

The Benefits of Stochastic Subsurface Uncertainty Assessment in a Complex Greenfield LNG Development

Alrik Thiriet

2019 SIS Global Forum

X MITSUI & CO.

September 18, 2018

Anadarko



Cautionary Language



Regarding Forward-Looking Statements and Other Matters

This presentation contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Mozambique LNG believes that its expectations are based on reasonable assumptions. No assurance, however, can be given that such expectations will prove to have been correct. A number of factors could cause actual results to differ materially from the projections, anticipated results or other expectations expressed in this presentation, including Mozambique LNG's ability to successfully plan, secure necessary governmental approvals, enter into long-term sales contracts and time charter agreements, finance, build and operate the necessary infrastructure and LNG park in Mozambique; realize reservoir performance; and produce and market the recoverable resources identified in this presentation. See risk factors included in reports filed under the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission by certain sponsors of Mozambique LNG. Neither Mozambique nor its sponsors undertake and obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statements.

Cautionary Note to Investors – The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) permits oil and gas companies, in their filings with the SEC, to disclose only proved, probable and possible reserves that meet the SEC's definitions for such terms. We may use terms in this presentation such as "resources," "recoverable gas resources," and similar terms and quantities of "estimated proved reserves" using underlying management assumptions that the SEC's guidelines strictly prohibit us from including in filings with the SEC. These quantities may not constitute "reserves" within the meaning of the SEC's rules. Actual quantities that may be ultimately recovered from our interests may differ substantially. Factors affecting ultimate recovery include the scope of our ongoing drilling program, which will be directly affected by commodity prices, the availability of capital, drilling and production costs, availability of drilling services and equipment, drilling risks, lease expirations, transportation constraints, regulatory approvals and other factors; and our actual drilling results including geological and mechanical factors affecting recovery rates. Such estimates may change significantly as development of our oil and gas assets provide additional data.

U.S. Investors are urged to consider closely the oil and gas disclosures in our Form 10-Ks and other reports and filings with the SEC by certain sponsors. Copies are available from the SEC and the sponsors' websites.

Process 1. 2. Tools 3. Training Risk Communication 4. lılı.

Decision Challenges in Field Development





Uncertainty

Decision

Objective

Paradigm Shift – Adopt an Alternative Methodology



- A. Initial field development decisions were based on a deterministic assessment (the Base case)
 - Develop an initial well count and locations with large amount of redundancies (*what if reservoir is poorer than base case or poor completion or well failure...*)
 - AOF_{well} » Max(Rate_{well})
 - Nb_{wells} * Max(Rate_{well}) > 2*Avg_{LNG throughput}
 - Subsea gathering system with dedicated 1Bscf/d trunkline per train
 - Simple workflow: G&G interpretation ⇒ reservoir model ⇒ dynamic model ⇒ production forecast
- B. Alternative methodology from management's motivation to quantify risks (gas contracts in form of SPA = production obligation) and reduce cost in a low commodity price environment (capital efficiency)
 - Provide probabilistic production forecasts and reserves
 - Can we reduce well count and differ wells to future drilling campaign?





Key Learnings

- Making decision under uncertainty is difficult and requires careful and thoughtful framing
 - Move from an aspiration (minimize cost & maximize production) to a quantifiable risk tolerance goal - P(Max(Gas Rate) < X years) < 0.05
- Science of uncertainty assessment is complex
 - Statistics and modeling knowledge
- Importance of workflows, software and hardware
 - Integrated multi-disciplinary workflows
 - Modeling tools with probabilistic assessment modules, ideally running realizations in parallel
 - Tool capable of gathering data from multiple platforms, software and disciplines for data integration and analysis



Quantitative Stochastic Uncertainty Assessment

- 1. Large number of stochastic realizations using Monte-Carlo sampling of uncertain parameters
- 2. Dynamic model screening of each static model using a fast proxy
- 3. Model selection using distance-based technique, multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) and clustering
- 4. Dynamic model selection from stand-alone reservoir simulation
- 5. Full field simulation of selected model combinations





MOZAMBIQUE

Deepwater Stratigraphic Complexity

- Giant deepwater clastic reservoirs with complex stratigraphy impacts reservoir connectivity
 - A. Amalgamated deepwater slope channel elements
 - B. Channel complexes, imaged seismically
 - C. Channel complex set
- Uncertainty in reservoir thicknesses and location / transmissibility of internal boundaries (channel, channel complexes and channel sets)



*from Campion et al. (2005), Sprague et al. (2005) and Di Celma et al. (2011)



An Efficient Strategy to Provide Probabilistic Forecasts

Time

Time [Days]

OF1 Single Dynamic Reservoir Simulations

OF1 Static Model - Geoscreening (WCFPT_GZ)

Time (Days)

WCFPT_GZ - Time

Seoscreening

Stand-alone reservoir simulation

- Production is sensitive to connected hydrocarbon pore volume
- Probabilistic forecasts require large number of samples stochastic spatial variables
- Number simulations from coupled models is

unmanageable: $N_{FFM} = N_{OF1} * N_{OF2}$

- 1. Create large sample of single reservoir static models (Monte-Carlo sampling)
- Screen models using 2. dynamic connected volume, then dynamic simulation
- Compare all model pairs and 3. measure the difference
- Multi-dimensional scaling, 4. clustering and selection





OF1 Geoscreening - 30 2D MDS Clusters - OF1_Jan19_Ge...

Prediction – Communicate Probabilistic Results

- Improve communication and make informed decisions from quantitative uncertainty assessment
- Generate probabilistic prediction on many levels:
 - Field production, water breakthrough
 - Wells: Net Pay, HcPV, BHP(t)
 - Maps: P(net pay > 30m)
- Provide management with calibrated values for portfolio models, planning, risk management and reserves



Benefits – Model Rejection, Fast Learnings and Updates

- Stop traditional history matching techniques with ad-hoc model changes to match history, which generally leads to poor predictivity
 - Most history matching problems are non-unique
 - Does not provide uncertainty assessment
 - Slow process
- Model rejection techniques with additional information provide
 - Instant update to prior distribution of uncertain parameters (posterior distribution - Bayes)
 - Learnings
 - Reduction of uncertainty
 - Additional matched models using resampling techniques







www.mzlng.com

Development of Efficient Visualizations & Analytics Tools

Select Date for Time dependent analysis

Schadula

Sch7 NoCor

Sch7_NoCor

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7_NoComp

Sch7_NoComp

Sch7 NoCom

Sch7_NoCom Sch7_NoComp

Sch7_NoComp

Sch7_NoCome Sch7_NoComp

Sch7_NoComp

Sch7 NoCom Sch7_NoComp

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7_NoCom

Sch7_NoCom Sch7_NoComp

Sch7 NoCom FFM_72_275 Sch7_NoComp FFM_72_288

Sch7_NoComp

Sch7_NoComp

Sch7 NoCom

FFM_72_3 Sch7_NoComp FFM_72_322 Sch7_NoComp FFM_72_499

•

elect Production Sottom Hole Pressure [psi]

Model Selection FFM Model

FFM 301 3

FFM_301_6 FFM 336 275

FEM 336 3

FFM 336 57

FFM_336_6

FFM_336_7

EEM 220 10

FEM 339 174

FEM 339 288 FFM_339_3 FEM 330 433

FFM 339 499

FFM_339_57 FFM_339_6

FFM_339_7

FFM 339.95

FFM 36 107

FFM 36 3

FFM_36_57

FFM 36.7

FFM_36_95

FFM_4_10

FFM 4 107

FFM_4_174

FFM_4_288

FFM 4.3

FFM_4_322 FFM 4 433

FFM 4 499

FFM_4_57

FEM 4 95

FFM_455_433

FFM_72_10 FEM 72 174

FFM_72_57

Map Chart

• Challenge:

- Large amount of data from various sources
- Data stored in various locations •
- Multi-disciplinary

Solution

- Create a central data store (SQL) linked to original data locations and properly managed
- Establish links between data tables •
 - Model parameters static volume – connected volume(t)
 - Well location static prediction -٠ dynamic forecast
- Develop dashboards to query and visualize the data in one common location
- Data analytics •





Bottom Hole Pressure [psi] 🛛 🖯



Potential in MMscf/d in MMscf/d 🛛 📿





Limitations of Tools Employed for this Study



- Pillar-based grids are not ideal to construct complex stratigraphic models where internal surfaces representing geologic boundaries are driving gas recovery ⇒ evaluation of depo-grid underway
- Inability to properly handle structural uncertainty near faults to preserve or modify fault throw
- Sequential built of reservoir model parallelization is hindered by tool and licensing structure
- Model export for integrated subsurface-surface, coupled reservoir simulation
- Limited access to cluster technology for faster delivery
- Streamline simulation used in geoscreening is not a direct proxy to primary gas depletion

Acknowledgments



- Mozambique Development Subsurface team for their intense efforts and openness to change
- Mozambique Upstream department for their collaboration and ideas
- Mozambique LNG senior management vision
- Our partners' support, recommendations and feedback

THANK YOU