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Summary

In a stratified earth, seismic waves tend to propagate faster parallel to bedding than across layer boundaries. In this context, a boundary is an interface between two zones with different acoustic impedance. During sediment deposition, clay minerals in shales settle in a preferential direction, and also form plate-like crystals during diagenesis, causing similar behavior to seismic wave propagation. This phenomenon causes velocity anisotropy, defined as the dependence of the velocity of a rock on the direction of wave propagation through the rock. Other causes include aligned cracks and fractures, and stress due to the weight of overburden.

In anisotropic media, it is generally observed that well velocities are lower than the seismic velocities (as the seismic ray-paths sample more of the horizontal sound speed direction which is commonly the fastest in layered media). Thus, the depths from an isotropic depth migration are generally greater than the corresponding well depths (exceptions to this ‘rule’ could be when we have vertical fractures in a layer or when the lateral stress field dominates propagation behavior compared to layering effects). Consequently, it is not proper to migrate isotropically using the well velocities, as this will give rise to poorly focused images and improperly collapsed diffractions.

This paper demonstrates the case of earth velocity model building from Western Offshore Basin, India using 1) DIX conversion 2) Isotropic grid tomography 3) Geostatistical volume creation 4) Constrained Velocity Inversion (CVI) and 5) Well-tie tomography methodology, which can be called as hybrid approach, to derive an anisotropic velocity model for depth imaging, which is having the properties of close to medium velocity which results better image and resolution of migrated seismic data along with very small misties.

Introduction

For depth calibration for final imaging requires a velocity term plus at least two other anisotropic parameters. In the simplest case, this can be achieved using a depth calibration term delta (\(\delta\)) in conjunction with term epsilon (\(\varepsilon\)) related to differences between horizontal and vertical velocity (Thomsen 1986). In Thomsen’s notation, the vertical and horizontal velocities are related to the surface seismic near-offset interval velocity (\(V_{nmo}\)) by:

\[
V_{nmo} = V_V \sqrt{1+2\delta} \approx V_V (1+\delta) \quad (1)
\]

\[
V_h = V_V \sqrt{1+2\varepsilon} \approx V_V (1+\varepsilon) \quad (2)
\]

Where \(V_{nmo}\) is the near-offset interval velocity estimated from stacking velocity analysis, \(V_V\) is the vertical velocity seen in well logs, and \(V_h\) is the horizontal component of velocity (which we do not usually have access to, but could in principle be measured from cross-well experiments).
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In other words, the velocity measured from surface seismic data is higher than the earth’s vertical velocity component (for positive δ). Hence, an isotropic depth migration using this higher seismically derived velocity will produce an image that appears too deep in comparison to well-markers.

To achieve the anisotropic velocity which is closely matching at well locations, a combination of different methods shown in flow diagram-1. The final velocity model was applied for imaging on the data pertaining to Western Offshore Basin, Mumbai where the small velocity anomalies have been resolved.

Method and Discussions

The hybrid approach of velocity model building is summarized in the attached flow diagram. Picked RMS Velocity of the survey was taken as input for the preparation of initial velocity volume. Horizons provided by interpreters was used here for extraction of velocity slices. Some extra dummy horizons were inserted where there was large gap between the horizons. RMS velocity was extracted along the horizons. Extracted velocities along the horizons were made smooth. Figure 1, below is an example of smooth RMS velocity along the horizon.

From the different horizons extracted and smoothed described in previous step, RMS velocity volume was made. The RMS velocity volume was converted to Interval velocity in time domain (Vint in time) by DIX conversion. In this case again, velocity was extracted along the horizons. Further smoothening of these extracted velocities along horizons was made.

![Flow diagram-1](image-url)
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Figure 2. Shows the extracted interval velocities in time domain along the horizon before and after smoothing applied.

Figure 2. Interval Velocity (time domain) before and after smooth

After smoothing the velocity along the horizons, Interval velocity volume in time domain was made. The Interval velocity in time domain was converted to depth domain by DIX method shown in figure 3.

Figure 3. Initial Interval velocity along one inline

Tomography was run in isotropic mode on initial interval isotropic velocity. The inputs like dip, azimuth, and continuity volume along with the residual moveout picks from target line PSDM were given to update the isotropic velocity model. The comparison of initial isotropic velocity and updated tomo isotropic velocity along one inline was shown in Figure-4. The anisotropic tomography velocity updating was carried out by estimating the delta from the log & seismic velocity. The seismic velocity was scaled close to the well velocity by providing the trend from the sonic velocity. The Geostatistical velocity volume was created with splicing the isotropic velocity volume and the P-velocity from the logs.

Figure 4: Initial isotropic velocity (Left) Tomo isotropic velocity (Right)

As many as 26 wells distributing across the area were considered for creating geostatistical velocity volume. The black dots in figure 5 shows the distribution of wells that are taken into account during velocity model generation. Figure 6 shows the geostatistical section of velocity at a well location at inline 2150.

Figure 5. Location of wells in the area

Both final isotropic volume and Geostatistical volume was converted to time domain using DIX conversion. Constrained Velocity Inversion was applied between the Isotropic Volume and the Geostatistical volume as trend to generate initial
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Figure 6. Geostatistical volume across well IL 2150 anisotropic volume. Constrained velocity inversion finds the global solution applying the least squares to fit. Few noisy data points are ignored here and it gives a smoother volume. Figure 7. Shows comparison of Geostatistical velocity and Initial Anisotropic Velocity at inline 2150. Delta function was derived from this anisotropic volume ($V_v$) and updated tomographic iso-velocity volume ($V_{v_{iso}}$) using the relationship in equation (1) above. For initial update, epsilon volume was taken same as that of delta volume. Target line PSDM was run with the Initial Anisotropic volume, delta and epsilon volume.

Figure 7 Geostatistical Velocity (Left) Initial Anisotropic Velocity (Right)

Figure 8. Vertical functions extracted at well location Stack was made from the target line PSDM gather and seismic attributes (Dip, Azimuth & Continuity) was extracted from the stack. Auto picker was run in gathers to find the residual move out of the primaries. There after grid-tomography was run to update the initial anisotropic velocity. Figure 9. Shows the comparison of Initial Anisotropic Velocity and Anisotropic 1st Tomography updated.

After 1st tomography approach was applied on the Initial Anisotropic Velocity, it was observed that output gather has become flattened and stack quality

Figure 8 Initial Anisotropic Velocity (Left) Anisotropic 1st tomography (Right)

Figure 9 Initial Anisotropic Velocity (Left) Anisotropic 1st tomography (Right)
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improved. This was because proper delta function was calculated during the tomographic approach. Figure 10. Shows the comparison of gathers before and after Anisotropic 1\textsuperscript{st} tomography.

Migration algorithms that set-out to handle lateral parameter variation (depth migrations) require the parameters to be in their true subsurface locations, and not arbitrarily posted vertically below the analysis points. In order to achieve this, we have to analyse parameter information for each offset independently, effectively looking back along each 3D raypath to assess which parts of the subsurface have been traversed by energy arriving at a given receiver: and this requires a tomographic inverse solution.

To update velocity obtained from 1\textsuperscript{st} anisotropic tomography, 2\textsuperscript{nd} time tomography was run. For that target line PSDM was run with 1\textsuperscript{st} updated anisotropic velocity. Gathers obtained from target line PSDM was stacked. Attributes of dip, azimuth and continuity was extracted from the stack. With these inputs, tomography was run for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} time to update the velocity. This velocity here was considered as final updated anisotropic velocity. Figure 11 shows the improvement of velocity after 2\textsuperscript{nd} Anisotropic Tomography over 1\textsuperscript{st} anisotropic tomography.

Well-tie tomography was applied on Anisotropic 2\textsuperscript{nd} updated velocity to reduce the mis-ties. Time migrated horizons were map migrated to depth horizons with the velocity of final anisotropic volume. Mis-tie was calculated at each well (depth difference at well markers with depth horizons). With these inputs of mis-tie, well-tie tomography was run. The velocity which was obtained after running well-tie was the input for migration. Figure 12. Shows the comparison of Anisotropic 2\textsuperscript{nd} tomography and well-tie tomography.
Hybrid Velocity Model Building

Results

The RMS velocity which was extracted along the horizons was not smooth and hence smoothing was required. It is often better to apply smooth on data along the horizons (if we have confidence on horizon) than on the whole volume of data. If sonic velocity is incorporated from the logs then good anisotropic velocity can be obtained. From the vertical functions extracted at a well location, it can be observed that Isotropic velocity is having higher values than the anisotropic velocity. Anisotropic velocity is smooth one which was generated by CVI using both Geo statistical Velocity and Isotropic velocity. The anisotropic parameter (initial delta) was derived from this initial anisotropic volume and grid-tomography updated isotropic interval velocity volume using equation 1 above. Figure 8. Shows the vertical functions extracted at the well location for Isotropic Velocity, Anisotropic Velocity, Geostatistical Velocity and Sonic Velocity. The velocity which is generated through hybrid approach, gives the most accurate results and it also matches with the sonic log. Figure 13 shows that the improvement from the Initial Interval velocity to final velocity.

Conclusions

Generally, in depth imaging, depth calibration using well-tie updated velocity is applied in post stack data. Well calibrated velocity is most correct one as it positions structures at the proper places. In this case a final interval velocity model is achieved through combination of various techniques (Hybrid approach). This approach of velocity model is able to incorporate the small velocity variations within the layers as well as along lateral direction. The velocity anomalies captured in the volume match quite better way at well locations. Depth migration using this hybrid approach velocity not only gives flat depth gather but good match with the well tops and better focusing. Figure 14
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