Thermalcompositionalreactive simulation with DARTS

Denis Voskov







CO₂ injection into depleted fields

- Injection into depletion reservoir \geq
 - Pressurizing reservoir 0
 - Joule-Thomson cooling Ο
 - Hydrate formation •
 - Salt precipitation Ο
 - Capillary backflow ٠
- Injectivity interruption

TUDelft

- Pressure depletion 0
- Two-phase cooling Ο
 - Hydrate formation •

988.3 879.3

770.2

661.1

552.0

442.9

333.9

224.8

115.7

6.6

Challenge with CO2 expansion





Thermodynamics of CO₂-gas-brine

 Gas component model: ignore effects of water component presence in gas phase

$$f_i^{g} = p \Phi_i y_i$$

$$f_i^{g} = f_i^{a}$$

$$f_i^{a} = h_i \gamma_i x_i$$
Cubic
Equation of
State
$$K_i = \frac{y_i}{x_i} = \frac{h_i \gamma_i}{p \Phi_i}$$
Activity
model

• Derive enthalpy directly from EoS for gas, liquid and aqueous phases

$$h^g = -RT^2 \sum n_i \left(\frac{\partial \ln \phi_i}{\partial T}\right), \quad h^a = -RT^2 \sum n_i \left(\frac{\partial \ln \gamma_i}{\partial T}\right)$$



Wapperom et al., SPE RSC, 2023

Henry

constants

PDE for Energy Transition applications

$$g(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = a_t(\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \Delta \boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{\xi}) + \boldsymbol{d}(\boldsymbol{\omega},\boldsymbol{\xi}) = 0$$

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = \{\boldsymbol{G}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_0, \boldsymbol{K}_0\} \qquad \qquad \boldsymbol{\omega} = \{\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{H}, \boldsymbol{z}\}$$

$$\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{\phi_0 V}{\Delta t} [\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) - \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_n)] + \sum_l v_l^l \boldsymbol{\beta}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) + \sum_l \mathbf{D}^l (\boldsymbol{\chi}^l - \boldsymbol{\chi}) \boldsymbol{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) + \mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{\delta}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \mathbf{0}$$

+ diffusion and
reactions
$$\gamma_c(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = c(p) \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} x_{cj} \rho_j s_j d_{cj}, \quad \delta_c(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} v_{ck} r_k$$



2. 2



$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \omega} = \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \omega} \overline{a}(\omega,\xi) + \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \omega} \overline{b}(\omega,\xi) + \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \omega} \overline{c}(\omega,\xi) + \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial \omega} \overline{d}(\omega,\xi) + \overline{f}(\omega,\xi)$$
$$|\widehat{\beta_c} - \beta_c| \le cA^2 \sup|\nabla^2 \beta_c|$$

ω



Voskov, JCP 2017





DARTS-engine: C++ & CUDA DARTS-physics: hybrid Accumulation Compositional (C++/Libraries) Geothermal Convection (Python, IAPWS-97) adaptive_inter <NE, NO> Thermal compositional Diffusion (C++/Libraries) **Chemical formulation** Reaction (Python/PHREEQC) $\alpha(\omega), \beta(\omega), \gamma(\omega), \delta(\omega), \dots$ $a_t(\omega,\xi) + \nabla \cdot b(\omega,\xi) + \Delta c(\omega,\xi) + d(\omega,\xi) = 0$ Voskov et al., JOSS, 2024 UDelft

Delft Advanced Research Terra Simulator

- Operator-Based Linearization
 - Parametrization of thermodynamics
 - Adaptivity in parametrization
- Flexibility and performance
 - Flexible nonlinear physics
 - Implementation at GPU
 - Adjoint capabilities

Delft

- Complex thermodynamics
 - Thermal-compositional formulation
 - Fully coupled chemistry
 - Fully coupled geomechanics







Lyu et al., IJGGC, 2021; Wang et al., RENE, 2021

Equilibrium chemical reactions

Chemical Equilibrium with Constant Concentrations



Component mass balance:



$$a_c + l_c = Vr \times E \quad \Rightarrow \quad a_e + l_e = 0$$

 $K_{sp} - Q_{sp} = 0$ equilibrium

Chemical reactions:

$$a_c^k + l_c^k = \boldsymbol{vr}^k$$
 kinetic

Equilibrium reactions in brine-CO₂ system

120





20 40 60 80 100





$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\phi^T \rho_t^E z_i^E) + \operatorname{div}(\boldsymbol{e_i}\boldsymbol{l}) = 0$$

$$f_i^g = f_i^l \qquad \rho_t^E = \rho_t \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} \boldsymbol{e_i}\boldsymbol{z}$$

$$\prod_{c=1}^{n_c} a_c^{\nu_{cq}} - K_q = 0 \qquad \boldsymbol{z}^E \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} \boldsymbol{e_i}\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{E}\boldsymbol{z} = 0$$



Kala and Voskov, Comput. Geosci, 2020

Multiphase flow with reactions (1D benchmark)



de Hoop et al., Comput. Geosci, 2024; Ahusborde et al., Comput. Geosci, 2024



CO2 injection into calcite core

• Carbon dioxide dissolution:

 $CO_{2(g)} \rightleftharpoons CO_{2(aq)}$,

• Acid formation:

 $CO_{2(aq)} + H_2O \rightleftharpoons H_2CO_3,$ $H_2CO_3 \rightleftharpoons H^+ + HCO_3^-,$ $HCO_3^- \rightleftharpoons H^+ + CO_3^{2-},$

Calcite dissolution:

TUDelft

 $\begin{aligned} CaCO_3 + H^+ &\rightarrow Ca^{2+} + HCO_3^-, \\ CaCO_3 + H_2CO_3^* &\rightarrow Ca^{2+} + 2HCO_3^-, \\ CaCO_3 &\rightarrow Ca^{2+} + CO_3^{2-}. \end{aligned}$

Other aqueous reactions considered: $H_2 0 \rightleftharpoons H^+ + 0H^ 2H_20 \rightleftharpoons 0_2 + 4H^+ + 4e^ 2H^+ + 2e^- \rightleftharpoons H_2$ $CO_3^{-2} + 2H^+ \rightleftharpoons CO_2 + H_2O_1$ $CO_{3}^{-2} + 10H^{+} + 8e^{-} \rightleftharpoons CH_{4} + 3H_{2}O_{1}$ $Ca^{2+} + H_2 0 \rightleftharpoons CaOH^+ + H^+$ $Ca^{2+} + CO_3^{-2} + H^+ \rightleftharpoons CaHCO_3^+$.









Snippe et al., IJGGC, 2019

Use PHREEQC for equilibrium chemistry calculation.

Element balance reduction

 q_1 q_2 q_3 q_4 q_5 q_6 k_1 H_2O -1-10 0 1 0 0 -1 -2 1 0 $\tilde{H^+}$ 0 OH^{-} 0 CO_2 0 HCO_3^- 0 $S = CO_3^{2^{-3}}$ 1 CaCO₃ Ca²⁺ 0 1 $\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}$ $CaOH^+$ 0 $CaHCO_3^+$ 0 0 0 0 $CaCO_{3,solid}$ -10

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} H \\ O \\ C \\ Ca \\ CaCO_{3,solid} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & \dots & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

TUDelft

$$\mathbf{S}_{C\times R} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_{Q\times K} & \mathbf{I}_{1,Q\times Q} \\ -\mathbf{I}_{2,K\times K} & \mathbf{S}_{3,K\times Q} \\ -\mathbf{S}_{1,(C-R)\times K} & \mathbf{S}_{2,(C-R)\times Q} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\mathbf{E}_{1(E\times C)} = \begin{bmatrix} e_{11} & e_{12} & \cdots & e_{1C} \\ e_{21} & e_{22} & \cdots & e_{2C} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ e_{E1} & e_{E2} & \cdots & e_{EC} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\mathbf{E}_{2(K\times C)} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{S}_{1,K\times Q} & -\mathbf{I}_{2,K\times K} & \mathbf{O}_{K\times (C-R)} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{n}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{l} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{r},$$
$$\frac{\partial (\mathbf{E}\mathbf{n})}{\partial t} + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{r} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{E}_1 \mathbf{S}\mathbf{r} \\ \mathbf{E}_2 \mathbf{S}\mathbf{r} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbf{r}_k \end{bmatrix}$$

Modeling of dissolution at core scale

Step 1: porosity interpretation (image subtraction, filtering, gridding)



Step 2: modeling of dissolution (combination of DARTS + PHREEQC)





Margert, MSc thesis, 2019

FluidFlower benchmark





Generation of prior realizations



Digitizing of tracer test



History matching using RML (single realization)

Tracer observations (high resolution images)



Inversed model (RML, 18,278 forward runs for 100 priors)

$$E(\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\text{ref}})^{\mathrm{T}} C_{M}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\text{ref}}) + \frac{1}{2}(G(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathbf{d}_{\text{obs}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon})^{\mathrm{T}} C_{D}^{-1}(G(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathbf{d}_{\text{obs}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon})$$



Data Assimilation for FluidFlower experiments

- Models: 100 history matched permeability maps
- Temperature: $23^{\circ}C \pm 2$, normal distribution
- Diffusion: $2 \cdot 10^{-10} 2 \cdot 10^{-9}$, log-normal distribution
- Two phase: Corey parameters with std from 5 to 50%, normal distribution





CCS in depleted fields: Joule-Thomson cooling





Hydrate formation



after hyd diss: W/CO₂



Salt precipitation





JT-cooling validation

Cooling for Pure CO₂











JT effect at various scales

pressure 60 50 40 30 0.02 0.04 temperature 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.00 350 348 346 344 342 340 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08 0.00 satA 0.10 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.02 0.06 0.08 0.00 0.04 densV 0.10 120 100 80 60 · 0.00 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08 0.10

JT in CO2-CH4-H2O system at experimental scale, 1 sec



JT in CO2-CH4-H2O system at experimental scale, 10 sec



Radial model results





CCS in depleted fields: impact of salt precipitation

Isenthalpic cooling









after hyd diss: W/CO₂

after hyd form: W/CO₂/H

Salt precipitation





Salt precipitation: core flood experiments

Gas and salt saturations in a homogeneous core





3D reconstruction of salt in Bentheimer core



Permeability reduction in a homogeneous core

Core type	1st section of core			2nd section of core		
	K initial (mD)	K final (mD)	K reduction	K initial (mD)	K final (mD)	K reduction
Bentheimer	2164	24	99%	1707	170	90%
Berea	164	0.8	99%	168	148	12%
Fontainebleau	164	18	99%	187	170	9%

Salt mainly precipitated at inlet regions and permeability had a huge reduction in it



Yan et al., in prep.

Simulation results with DARTS





Impact of pore structure, wettability and direction



CO2 injection direction

TUDelft

Yan et al., JCIS, 2025

CCS in depleted fields: risk of hydrate formation

Isenthalpic cooling

Salt precipitation

Thermodynamic models for hydrates

- Van der Waals and Platteeuw (1958)
 - Chemical potential change upon cage filling

$$\frac{\Delta\mu_{w,H}}{RT} = \frac{\mu_{w,H}}{RT} - \frac{g_{w,\beta}}{RT} = \sum_{m} \nu_m \ln\left(1 - \sum_{j} \theta_{jm}\right)$$

Fugacity related to reference phase

$$f_{w,H} = f_{w,A} \exp\left[\frac{\Delta\mu_{w,H} - \Delta\mu_{w,A}}{RT}\right]$$

Langmuir 'adsorption'

$$heta_{jm} = rac{C_{jm}f_j}{1+\sum_k C_{km}f_k}$$
Delft

Hydrate dissociation

- Class 3 hydrate deposit
 - Radial reservoir
 - Partially saturated with CH₄-hydrate
 - Pressure at well 27 bar

Impact of water saturation on permeability

Ехр	Core	Salt type/concentration
1-9	Bentheimer	1wt% NaCl
10	Bentheimer	1wt% NaCl

Note: In exp 10, for the first 2 cycles, the normalized permeability was calculated based on the differential pressure, while for the third cycle brine permeability test was performed in the presence of hydrate to validate the previous calculation.

Permeability is directly influenced by hydrate saturation, which is, in turn, dependent on the water saturation level.

Acknowledgments

- DARTS team: Mark Khait, Xiaocong Lyu, Yang Wang, Xiaoming Tian, Stephan de Hoop, Kiarash Mansour Pour, Artur Palha, Aleks Novikov, Michiel Wapperom, Yuan Chen, George Hadjisotiriou, Gabriel Serrao Seabra, Luisa Orozco
- ASSET team: Rouhi Farajzadeh, Mahnaz Aghajanloo, Lifei Yan, Michiel Slob, Sadegh Taghinejad, Manon Schellart, Georgios Ntentopoulos
- Students and collegues: Dan Nichita, Juan Diego Heringer, Andrey Margert, Michel Kern, Brahim Amaziane, Jan Norbotten, Bernd Flemisch, James Gunning

open-DARTS

https://darts.citg.tudelft.nl

Time for Questions and Answers

