of EM fields.

Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences

FUTURE WORK

Within the next 3 months

- Implementation of the goal-oriented self-adaptive algorithm for 2D edge elements. It would allow us to solve 2.5 D problems.
- Parallel implementation of the 2D code (Maciek Paszynski).

Long term goals

- Solve 3D problems with casing at DC.
- Solve 3D problems with mandrel at AC.
- Invert coupled sonic and EM measurements in 2D.