Smart Monitoring –Optimized Experimental Design (OED) methods for (geo)physical data acquisition

Nino Menzel

URS Smart Monitoring Group Meeting

13.06.2024



Recap – Optimized Experimental Design



Survey expenses

 "smart" data acquisition aims at reaching the point of maximum benefit as fast as possible

1.0

0.8

6 7 Relative survey resolution (-)

0.2

0.0

- Benefit of a survey: resulting net increase in resolution of model parameters of interest
- Overall goal: limit the amount of acquired data (and variable survey cost) without drastically reducing information content
- In our case: effective monitoring of fluid transport processes using (geo-)physical surveys



Recap – Optimized Experimental Design







Inputs:

- A-priori information of the target area in the subsurface (transport process: hydr. parameters; geological structure: geometrical parameters)
- "Small" base measurement setup
 - Seismic survey with 40 recievers and 5 shot points
 - Geoelectric survey using 20 electrodes
- Densest possible measurement setup (comprehensive dataset)
 - Seismic survey with n recievers and m shot points
 - Geoelectric survey with *n* electrodes







Modelling in Python / pyGIMLi

N. Menzel, Optimized Experimental Design









6

Model-driven OED for fluid transport monitoring:

- Survey focusing based on a-priori information
 - Geological model and corresponding parametrization
 - Transport process simulation
- Focusing mask is created based on a-priori information, e.g., several transport simulations with varying parameter sets
 - Accounts for parameter uncertainties by including probability-based weights for every model cell
- Approach relies on sufficient a-priori information with limited uncertainties









Data-driven OED for fluid transport monitoring:

- Survey focusing based on acquired data of previous time step
 - No focusing for first time step unfocused OED
- Robust approach that does not include any additional sources of uncertainty
- However, approach only sufficient for small monitoring intervals









Hybrid OED for fluid transport monitoring:

- Survey focusing based on synthetic fluid transport model and resulting concentration distribution
- Similar to model-based approach, but with additional step:
 - After each iteration, simulated and acquired data of time step t_n are compared to evaluate accuracy of transport simulation

 $x(d_{sim}) \approx x(d_{acq})$: $x(d_{sim}) \neq x(d_{acq})$:

No changes applied to transport simulation

Adapt transport simulation parameters





Hybrid OED for fluid transport monitoring:

- To test approach, we assumed transport process simulation that deviates from true model
- Two transport models: "true" model and wrong assumption to test whether hybrid approach is able to correct transport parameters
- Simulations for several parameter sets with varying hydr. conductivities
- Calculate data misfit of "acquired" and "simulated" data for all different data sets
- Data set with lowest misfit holds simulation parameters that are closest to true model









Thanks for your attention! Questions?





Compare-R" method (Wilkinson et al., 2015):

• Uses **resolution matrix** of linearized Gauss-Newton solution for ERT problem; defined as:

$$R = (G^T G + C)^{-1} G^T G$$

 Iterative optimization starts from a set of base measurements -> calculation of change in resolution matrix for each possible new measurement:

$$\Delta R_b = \frac{z}{1 + (g * z)} (g^T - y^T) \qquad \text{where} \quad z = (G_b^T g_b + C)^{-1} g, \qquad y = (G_b^T G_b) z$$

• All additional measurements are **ranked according to improvement** of resolution matrix:

$$F_{CR} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{w_{t,j} \,\Delta R_{b,j}}{R_{c,j}}$$

• Depending on chosen step size, **n measurements** with greatest benefit **are added to base set**



15