OTM-023: Enabling survey to understand structural properties of the sub-surface for infrastructure planning

Enabling survey to understand structural properties of the sub-surface for infrastructure planning

Challenge

| | Challenge ID | OTM:023 | | | | |
|----|--|---|------|------|-------|--------|
| 1 | Title | Enabling survey to understand structural properties of the sub-surface for infrastructure planning | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2 | Theme ID | ON 2.5: Surface Geology Mapping - Engineering geological evaluation | | | | |
| 3 | Originator of Challenge | Onshore: OTM | | | | |
| 4 | Challenge Reviewer / initiator | BP, PEMEX, Sasol | | | | |
| | General description | Overview of Challenge | | | | |
| 5 | What is the nature of the challenge? (What is not adequately addressed at present?) | Knowledge about the surface might well help with planning infrastructure and facilitate seismic surveys which give detailed information relating to the sub- surface etc The identification of the structural properties of the sub-surface e. g. likely bearing capacity, distance to bedrock, is necessary in order to plan the siting of infrastructure required for O&G development. This includes welfare facilities, compounds, rigs, pipelines etc. | | | | |
| 6 | Thematic information requirements | 11. Determine lithology, mineralogy and structural properties of the near surface, | | | | |
| 7 | Nature of the challenge - What effect does this challenge have on operations? | An early indication of where the most suitable locations are sited for development would save operational time for a survey and site investigation crews and also allow more effective decision making earlier in the planning process. To achieve this, we ne | | | | |
| 8 | What do you currently do to address this challenge?/ How is this challenge conventionally addressed? | Base maps (which are often inaccurate), together with on-the-ground surveys. | | | | |
| 9 | What kind of solution do you envisage could address this challenge? | | | | | |
| 10 | What is your view on the capability of technology to meet this need? – are you currently using EO tech? If not, why not? | | | | | |
| | Challenge classification | | | | | |
| 11 | Lifecycle stage | Pre license | Exp. | Dev. | Prod. | Decom. |
| | Score from impact quantification [1] | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | |
| 12 | Climate classification | NOT CLIMATE SPECIFIC | | | | |
| 13 | Geographic context/restrictions | Generic onshore (Unspecified) | | | | |
| 14 | Topographic classification / Offshore classification | Generic onshore (Unspecified) | | | | |
| 15 | Seasonal variations | Any season | | | | |
| 16 | Impact Area | Operational cost reduction | | | | |
| 17 | Technology Urgency | Immediately (0-2 years) | | | | |
| | (How quickly does the user need the solution) | | | | | |
| | Information requirements | | | | | |
| 18 | Update frequency | Not importan | t | | | |
| 19 | Data Currently used | | | | | |
| 20 | Spatial resolution | | | | | |
| 21 | Thematic accuracy | | | | | |
| 22 | Example formats | | | | | |
| 23 | Timeliness | Within a month | | | | |
| 24 | Geographic Extent | reservoir footprint | | | | |
| 25 | Existing standards | | | | | |

[1] Impact quantification scores: 4 - Critical/enabling; 3 - Significant/competitive advantage; 2 - Important but non-essential; 1 - Nice to have; 0 - No impact, need satisfied with existing technology

Relevant products

Content by label

There is no content with the specified labels