

PETROPHYSICAL AND MINERALOGICAL EVALUATION OF SHALE GAS RESERVOIRS (A COOPER BASIN CASE STUDY)

Maqsood Ahmad

Master of Science in Applied Geology

University of The Punjab, Lahore Pakistan

Master of Information Technology

Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane Australia

Master of Engineering Science in Petroleum Engineering

The University of New South Wales, Sydney Australia

**Thesis submitted
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

Australian School of Petroleum

Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences

**The University of Adelaide
Australia**

January 2014

AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL
OF PETROLEUM



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

Table of Contents

Title	Page No.
Abstract	v
Declaration	vii
Acknowledgment	xiii
List of Figures	x
List of Tables	Xvi
Dedication	Xv
Research Activity Flow Chart 2010-2013	Xvii
Publications List from Research Dissertation	xix
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	
1.1 Shales Gas Reservoir History	1
1.2 Organic Shales Importance as a Natural Gas Resource	1
1.3 Shale Gas Resources in Australia	4
1.4 Geology of Cooper Basin and Nappamerri Trough	7
1.5 Mudrocks and Shales (Geological, Geochemical and Petrophysical Characteristics)	11
1.6 Selection Criteria for Potential Shale Gas Reservoirs	13
1.7 Roseneath and Murteree Shale Geological and Geochemical Characteristics	23
1.8 Methodology	23
1.8.1 QEMSCAN, XRD, Micro and Nano CT-Scanning, FIB/SEM	25
1.8.2 Helium Porosimetry	27
1.8.3 Mercury Injection Capillary Pressure (MICP) Techniques	28
1.8.4 Core Crushing Method/Liquid Pycnometry	28
1.8.5 Log Interpretation	28
1.9 Study Area	29
1.10 Objectives	30
1.10.1 Microlamination	33
1.10.2 Siderite and Dolomitization	33
1.10.3 Brine, Clays, Organic Matter and Methane Interaction	34
1.10.4 Organic Matter Over maturation and Graphitization	34
1.11 Research Problem Statement and Scope	34
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review	
2.1 Conventional Wireline Logging and Core Analysis – Evaluation Techniques	37
2.2 Unconventional Evaluation Techniques-Radiation Probes	45
2.3 Unconventional Rock and Mineral Analyses Techniques-QEMSCAN	53

CHAPTER 3: Mineralogy and Petrophysical Evaluation Using QEMSCAN, Micro and Nano CT-Scanning, FIB/SEM and X-Ray Diffraction Techniques

Page No.

3.1	Introduction	60
3.2	Mineral and Rock Evaluation (QEMSCAN)	60
3.3	Micro and Nano CT-Scanning Techniques	65
3.4	FIB/SEM (Focused Ion Beam Milling/Scanning Electron Microscopy)	67
3.5	XRD Quantitative Techniques (Rietveld)	72
3.6	Results	74
3.7	Discussion	81
3.7.1	QEMSCAN	81
3.7.2	Micro and Nano – CT-Scanning	82
3.7.3	FIB/SEM	83
3.7.4	X-Ray Diffraction	83
3.8	Conclusions	84

CHAPTER 4: Evaluation of Porosity Using Core Analysis

4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	Methodology	88
4.2.1	MICP – Mercury Injection Capillary Pressure Techniques	89
4.2.2	Core Crushing Method/Liquid Pyknometry	90
4.2.3	Helium Porosimetry	92
4.3	Results and Discussion	93
4.3.1	MICP Techniques	90
4.3.2	Liquid Pyknometry/Core Crushing Method	94
4.3.3	Helium Porosimetry	96
4.3.4	Total Free Porosity and FIB/SEM	98
4.4	Conclusions	103

CHAPTER 5: Water Saturation Evaluation Using Wireline Logs, Focused Ion Beam Milling and Scanning Electron Microscopy

5.1	Introduction	105
5.2	Methodology-Wireline Logs and FIB/SEM - Application for Water Saturation	106
5.3	Results	109
5.4	Discussion	115
5.5	Conclusions	121

CHAPTER 6: Conclusions

Page No.

6.1	Conclusions	123
6.2	Recommendations	126

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX – A 127

Murteree Shale (FIB/SEM 2D Images)

APPENDIX – B 142

Roseneath Shale (FIB/SEM 2D Images)

APPENDIX – C 156

Mathematical Expressions & Nomenclature for Shale Volume, Porosity, & Water Saturation Estimation

APPENDIX – D 159

Della#4 - Wireline Logs and Digital Data

APPENDIX – E 168

Moomba#46 – Wireline Logs and Digital Data

APPENDIX – F 172

Murteree Shale Micro-XCT technique results from project well Della4

APPENDIX – G 176

Murteree Shale QEMSCAN mineralogical and textural map from project well Della4

REFERENCES: 178

Abstract

Unconventional shale gas reservoirs are over-mature potential source rocks and possess commercial quantities of hydrocarbons in a mechanism which is different from conventional gas reservoirs. These organically rich shale rocks also known as continuous hydrocarbon reservoirs represent a voluminous, long-term, global source of thermo-genic methane and other hydrocarbon gases and could be referred to as shale gas. Roseneath and Murteree shale formations in Cooper Basin have been identified as potential shale gas reservoirs in South Australia. Core samples from these carbonaceous shales were selected for this study.

Petrophysical and mineralogical characterization of shale gas reservoirs is still a challenge due to ultra-fine grained micro-fabric, micro level heterogeneity and anisotropic characteristics of these sedimentary rocks. Unlike conventional gas reservoirs, shale gas reservoirs have very low effective porosity and micro to nano-scale permeability. Conventional standards applications to characterize unconventional gas reservoirs give contradictory results about the mineralogy and rock characteristics, effective and total porosity as well as estimated brine saturation. These uncertainties in the results raised the question, which tools/standards are suitable for petrophysical and mineralogical evaluation of shale gas reservoir.

This research outcome tried to answer the above questions and tells how mineralogy and rock characterization, total porosity, reasons of very low effective porosity and saturation which play a key role in selection and development of a shale gas play, can be evaluated and estimated using both conventional and unconventional techniques

The Roseneath and Murteree shale formations in Cooper Basin have been identified as potential shale gas reservoirs in South Australia. Two core samples from these carbonaceous shales intercepted in Della4 and Moomba46 wells were selected for this project. Core samples were used for number of reservoir characterization phases namely, a) minerals quantification and rock classification, b) visual identification and density of pores location in grains and matrix, c) their types, size classification and interconnectivity, d) evaluation of effective and total interstitial/intergranular and intragranular porosity. While log data from Della# 4 was applied in various resistivity models for water saturation estimation in Murteree shale.

QEMSCAN (Quantitative Evaluation of Minerals using Scanning Electron Microscopy) aided by X-Ray Diffraction techniques was used for mineral and rock characterization. Based on QEMSCAN analysis, we found that Murteree shale has, 42.78% quartz, 6.75% siderite, 28.96% illite, 14.09% coalinite, 1.91% Total Organic Content and 0.04% pyrite, while rutile, sphalerite and some other silicates minerals were identified as accessory minerals. Computerized Tomography (CT), Focused Ion Beam Milling and Scanning Electron Microscopy (FIB/SEM) were employed for identification of pores, network of fractures and their interconnectivity in scanned samples. FIB/SEM combined with CT scanning significantly enhanced shale rock characterization and reservoir petrophysical quality assessment. Helium porosimetry and mercury injection capillary pressure (MICP) techniques were applied for effective porosity and liquid pycnometry was used to estimate the total pore volume. While water saturation was estimated using wireline logs data from Della#4 well completion report and later correlation of results with data found in well completion reports of recent wells drilled through Roseneath and Murteree shale interval.

QEMSCAN results when correlated with XR-diffraction quantitative analyses are found in good agreement with each other for Murteree shale samples. Total free porosity found to be 2 percent is close to total porosity calculated using Wyllie's formula with Hilchie's correction factor. Stieber formula was applied to estimate clay volume (52.3%) from Gamma Ray logs data and this figure

is close to estimated clays volume in XR-diffraction and QEMSCAN techniques 50.59% and 47.30% respectively. QEMSCAN coloured maps revealed the location of lamination, quartz and clay rich zones, high and low porosity zones as well as high and low sorption areas. FIB/SEM scanned images showed that free porosity is largely associated with clay and siderite rich zones. Pores are intergranular and linear, isolated by clays microfabric lamination, and elongated wedge shaped. All pores types and morphology are described.

Since individual pores and porosity evaluation found in QEMSCAN and FIB/SEM technique are not possible to be imaged using CT-scanning, only a network of micro-fracture system in Murteree shale sample was identified in CT-scanned samples. Therefore, no porosity evaluation is possible using CT-scanning. To check the interconnectivity of the pores and fractures network, helium porosimetry was used to measure effective porosity revealing very low effective porosity less than 2.0 % on all samples. Also MICP techniques revealed that samples were mainly comprised of meso-pore throat sized pores, with pore throat diameters range between 2–50 nanometres and an effective porosity of less than 2%. Pores aperture size was documented by 2D imaged pores size and their interconnectivity in FIB/SEM results. The MICP based pores throat classification confirms ultra-low permeability in these reservoirs. The contradiction between imaged pore sizes and the effective porosity led to estimate the total porosity using liquid pyknometry.

Liquid pyknometry method was applied on crushed/powder samples to measure total porosity. It estimated an average absolute porosity of 30.5% for Murteree shale and 39% for Roseneath shale, much higher than MCIP technique and helium porosimetry results, revealing very high isolated porosity and very low permeability. The findings were investigated and analysed using extensive FIB/SEM images. These 2D images displayed high amounts of isolated porosity supporting high porosity existence estimated from pyknometry technique. Therefore, it was envisaged that total porosity assessment was not possible by helium porosimetry and mercury injection capillary pressure techniques. The pyknometry technique supported by the SEM images is an alternative method which measures total rather than effective porosity.

From our FIB/SEM experimental work and observations we believe Roseneath and Murteree formations have high level of heterogeneity, anisotropy and possess macro and micro-level natural fracture systems. The observed pores and fractures system strongly support that total porosity is much higher than 2.00% estimated from QEMSCAN, sonic and density porosity from logs data as well as effective porosity from helium porosimetry and MICP techniques.

Later selected water saturation models were applied for water saturation estimation in Murteree shale. Based on cumulative effect and interaction of minerals, fluids and organic content application of Archie's equation and other resistivity models such as Indonesian, Siamandoux and Total shale model were investigated. Wire-line logs data was calibrated with QEMSCAN, XRD and FIB/SEM images for clay volumes and total porosity. Evaluation of Archie's parameters (cementation exponent, m , tortuosity factor, a , and saturation exponent, n) were re-examined through sensitivity analysis before applying these models. Using Simandoux and Indonesian models we found 86.00% (S_w) and 84.00% (S_w) respectively when original porosity 2.00% was considered for Murteree shale. However, when total porosity based on 2D FIB/SEM images was considered to be more than or equal to 10.00%, Archie model gave an estimation of 89.00% and with humble formula 84.00% water saturations respectively. Total shale model estimated 58.00% and 70.00% water saturations when cementation exponent (m) was taken as 2.00 and 2.15 respectively in same Murteree shale interval with a total porosity 10.00%.

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institutions and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I certify that no part of this work will, in future, be used in submission for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I gave consent for this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available, for loan and photocopying, subjected to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copy right of published works contained within this thesis resides with the copy right holders of those works. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Maqsood Ahmad

Signed:

Date:

April 14, 2014

Australian School of Petroleum
The University of Adelaide
South Australia; Australia

Acknowledgment

The author is especially indebted to Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences, The University of Adelaide, for providing me a generous double divisional Ph.D. scholarship and research funding, later on as well. I would like to express my profound gratitude, appreciation and recognition to my principal supervisor, Associate Professor Manouchehr Haghighi and co-supervisor Professor Pavel Bedrikovetsky for their engagement and support throughout this highest research degree project. Each contributed in their unique professional way to guide me to achieve my goal.

It is worth mentioning with gratitude, Head of School, Professor Steve Begg and Professor Ainsworth Bruce for their annual retreat arrangements to closely monitor the post graduate students research activity and feedback received later at the end of retreats, in the last four years. I appreciate their attention and time for this sincere effort to train future research students for presentations and communication skills in their future role. I would like to acknowledge the many people who assisted me during this research. I also extend my thanks to research and teaching staff at Australian School of Petroleum, Kathryn Amos, Mary Gonzalez, Carageorgos Themis, Richard Daniel, You Zhenjiang and Badalyan Alexander. I am pleased to thank Senior Lecture, Andy Mitchell for sending email about the approval of my scholarship and to join ASP, in Adelaide University. Thanks, Andy!

The support and feedback from my fellow research postgraduate colleagues were invaluable in the conduct of this work as well. Special thanks go to all the people at the Australian School of Petroleum. However, I would like to mention Maureen Sutton, Hollands Delise, Ian West, Jodie Norman, Conny Meyer and Eileen Flannery for their support and cooperation in all administrative matters, laboratory work and computer matters especially.

The author strongly acknowledges the help and support of laboratory staff in Ian Wark Research Institute, University of South Australia for QEMSCAN and CT scanning analysis. The support in preparing results of QEMSCAN, Microtomography and Nanotomography Dr Jeremy Deverrel, Zofia Swierczek and Simon Dove support is worth appreciation for conducting experimental work on priority levels. I am also pleased to express my appreciation to Mr Gelb Jeff for his expert advice about Nano-CT Scanning data interpretation after repeating the Nanotomographic and Microtomographic run on Murteree core sample in Xradia Lab Inc. Pleasanton, CA, USA.

The help from laboratory and technical staff at the department of Geology and Geophysics, as well as the Adelaide Microscopy staff to conduct the FIB/SEM μ -CT scanning experimental work has been much appreciated in publications as well. Staff at Adelaide Microscopy facility, in University of Adelaide especially microscopist Mr Leonard Green, Mr Ken Neubauer, Miss Aoife McFadden and Mr John Terlet help is very much appreciated in the use of FEI-FIB/SEM, FEI

Quanta 450, and X-ray Micro-CT radiation techniques in preparing very high quality images for this project. I am also humbled by the support of principal geologist, Dr Nick Lemon, in SANTOS Ltd. Adelaide for sending emails mentioning the availability of Murteree and Roseneath shales core samples in PIRSA Core Library, in Adelaide. David Groom, Michael Willison and their fellow colleagues help in PIRSA Core Library is highly appreciable as well. I also want to thank to Associate Professor Dr Cristopher Sumbly, School of Chemistry and Physics, University of Adelaide for timely help and running XRD experiments on some shale samples and later in interpretation as well.

Finally, I would like to extend my gratitude and sincere thanks to my brother Aziz, for his overwhelming support until the submission of my thesis. And my mother, Hajran, her prayers for my success was the biggest source of this humble achievement in my life.

List of Figures

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
1.1	World major shale gas resources in 32 Countries	3
1.2	World conventional and unconventional gas resources	4
1.3	Australian sedimentary basins map, showing basin age and major oil, gas and coal occurrence	5
1.4	Stratigraphy of Cooper Basin and location of Roseneath, Epsilon and Murteree Formations (REM) interval	8
1.5	Stratigraphy column thickness in Nappamerri Trough of Cooper Basin and location of Roseneath, Epsilon and Murteree Formations (REM) interval	9
1.6	Natural gas potential from conventional and unconventional gas reservoirs (Roseneath Epsilon and Murteree) interval in Cooper Basin	11
1.7	Shale gas reservoir selection criteria based on geological, geochemical and mineralogical characteristics	16
1.8	Graphical expression of Rock Evaluation Pyrolysis output, denoted by S_1 S_2 S_3 peaks and temperature used in the kerogen classification, TOC (Wt.%) and source rock hydrocarbon generation potential	17
1.9	Four kerogen types (I, II III and IV) with evolution paths with correlating values of Vitrinite reflectance (VR) and Thermal alteration index (TAI)	18
1.10	Schematic illustrating use of coal rank, vitrinite reflectance Rock Evaluation Pyrolysis (Temperature (T_{max}) TOC wt.%) and accompanied changes in colour of organic matter used to predict source rock richness, maturity and hydrocarbons generation potential	18
1.11	Schematic showing total effective and core porosity and their associated water saturations in shaly sands	21
1.12	Box model used for modelling components of gas shales	22
1.13	Geological and geochemical properties of Murteree and Roseneath shales	23
1.14	Murteree shale core sample divided into various parts for (1) QEMSCAN, (2) Micro-CT Scanning and (3) Nano CT-Scanning, (4) FIB/SEM, (5) Helium Porosimetry, (6) MICP and (7) Liquid Pyknometry experimental work	24
1.15	Schematic showing the principles of Micro X-ray Tomography	26
1.16	Study area location in Cooper Basin, South Australian	28
1.17	Schematic showing continuous hydrocarbon shale gas/source rock (shale gas reservoir), its relation to conventional oil and gas reservoirs in a petroleum system	28
2.1	Location map of shale gas systems in North America	34
3.1.	Murteree shale resin embedded two samples used for QEMSCAN techniques and SEM Imaging.	61
3.2	Schematic of production and estimation of characteristics x-rays	61
3.3	(A) Murteree shale false coloured digital map and (B) Identification of laminations/streaks labelled as A and B prepared using QEMSCAN. The areas of low and high concentration of minerals are easily recognizable in these two false colour maps of Murteree shale.	63
3.4	Bar map showing mass % of constituent inorganic and organic phases using QEMSCAN automated system.	64
3.5	(A) Murteree shale sample mounted on aluminium tube with glue to be scanned by Micro- Computerized Tomography and (B) (C) and (D) are zircon, sphalerite and pyrite mineral standards.	65

Figure No.	List of Figures (continued) Title	Page No.
3.6	Schematic illustrating x-rays application (A) for detection of attenuated x-rays (<i>I</i>) and (B) mathematical expression used for linear attenuation coefficient estimation, μ using (C) Beer's law	66
3.7	Slices of Murteree shale sample embedded in resin in X-Y plane imaged by Micro X-Ray CT technique.	64
3.8	Schematic diagram of a FIB (Focused Ion Beam) column	67
3.9	Murteree Shale (A) and Roseneath Shale (B) samples prepared using focused ion beam milling and later imaged using secondary and back scattered electron signals in Scanning Electron Microscopy.	67
3.10	Schematics of Focused Ion Beam Gun (A), Scanning Electron Gun (B), Scanning Electron microscope (SEM-Column) with an angle 52° to each other, chambers with different internal components and Electron Beam Gun (C), used in FIB/SEM milling and imaging techniques.	69
3.11	Roseneath shale samples prepared using FIB techniques showing the image quality to identify intergranular/interparticle/interstitial porosity, minerals, flocculation organic matter and fracture system by white arrows.	71
3.12	Roseneath and Murteree shale samples prepared using FIB techniques showing the image quality to identify intergranular/interparticle/interstitial porosity, minerals, flocculation organic matter and fracture system	72
3.13	Murteree shale powder samples in plastic bags used for XRD analyses and small chip before grinding the sample into powder.	73
3.14	Schematic showing the working of the X-Ray diffractometer	74
3.15	XY slice of microtomogram of Murteree shale using Micro-X-ray Computerized Tomography	75
3.16	3D Model of Murteree shales sample. Red: silicate phase, Green = heavy minerals like siderite rutile, Light Blue= porosity; while Blue Colour = Represents the lowest density phase using Micro-X-Ray Computerized Tomography	76
3.17	Murteree shale images taken before and (B) after application of QEMSCAN using SEM and porosity loss by visual quantification is evident in B after grinding sample for QEMSCAN analyses	76
3.18	Porosity related to flocculated compacted clays in SEM Image of Murteree shale QEMSCAN results	77
3.19	Siderite (FeCO_3) identification in Murteree shale sample by Characteristic X-rays using SEM-Quanta450 system.	77
3.20	Organic matter (Residual Kerogen) identification in Murteree shale sample by Characteristic X-rays using SEM-Quanta450 system.	78
3.21	Images of Roseneath Shale, and (A&B) and (C) Murteree shale using FIB/SEM with natural fracture system (white arrows).	78
3.22	Microfracture system using X-Ray Nano-Computerized Tomography Scanning system	75
3.23	Murteree Shale Diffractogram produced using XRD Quantitative Techniques (Rietveld)	79
3.24	Murteree Shale image with highly porous siderite domains marked by white arrows, a red arrow showing a pore in a siderite grain while green arrow representing organic matter.	80

Figure No.	List of Figures (continued) Title	Page No.
4.1	Mechanically prepared Roseneath shale sample to observe the distribution of clay (Red arrows), quartz (Yellow arrows) heavy minerals (Whites arrows pyrite siderite rutile) and organics (Green arrows) using BSE signal detector, while green circles representing area of higher organics concentration.	85
4.2	Mechanically prepared Murteree shale sample to observe the distribution of quartz (Yellow arrows), clays (Red arrows) heavy minerals (Whites arrows) and organics (Green arrows) using BSE signal detector.	86
4.3	FIB/SEM prepared Roseneath shale sample labelled for pore throat, porous domains, intergranular and interstitial pores identified using SE signal detector (Red arrows= Intergranular/Interstitial pores; PD= Porous domains and White arrows= Pore throats or apertures connecting pores in domains).	86
4.4	Murteree shale samples-project well Della4 (MICP, Helium Porosimetry, Liquid Pyknometry and FIB/SEM analyses	88
4.5	Roseneath shale samples-project well Moomba46 (MICP, Helium Porosimetry, Liquid Pyknometry and FIB/SEM analyses	89
4.6	Schematic illustrating concept of pores and pore throat used in Washburn equation (Black arrows pointing to pores while yellow arrows pointing the communication channels/pore throats between pores, blue colour represents the fluid (A) and State of the art high pressure Micromeritics AutoPore-III porosimeter used for Pore throat classification (B).	90
4.7	Capillary-Stoppered Pyknometry	90
4.8	Software and TEMCO HP-401 Helium Porosimeter	92
4.9	Imbibition and Drainage curves of Murteree shale samples using MICP technique, Della4 Project Well.	94
4.10	Pore throat size range distribution illustrated by black bracket (A) in Murteree shale samples using MICP technique results and C= Conformance.	95
4.11	Imbibition and Drainage curves in Roseneath Shale sample using MICP technique, Project Well Moomba#46.	95
4.12	Pore throat size distribution in Roseneath shale samples using MICP technique results.	96
4.13	Characteristic x-rays of siderite grains for identification of oligonite and Sideroplesite surrounded by the clay platelets in FIB/SEM 2D image of Murteree shale labelled as A. A white arrow pointing to a cylindrical pore in siderite rich area over the ellipse surrounding a porous domain in Panel A.	99
4.14	2D images of highly porous isolated siderite rich domains in Murteree shale core sample labelled A, B and C from Project well Della4 at depth 6619.00 – 6620.00 ft., identified using SE detector of FIB/SEM system, inaccessible by helium porosimetry and MICP techniques, and pore throats labelled by brown arrows in 2D image labelled D.	100
4.15	Occluded intergranular porosity in FIB/SEM 2D images of Murteree Shale.	100
4.16	FIB/SEM prepared Roseneath Shale sample image with isolated highly porous domains, siderite grains marked by white arrows and green arrows showing the organics in panel A and red rectangle in An enlarged (increased magnification & resolution) to show the strength of the intergranular porosity of siderite grains in panel B.	101

Figure No.	List of Figures (continued) Title	Page No.
4.17	Roseneath shale FIB/SEM sample showing porous siderite grain with intragranular microporosity and surrounded by intergranular porosity as well.	101
4.18	Roseneath shale (FIB/SEM) image depicting the role of local clays lamination in the inaccessible porous zones mainly dominated by siderite and clay platelets and role of pyrite (marked by P) and other heavy mineral in keeping the intergranular pores open during fracturing operations (Om =organic matter, QU=quartz; and C=clays	102
4.19	Serial Sectioning of Murteree Shale using FIB/SEM for 3D volumetric Model, depicting the problem faced during milling operations, redeposit ion of the sectioned material in front of ablated faces of the sample labelled by white arrows in panels A, B and C, leading to failure of 3D model construction for identification/guess of interconnectivity of the pores and total porous zone in sample.	102
4.20	Murteree shale sample mechanically prepared and imaged without carbon coating using SE detector of SEM, showing stacked clays/micas platelets representing challenge for fracturing operation	103
5.1	Stratigraphic cross section and composite well log from project well Della4	108
5.2	Backscattered electron beam image showing the distribution of organic matter, pyrite, siderite and silicate content of a scanned Murteree shale sample during QEMSCAN analyses	109
5.3	Graphical expression of various formulas used to derive shale/clays volume.	111
5.4	Two FIB/SEM images showing moldic and intergranular porosity, from Murteree shale (A) and enlarged rectangle in in panel B project well Della4, depth 6619.00-6620.00ft.	112
5.5	One of FIB/SEM images showing intergranular/fractured submicron porosity and chaotic clay platelets arrangement from Murteree shale.	112
5.6	One of FIB/SEM images showing intergranular/fractured submicron porosity by red arrows and chaotic clay platelets, both detrital and authigenic minerals arrangement in this 2D image Murteree shale with from Project well Della4.	113
5.7	Ion Milled Roseneath Shale sample surface: Red arrows pointing the electric current paths/gas flow paths and tortousity in sample, Q quartz, C clays, f, floccules, om, organic matter; yellow arrows showing heavy minerals; green arrow pointing to the attachment of the clay particles edges with face of the clay particles, shale resistivity model concept (SRM, organics, clays and adsorbed gas - yellow ellipses) and P (white) showing a large pore just above window bar at the bottom.	116
5.8	STEM (Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy) image (A) showing clay platelets attachment, in panel A (Face to Face red arrow, Face to Edge White arrow, and Edge to Edge green arrow) with dark coloured organic matter, inter-clay platelets porosity – flocculation (from Sondergeld et al. 2010 with modification), and Murteree shale SE images with clays attachment to organic matter image in panel B by white arrow.	116

Figure No.	List of Figures (continued) Title	Page No.
5.9	Mechanically prepared and resin embedded Murteree shale sample imaged using backscattered electrons detector of SEM system to identify distribution and morphology of the microfabric comprising chaotic attachments of clays plateletts - (a) face to face, (b) face to edge and (c) edge to edge; siderite, quartz, organic matter, pyrite, red asterisk showing flocculation areas, zone A showing a mechanically and chemically resistant quartz grain surrounded by clays and zone B showing clays fully covered and attached to the organic matter.	117
5.10	Mechanically prepared and resin embedded Murteree shale sample imaged using backscattered electrons detector of SEM system to identify distribution and morphology of the microfabric comprising chaotic attachments of clays plateletts - (a) face to face, (b) face to edge and (c) edge to edge, siderite, quartz, organic matter pyrite, red asterisk showing flocculation, zone A showing and zone A showing clays fully covered and attached to the organic matter.	117
5.11	Clays and Organic matter postdeposition diagenetic process and consequent products (Boles and Franks 1979, Hunnur 2006, Thyburg et al., 2009, Passey et al., 2010 and Schieber 2010)	118
5.12	New Fluids (fresh water and methane gas along with brine), organic matter and clays as a postdeposition diagenetic process which has impact on true resistivity and conductivity estimated using wireline logging techniques as well as on water saturation.	119
5.13	Correlation between conventional shaley model (A) and conceptual resistivity model (B) in Murteree shale gas reservoir	120
5.14	Unconventional resistivity model of Murteree shale gas reservoir	121
5.15	Murteree Shale FIB/SEM Sample and size of the porous domains	121

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
1.1	Shale gas history	1
1.2	World estimates of shale gas resources in-place	3
1.3	Shale gas potential in major Australian Sedimentary Basins	6
1.4	Classification of argillaceous sedimentary rocks	11
1.5	Source rock identification and petrophysical variables evaluation techniques and methodology for shale gas reservoir characterization	14
1.6	Reservoir characterization of potential source rocks phases	15
1.7	Type of kerogens representing source of various hydrocarbons	17
1.8	Project well names, location and sample depth in Nappamerrie Trough South Australian part of Cooper Basin	29
3.1	How estimated characteristics x-rays energy (E) and wavelength (λ) is used for identification and quantification of minerals in rock samples by QEMSCAN techniques	62
3.2	Mineral constituents distribution (volume% and mass %, grain and pore size) in Murteree shale sample presented in figure 3.3	63
3.3	Minerals, their EDXS % estimated and density used in QEMSCAN, SEM, Micro and Nanotomography Evaluation Techniques (Liu et al. 2005, David French et al., 2008)	79
3.4	X-Ray Diffraction results of Murteree Shale	80
3.5	Petrographic Techniques – Advantages and Disadvantages	84
4.1	Porosity values of Roseneath and Murteree shale using the core crushing method (Liquid Pyknometry)	96
4.2	Comparison of Roseneath and Murteree shale formations porosity (%) using helium porosimetry	97
5.1	Digital log data of Murteree shale in project well Della4	108
5.2	Total clay content% in Murteree shale Well Completion Report Della#4 Project Well	110
5.3	Shale/Clays Volume (Total Clay Fraction) Derived	110
5.4	Porosity evaluated using various formulas	111
5.5	Four water saturation models results	113
5.6	Sensitivity analysis results using different true resistivity in Indonesian and Simandoux models	114
5.7	Sensitivity analysis for assumed porosity =0.1(fraction) in Murteree Shale	114
5.8	Sensitivity analysis results using different porosity in water saturation models	115
5.9	Correlation of four water saturation models results for Murteree shale gas reservoir	120

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, brothers, and sister

Research Activity Flow Chart 2010-2011		
2010	Literature Review	Research Title/Topic Selection & Registration: Petrophysical and Mineralogical Evaluation of Shale Gas Reservoirs A Cooper Basin - Case Study
		Experimental Techniques & Methodology Selection & Applied: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helium Porosimetry 2. Mercury Injection Techniques 3. Liquid Pycnometry 4. QEMSCAN, XRD & FIB/SEM 5. Micro and Nano CT-Scanning 6. Wireline Logging Techniques Objectives/Tasks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mineral and Rock Characterization 2. Effective and Total Porosity 3. Pore Throat and Pore Size, Morphology and Micro Fracture System Study and Interconnectivity 4. Water Saturation Evaluation
Wells & Cores Selection (Della#4 and Moomba#46) Samples Collection & Experimental Setup		
Sample Preparation for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QEMSCAN Radiation 2. Micro and Nano CT-Scanning 3. XRD – Technique 4. SEM Imaging of QEMSCAN samples Experimental Results: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organics and Various Minerals Phase Identification & Quantification 2. Weight % & Volumetric % of each Mineral Phase 3. False Colour Map Preparation of Scanned Samples 4. Fractures & Pores Identification in QEMSCAN Used Sample 5. XRD – Minerals Identification and Quantification 6. Micro and Nano CT-Scanning for Pores and Micro Fracture system Results Correlation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QEMSCAN and XRD Results Correlation 2. Pores Correlation between FIB/SEM Images and QEMSCAN Results 3. Micro – CT Scanning and FIB/SEM Images Correlation for Micro Fracture System 		
2011		

Research Activity Flow Chart 2012-2013

2012	Literature Review	<p>Sample Preparation for :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helium Porosimetry 2. MICP(Mercury Injection Capillary Pressure) 3. Liquid Pyknometry 4. FIB/SEM <p>Experimental Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective Porosity by Helium and MICP 2. Pores Throat size and Pores Size Description by MICP & FIB/SEM 3. Total Porosity by Liquid Pyknometry <p>Results Correlation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helium Porosimetry and MICP Results Correlation 2. Pores Correlation between MICP and FIB/SEM 3. Total Porosity from Liquid Pyknometry & FIB/SEM Images & MICP Graphs
2013	Literature Review	<p>Well Completion Reports Selection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Della#4 & Wireline Log Data Digitization 2. Moomba#46 & Wireline Log Data Digitization 3. Recently drilled Well Completion Reports in Cooper Basins for Murteree and Roseneath Shale 4. Use of FIB/SEM Images from Murteree & Roseneath Shales <p>Experimental Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FIB/SEM images Description for Organics and Clays 2. Fluids, Organics and Mineral Interaction 3. Resistivity and Conductivity Analysis 4. a, m, n, R_w and R_{cl} from Published Data 5. Water Saturation Calculation Using Archie, Indonesian, Simandoux and Total Shale Models <p>Results Correlation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diagenesis Related Changes in Mineralogy and Fluid Production 2. Interaction between Clays, Methane and Brine 3. Interaction Impact on Resistivity 4. Use of Archie's Formula for Water Saturation and Correlation with Indonesian , Simandoux and Total Shale Model

Three research papers were produced and published based on this research as given below with the titles and name of Journal and Conference venues, presented.

EVALUATION OF FREE POROSITY IN SHALE GAS RESERVOIRS (ROSENEATH AND MURTEREE FORMATIONS CASE STUDY)



M. Ahmad, A. Alamar, R.Koo, H. Nguyen and M. Haghghi
Australian School of Petroleum , North Terrace Campus
The University of Adelaide SA 5005
mahmad@asp.adelaide.edu.au
APPEA Journal 2012, pp 603-610



SPE-158461-PP

Mineralogy and Petrophysical Evaluation of Roseneath and Murteree Shale Formations, Cooper Basin, Australia Using QEMSCAN and CT Scanning

Maqsood Ahmad, and Manouchehr Haghghi, SPE, Australian School of Petroleum, The University of Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia

Copyright 2012, Society of Petroleum Engineers

This paper was prepared for presentation at the SPE Asia Pacific Oil and Gas Conference and Exhibition held in Perth, Australia, 22-24 October 2012. This paper was selected for presentation by an SPE program committee following review of information contained in an abstract submitted by the author(s). Contents of the paper have not been reviewed by the Society of Petroleum Engineers and are subject to correction by the author(s). The material does not necessarily reflect any position of the Society of Petroleum Engineers, its officers, or members. Electronic reproduction, distribution, or storage of any part of this paper without the written consent of the Society of Petroleum Engineers is prohibited. Permission to reproduce in print is restricted to an abstract of not more than 300 words; illustrations may not be copied. The abstract must contain conspicuous acknowledgment of SPE copyright.

Maqsood Ahmad and Manouchehr Haghghi SPE
Australian School of Petroleum , North Terrace Campus
The University of Adelaide SA 5005
mahmad@asp.adelaide.edu.au



SPE 167080

Water Saturation Evaluation of Murteree and Roseneath Shale Gas Reservoirs, Cooper Basin, Australia Using Wire-line Logs, Focused Ion Beam Milling and Scanning Electron Microscopy

Maqsood Ahmad, ASP, the University of Adelaide
Manouchehr Haghghi, ASP, the University of Adelaide

Copyright 2013, Society of Petroleum Engineers

This paper was prepared for presentation at the SPE Unconventional Resources Conference and Exhibition-Asia Pacific held in Brisbane, Australia, 11-13 November 2013. This paper was selected for presentation by an SPE program committee following review of information contained in an abstract submitted by the author(s). Contents of the paper have not been reviewed by the Society of Petroleum Engineers and are subject to correction by the author(s). The material does not necessarily reflect any position of the Society of Petroleum Engineers, its officers, or members. Electronic reproduction, distribution, or storage of any part of this paper without the written consent of the Society of Petroleum Engineers is prohibited. Permission to reproduce in print is restricted to an abstract of not more than 300 words; illustrations may not be copied. The abstract must contain conspicuous acknowledgment of SPE copyright.

Maqsood Ahmad and Manouchehr Haghghi SPE
Australian School of Petroleum , North Terrace Campus
The University of Adelaide SA 5005
mahmad@asp.adelaide.edu.au