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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to present the development of a simulator of oil well drilling processes.

Design/methodology/approach – The simulator incorporates the main variables that are used by drilling engineers in the definition of the drilling processes. The code is useful a priori, in the design of a drilling process, as a tool for comparing different design options and predicting their results and a posteriori of a failure to understand its genesis and therefore provide know-why to improve the drilling techniques.

Findings – The developed finite element simulator uses a co-rotational Bernoulli beam element, an explicit time integration scheme and an explicit contact algorithm. The numerical results show that the simulator is stable and provides consistent solutions.

Practical implications – During the drilling of oil wells, the fatigue damage and wear of the drilling column is of utmost concern. To determine the mechanical behavior of the drilling column standard simplified analyses are usually performed using commercially available codes; however, those standard analyses do not include a transient dynamic simulation of the process; hence, it is necessary to develop a specific tool for the detailed dynamic simulation of drilling processes.

Originality/value – A simulator able to perform a description of the drilling process in the time range will be an important contribution to the tools used by drilling engineers.

Keywords Simulation, Finite elements, Oil drilling

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

The drilling of oil wells is an involved process in which a well of prescribed trajectory is accurately constructed through several thousand meters of different rock formations (see Figures 1 and 2).

During the drilling of oil wells, the fatigue damage and wear of the drilling column is of utmost concern (Shathuvalli et al., 2005; Sikal et al., 2008); especially when using the casing while drilling technique (CWD) in which the well is simultaneously drilled and cased (Warren et al., 2000). In this process the drilling column, instead of being composed by heavy drill pipes is composed by the much lighter casing pipes; hence, the wear and fatigue effects are more relevant. To determine the mechanical behavior of the drilling column standard simplified analyses (Rae et al., 2005) are usually performed using commercially available codes; however, those standard analyzes do not include a transient dynamic simulation of the process; hence, it is necessary to develop a specific tool for the detailed dynamic simulation of drilling processes.

In this paper we describe the fundamentals of the code that we developed for modeling drilling processes. It is important to remark that the model that we developed does not incorporate any ad hoc simplification (e.g. “stiff string” or “soft string” models), therefore, the model results are not biased by assumptions that may neglect certain effects.

In the second section of this paper we discuss the finite element formulation that we implemented in the drilling simulator. In the third section we discuss the simulation
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set-up; that is to say, the main assumptions used to model the drilling processes, the required data input and the imposed boundary conditions. In the fourth section we present some illustrative numerical examples and discuss the requirements for getting stable solutions. In Appendix we describe the geometrical representation of the well trajectory usually used by drilling engineers. Our simulator pre-processor includes a module for translating the input geometrical data into Cartesian coordinates.

The need for geometrical nonlinear analysis
It is well known that axial compressive load acting on a tubular column diminishes its lateral stiffness while an axial tensile load increases its lateral stiffness. This is a geometrical nonlinear effect and can only be modeled considering the equilibrium of the column in its deformed configuration (Bathe, 1996; Dvorkin and Goldschmit, 2005).

In a static analyses, in the lower compressed sector of the drilling column, the diminishing of the lateral stiffness can lead to the buckling of the column, which is a
contained buckling, due to the lateral restraint imposed by the oil well (Lubinski and Althouse, 1962; Mitchell, 2003).

In some drilling operations the pressure of the mud inside the column (internal pressure when referring to the column) is higher than the pressure in the annulus between the well and the column (external pressure when referring to the column); when considering the buckling of the column, the internal pressure has a destabilizing effect; that is to say, it lowers the axial buckling critical load. On the contrary the external pressure has a stabilizing effect; that is to say, it increases the axial buckling critical load. These effects were discussed in Palmer and Martin (1975) and Dvorkin and Toscano (2001). In this paper we will consider that the internal and external pressures are balanced.

In a dynamic analysis the effect of the axial load on the lateral stiffness is evidenced analyzing the drilling column natural frequencies; a tensile load increases the transversal bending natural frequencies while a compressive load decreases them. Since it is necessary to incorporate these axial load effects to the model, we developed our code using a geometrically nonlinear formulation limited to the case of small strains which closely represents the actual operation conditions.

2. The finite element formulation
In the simulator that we developed, the pipes column is modeled using beam elements and it incorporates the following features:

- co-rotational beam elements used to model the pipes column;
- lumped mass matrix;
- frictional contact algorithm used to model the interaction between the pipes and the well;
- fluid damping introduced by the fluids inside the well; and
- explicit time integration algorithm.

2.1 The beam element formulation
The beam element that we implemented is the standard Bernoulli beam element with a tubular cross section; hence, we neglect the effect of shear deformations (Bathe and Bolourchi, 1979).

We implemented a co-rotational formulation aimed at the modeling of large displacements/rotations but infinitesimal strains, which is the case in the modeling of drilling operations.

For a two-node element “e” we define:

\[ ^0x_i^k (k = 1-2) (i = 1-3): \text{i-coordinate of the } k\text{-node at time } t=0 \text{ (reference configuration)}; \]

\[ ^t u_i^k (k = 1-2) (i = 1-3): \text{i-displacement of the } k\text{-node at the } t\text{-configuration}; \]

\[ ^t \theta_i^k (k = 1-2) (i = 1-3): \text{i-rotation of the } k\text{-node at the } t\text{-configuration}; \]

For the “e” element we define the axial vector:

\[ ^0 V_r^{(e)} = \sum_j \left( ^0 x_{ij}^2 - ^0 x_{ij}^1 \right) e_j \]

(1)

and we introduce two arbitrary vectors \( ^0 V_r^{(e)}, ^0 V_{r_0}^{(e)} \) that form with \( ^0 V_r^{(e)} \) an ortho-normal set.
At the $t$-configuration we calculate the new axial vector:

$$
\frac{\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r}{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{t}_x^2 + \mathbf{t}_u^2 - \mathbf{t}_x^1 - \mathbf{t}_u^1 \\
\sqrt{\sum \left(\mathbf{t}_x^2 + \mathbf{t}_u^2 - \mathbf{t}_x^1 - \mathbf{t}_u^1\right)^2 e_i}
$$  

The angle between $\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r$ and $\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r$ is:

$$
\theta^{(e)}_t = \cos^{-1}\left(\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r : \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r\right)
$$

We now define the rotation vector:

$$
\mathbf{t}^{(e)} = \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r \times \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_r
$$

and the corresponding rigid rotation matrix (Dvorkin et al., 1988):

$$
\mathbf{t}^{(e)} R^{(e)} = \mathbf{I} + \frac{\sin\theta^{(e)}}{\theta^{(e)}} \begin{bmatrix}
0 & -t\Theta_3 & t\Theta_2 \\
t\Theta_3 & 0 & -t\Theta_1 \\
-t\Theta_2 & t\Theta_1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
$$

Using the above defined rotation matrix we write:

$$
\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_s = \mathbf{t}^{(e)} R^{(e)} \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_s \\
\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t = \mathbf{t}^{(e)} R^{(e)} \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t
$$

2.1.1 The beam element torsion. Along each element $(e)$ the torsional angle has a linear distribution and at each node “$k$”:

$$
\theta^{k}_{\text{torsion}} = (\mathbf{t}^{(e)} \cdot \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t) \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t
$$

2.1.2 The beam element bending. To get the bending displacements we subtract from the total displacements the ones corresponding to a rigid body motion, and to the torsional deformation:

$$
\mathbf{u}^{1}_{\text{bending}} = 0 \\
\theta^{1}_{\text{bending}} = 0 \\
\mathbf{u}^{2}_{\text{bending}} = \mathbf{u}_2 - \mathbf{u}_1 - \left[\mathbf{R}^{(e)} \left(\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_1\right) - \left(\mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{v}^{(e)}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_1\right)\right] \\
\theta^{2}_{\text{bending}} = \theta^2 - \theta^1 - \theta^{2}_{\text{torsion}}
$$
2.1.3 The beam element stress resultants. In the system \( \left( tV_r^{(e)}, tV_s^{(e)}, tV_t^{(e)} \right) \) located in the deformed configuration we determine:
- the axial stress resultants using the difference between \( t\mathbf{u}_2 \) and \( t\mathbf{u}_1 \) projected on \( tV^{(e)} \);
- the torsional moment using the angle determined in Equation (7); and
- the bending moments and bending shears using the relative generalized bending displacements calculated with Equation (8).

2.1.4 The beam element mass matrix. We use a lumped mass matrix with concentrated displacement and rotational masses at the nodes.

2.2 The frictional contact algorithm
We implemented a frictional contact algorithm based on the explicit frictional predictive/corrective contact algorithm published by Cirak and West (2005).

In the model we introduce the following hypotheses:
- the contact column/well is localized at the boxes (couplings) of the inter-pipe connections (their OD is larger than the OD of the pipes, as shown in Figure 3); and
- in order to get a stable solution, avoiding “chattering”, we only consider contact every “NC” boxes and at \( \Delta t_c \) time intervals (see Section 4 where we discuss the solution stability using the results of our numerical experimentation).

2.2.1 Algorithm predictive phase. In Figure 4 we schematize a well section \((i, i+1)\) and a column section \((N-1, N)\). In the figure the column interpenetrates the well and therefore the contact algorithm needs to restore the geometrical compatibility.

For the \( N \)-node of the column:
- **Localize the well section that contains the node**: if the node is in the \( i \)-th well section and the \( x \)-coordinate is the vertical coordinate, we know that \( x_{\text{well}}^i < x_N < x_{\text{well}}^{i+1} \).
- **From the geometry in** Figure 4, we calculate the distance from a point located on the box OD to the well wall (\( \text{dist} \)).
If \( \text{dist} > (\text{IDW}/2) \) (as drawn in Figure 4) the N-node of the column interpenetrates the well and the prediction results for this node will need to be corrected in the corrective step of the algorithm.

2.2.2 Algorithm contact corrections. When from the analysis of the contact geometry for the N-node of the column we get interference between the box and the well, we go through the following corrective steps:

- **Calculate** (see Figure 4):

  \[
  t_{rO} = r_j + \left[ d_{\text{well}} \cdot (t_{rN} - r_j) \right] d_{\text{well}}
  \]  
  \( (9) \)

- **Correct the position of the N-node of the column**: making zero the interference:

  \[
  t_{rN}^{\text{new}} = t_{rO} + \frac{\text{IDW}}{2} \left[ \frac{t_{rN} - t_{rO}}{\| t_{rN} - t_{rO} \|} \right] d_{\text{well}}
  \]  
  \( (10) \)

- **Velocity correction**: the algorithm that we implemented conserves the energy and momentum of each of the column nodes independently; hence, the solution has a dependence on the order that we use to loop over the column nodes. This error tends to zero when we decrease the time step.

We define the vector \( t_{rON} = (t_{rN}^{\text{new}} - t_{rO}) \), the unit vector in the normal direction (n-direction) is \( t_{rON} / \| t_{rON} \| \) and a unit vector in a tangential direction (w-direction) is \( t_w = d_{\text{well}} \times (t_{rON} / \| t_{rON} \|) \).
The velocity of the $N$-node after solving the step $t \rightarrow t+\Delta t$ and before imposing the contact condition is $^{t+\Delta t}v_N = \frac{t+\Delta t_j^N}{m_N}$. After the impact column/well the normal velocity component is corrected conserving energy and momentum to (Cirak and West, 2005):

$$^{t+\Delta t}v_N = \frac{t+\Delta t_j^N}{m_N}$$

where:

$$^{t+\Delta t}j^N = \frac{2m_N t^N v_n^N - \sqrt{(2m_N t^N v_n^N)^2 - 8m_N (t^F_{ext} - t^F_N) \cdot (t_j - t_j^N)}}{2}$$

In the above equation, $t^F_{ext}$ and $t^F_{int}$ are the external and internal forces on the $N$-node of the column.

- **Angular velocity correction**: the sliding impulse in the $[t, t+\Delta t]$ interval is:

$$^{t+\Delta t}j^N_{sliding} = \min\left(m_n^{t+\Delta t}v_{sliding}^N, \mu^{t+\Delta t}j^N_n\right).$$

In the above equation, $^{t+\Delta t}v_{sliding}^N = \sqrt{\left(^{t+\Delta t}v_{d}^N\right)^2 + \left(^{t+\Delta t}v_{w}^N\right)^2}$ and $\mu$ is the column/well friction coefficient. The tangential velocity component is corrected to (Cirak and West, 2005):

$$^{t+\Delta t}v_{sliding}^N = \frac{^{t+\Delta t}v_{sliding}^N}{\left\|^{t+\Delta t}v_{sliding}^N\right\|} \frac{^{t+\Delta t}j^N_{sliding}}{m_N}$$

For the angular velocity $^{t+\Delta t}O_i$ the correction we use:

$$^{t+\Delta t}O_i^N = \frac{^{t+\Delta t}O_i^N}{\left\|^{t+\Delta t}v_{N}^N\right\|} \frac{^{t+\Delta t}j^N_{sliding}}{I_{ii}} \left(\frac{OD}{2}\right)$$

where ($i = 1,2,3$) and $I_{ii}$ is the rotational inertia moment of the section with respect to the $ii$-axis.

2.2.3 Frictional effects: numerical experimentation. To illustrate on the effect of the friction coefficient value, in Figure 5 we schematize the drilling column movement for different values of this coefficient. From that figure we see that when the friction coefficient increases its value the movement of the column changes and the contact area column-well shrinks and the wear of the pipes gets localized along a generatrix of the column.
Notes: In blue we show the time evolution of the contact points and in red the location of the contact point at the time of the drawn configuration. It is indicated with “a,b,c and d” four consecutive configurations.

Figure 5.
Effect of the friction coefficient column/well
2.3 Fluid damping
In this subsection we analyze the modeling of the damping effects introduced by the fluids inside the well.

2.3.1 Damping in the axial direction. When the column is moving with an axial velocity, the shear stress opposing the movement is:

\[ \tau = \frac{2 \mu_{\text{fluid}} v_{\text{axial}}}{(IDW - od)} \]

(16)

where \( \mu_{\text{fluid}} \) is the external fluid kinematic viscosity, \( v_{\text{axial}} \) is the linear velocity along the element axis and \( od \) is the pipes outside diameter.

The force opposed to the axial movement at node \( N \) is modeled as:

\[ F_{\text{axial}}^N = \tau \pi (od) l \]

(17)

where \( l \) is the distance between the center of the elements above and beneath the \( N \)-node.

2.3.2 Damping in the radial direction. The drag force opposing the velocity in the radial direction is modeled as:

\[ F_{\text{radial}} = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\text{fluid}} A C_D \left( v_{\text{rad}} \right)^2 \]

(18)

where \( C_D \) is the drag coefficient for a cylinder with a fluid of a density \( \delta_{\text{fluid}} \) moving towards it with a velocity \( v_{\text{rad}} \).

2.3.3 Damping for the rotational movement. The damping moment opposing the rotational movement is modeled as:

\[ M = 0.5 \mu_{\text{fluid}} (od)^3 \omega \frac{\pi}{(IDW - od)} \]

(19)

In the above equation, for each element, \( \omega \) is the angular velocity along the element axis.

2.3.4 Fluid damping: numerical experimentation. In Figure 6 we show an example of the effect of the damping on torsional vibrations and in Figure 7 we show an example of the effect of damping on axial vibrations.

2.4 The time integration algorithm
During an incremental analysis we solve the nonlinear dynamic equilibrium equations at specific instants along the time axis. The typical problem to be solved is: knowing the configuration (geometrical configuration, velocities, accelerations, stresses, etc.) at time \( t \) seek for the configuration at time \( t + \Delta t \) (Bathe, 1996).

Being \( U \) the vector of generalized nodal displacements (displacements and rotations) at a generic instant \( \tau \), the equilibrium equations at a time \( t + \Delta t \) are:

\[ M^{t + \Delta t} \ddot{U} + C^{t + \Delta t} \dot{U} = \dot{R}^{t + \Delta t} - \dot{F}^{t + \Delta t}. \]

(20)

In the above set of equations \( M \) is the mass matrix, \( C \) is the damping matrix, \( \ddot{U} \) is the vector of generalized nodal accelerations, \( \dot{U} \) is the vector of generalized nodal velocities, \( \dot{R} \) is the vector of external generalized nodal loads and \( \dot{F} \) is the
Figure 6. Damping effect on torsional vibrations. 
(a) Result without considering the drilling mud damping; (b) result considering a drilling mud damping
Figure 7. Damping effect on axial vibrations.

(a) Result without considering the drilling mud damping; (b) Result considering a drilling mud damping.
vector of generalized nodal internal forces; all of them at time $t + \Delta t$. The vector of internal forces is a function of the nodal generalized displacements; that is to say, 

$$t + \Delta t F = t + \Delta t F(t + \Delta t \mathbf{U}).$$

We use an explicit time integration scheme (Wood, 1990):

$$t + \Delta t \mathbf{U} = t + \Delta t \mathbf{U} + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta t) \mathbf{U}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

$$t + \Delta t \mathbf{U} = t + \Delta t \mathbf{U} + \frac{1}{2}(t + \Delta t \mathbf{U}).$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)

hence:

\[
\left( M + \frac{\Delta t}{2} C \right) t + \Delta t \mathbf{U} = t + \Delta t R - F \left( t + \Delta t \mathbf{U} + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta t) \mathbf{U} \right) - C t - \frac{\Delta t}{2} C \mathbf{U}. \hspace{1cm} (23)
\]

This explicit integration scheme is only stable if:

$$\Delta t < \frac{T_{\text{min}}}{\pi}$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)

where $T_{\text{min}}$ is the minimum eigenperiod contained in the model (Bathe, 1996).

It is not practical to calculate all the eigenvalues of the system to determine the minimum eigenperiod and also, since the model is geometrically nonlinear, the value of $T_{\text{min}}$ changes for each time step; hence, we will make a conservative heuristic approximation to determine $\Delta t$. For each element $(e)$ we calculate:

- $\Delta t_1^{(e)}$: the critical time step considering the bending of the isolated element under axial loading (A. R&D, 2012; Blevins, 1979);
- $\Delta t_2^{(e)}$: the critical time step considering the torsion of the isolated element (Blevins, 1979); and
- $\Delta t_3^{(e)}$: the critical time step considering the axial extension of the isolated element (Blevins, 1979).

Finally, based on our numerical experimentation we use for each time step:

$$\Delta t = \alpha \min \left( \Delta t_1^{(e)}, \Delta t_2^{(e)}, \Delta t_3^{(e)} \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} (25)

where $\alpha \leq 1$ (in our numerical experimentation we used $\alpha = 0.8$).

3. The simulation set-up

In this section we discuss the simulation set-up; that is to say, the main assumptions used to model the drilling processes, the required data input and the imposed boundary conditions.

3.1 Assumptions and data

3.1.1 The time intervals. A drilling process takes a given time for its completion. To analyze a complete process we subdivide it into intervals and assume that within each
interval the process is stationary. Each process will be modeled using a “simulation window” (see Figure 8) (the simulation windows should be large enough to assure that a stationary behavior is achieved inside it).

3.1.2 The well geometry data. The target well geometry is introduced with the model pre-processor as discussed in Appendix and the pre-processor provides the simulator with a list of points defined by the \((x, y, z)\) coordinates.

3.1.3 Drilling parameters data. For each “simulation window” characterizing a time interval, the user should specify the following data:
- number and type of pipes to be lowered in the well during the time interval;
- mud density and viscosity;
- required weight on the bit (WOB) (see Figure 9);
- Hook position (the load on the hook is a simulation result)[1];
- required torque on the bit (TOB) (see Figure 9);
- RPM of the bit;

![Figure 8. Time intervals in the middle of each time interval we indicate the simulation window](image)

![Figure 9. Schematic representation of TOB-WOB and Hook](image)
• weight of the bottom hole assembly (BHA) which is the weight of the lower part of the drilling column containing the bit and the weights that are added in order to get a specified WOB;
• friction coefficient between the pipes and the well; and
• number of centralizers and their position[2].

3.2 Imposed boundary conditions
At the model first node the power tong RPM and the vertical position (hooke position) are imposed and at the model last node the formation reactions (WOB and TOB) are imposed along the axial direction of the last element (see Figure 9).

At each centralizer we impose a contact condition considering the small gap between the centralizers and the well.

4. Numerical example and model verification
In what follows we analyze a typical CWD case, the modeled well geometry is shown in Figure 10. DLS distribution in the modeled well (see Appendix).

In Table I we summarize the data corresponding to the analyzed case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OD pipes (mm)</td>
<td>193.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness pipes (m)</td>
<td>9.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD boxes (mm)</td>
<td>215.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column length (m)</td>
<td>2,388.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pipes</td>
<td>199.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPM</td>
<td>80.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight on the bit (WOB) (N)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torque on the bit (TOB) (Nm)</td>
<td>1,514.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud viscosity (cp)</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of BHA (N)</td>
<td>2,224.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction coefficient pipes – formation</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. DLS distribution in the modeled well (see Appendix)
Considering individual pipes of 12 m of length, to verify the simulator results, we analyze the following cases (Table II).

The simulation starts with all the pipes in a vertical position (interfering with the well) and in the first time step the contact algorithm drives them inside the well; hence, the “simulation window” includes a transient response and converges to a stationary cyclic response.

In Figure 11 we show the relevant results for two of the analyzed cases.

The results provided by both sets of parameters are equivalent; however, NC = 10 gives a result with less spikes than NC = 2.

In Figures 12 and 13 we compare the results obtained with all the NC values. In Figure 14 we present the calculated values for the hook load as a function of time. The values of the time integration step (Equation (15)) are plotted in Figure 15.

5. Conclusions

With the purpose of providing a predictive tool for oil drilling engineers for the evaluation of wear and fatigue in drilling columns (especially when the casing while

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Δt_c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0015 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Analysis parameters (see Section 2.2)
drilling technique is used) a finite element code was developed for the simulation of the mechanical behavior of the pipe columns used in drilling processes.

The developed finite element simulator uses a co-rotational Bernoulli beam element, an explicit time integration scheme and an explicit contact algorithm.

The simulator incorporates the main variables that are used by drilling engineers in the definition of the drilling processes. The code is useful a priori, in the design of a drilling process, as a tool for comparing different design options and predicting their
results and a posteriori of a failure to understand its genesis and therefore provide know-why to improve the drilling techniques.

The numerical results show that the simulator is stable and provides consistent solutions.

Notes
1. The drilling column hangs from a hook (see Figure 9).
2. The centralizers are disks mounted on the drilling column pipes whose outside diameters are close to the well and therefore have the task of centering the drilling column inside the well.
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Appendix. The well geometry
The well geometry is represented by the coordinates of position stations defined along the borehole axis. Using as parameters the usual ones (Azimuth, Inclination and Measured Depth) we get the representation indicated in Figure A1.
The Azimuth and Inclination angles are indicated in the figure; the measured depth (MD) is the distance along the well path between a survey station “k” and the reference level. Knowing the Cartesian components of a station “k” we can calculate (with the angles measured in degrees):

\[
\Delta z_k = \cos^{-1}\left[ \cos(I_{k-1}) \cos(I_k) + \sin(I_{k-1}) \sin(I_k) \cos(A_k - A_{k-1}) \right]
\]

\[
RF_k = \left( \frac{180}{\pi} \right) \frac{2}{\Delta z_k} \tan\left( \frac{\Delta z_k}{2} \right)
\]

\[
V_k = V_{k-1} + \frac{\Delta MD_k}{2} \left[ \cos(I_{k-1}) + \cos(I_k) \right]
\]

\[
N_k = N_{k-1} + \frac{\Delta MD_k}{2} \left[ \sin(I_{k-1}) \sin(A_{k-1}) + \sin(I_k) \sin(A_k) \right] RF_k
\]

\[
E_k = E_{k-1} + \frac{\Delta MD_k}{2} \left[ \sin(I_{k-1}) \cos(A_{k-1}) + \sin(I_k) \cos(A_k) \right] RF_k
\]

(A1)

The dog leg severity (DLS) at “K” is defined as:

\[
DLS_k = \frac{100}{\Delta MD_k} \Delta z_k
\]

(A2)

and the total vertical depth is:

If \( DLS_k = 0 \) \( \rightarrow \Delta TVD_k = \Delta MD_k \cos(I_k) \)

If \( DLS_k \neq 0 \) \( \rightarrow \Delta TVD_k = \frac{\Delta MD_k}{2} \left[ \cos(I_{k-1}) + \cos(I_k) \right] RF_k \)

(A3)
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