

Dynamic Simulation of Gas-lift Wells and Systems

API RECOMMENDED PRACTICE 19G11
FIRST EDITION, OCTOBER 2018



AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

Special Notes

API publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein, or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by the Institute to assure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the Institute makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven, sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

Any manufacturer marking equipment or materials in conformance with the marking requirements of an API standard is solely responsible for complying with all the applicable requirements of that standard. API does not represent, warrant, or guarantee that such products do in fact conform to the applicable API standard.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Publishing Services, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Copyright © 2018 American Petroleum Institute

Foreword

This recommended practice is under the jurisdiction of the API Committee on Standardization of Production Equipment (Committee 19).

This document presents recommended practices for dynamic simulation of gas-lift wells and systems. Included are steady state models, pseudo steady state models, and dynamic numerical models. Other API specifications, API recommended practices, and Gas Processors Suppliers Association (GPSA) documents may be referenced in system design and operation.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this document are as follows.

Shall: As used in a standard, “shall” denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard.

Should: As used in a standard, “should” denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard.

May: As used in a standard, “may” denotes a course of action permissible within the limits of a standard.

Can: As used in a standard, “can” denotes a statement of possibility or capability.

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

This document was produced under API standardization procedures that ensure appropriate notification and participation in the developmental process and is designated as an API standard. Questions concerning the interpretation of the content of this publication or comments and questions concerning the procedures under which this publication was developed should be directed in writing to the Director of Standards, American Petroleum Institute, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein should also be addressed to the director.

Generally, API standards are reviewed and revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn at least every five years. A one-time extension of up to two years may be added to this review cycle. Status of the publication can be ascertained from the API Standards Department, telephone (202) 682-8000. A catalog of API publications and materials is published annually by API, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, standards@api.org.

Contents

	Page
1	Scope 1
2	Normative References 1
3	Terms, Definitions, Abbreviations, and Symbols 1
3.1	Terms and Definitions 1
3.2	Abbreviations 6
3.3	Symbols 7
4	Introduction to Dynamic Simulation of Gas-lift Wells and Systems 7
4.1	General 7
4.2	Definition of Steady-state Models 8
4.3	Definition of Pseudo-steady-state Models 8
4.4	Definition of Multiphase Flow Transient Numerical Simulation Models 9
4.5	Dynamic Simulation Basic Concepts 9
4.6	Two-phase, Three-phase, and Drift-flux Models 10
4.7	Comparison of Steady-state and Dynamic Simulation Techniques 16
4.8	Limitations of Steady-state Flow Evaluation 16
4.9	History of Multiphase Flow Modeling 19
5	Recommendations for Implementing Dynamic Simulation of Gas-lift Wells and Systems 21
5.1	General 21
5.2	Choose Type of Model to Use 21
5.3	Applications, Benefits, and Methods of Implementation of Dynamic Models 22
5.4	Information Required for Dynamic Simulation 26
5.5	Information Provided by Dynamic Simulation 29
5.6	Dynamic Behavior of Gas-lift Wells and Systems 33
	Annex A (informative) Case Histories 38
	Annex B (informative) Applications, Benefits, and Implementation 58
	Annex C (informative) Information Required for Dynamic Simulation Processes 77
	Annex D (informative) Information Provided by Dynamic Simulation 81
	Annex E (informative) Overview of Gas-lift Systems and Applications 104
	Bibliography 118
Figures	
1	Dynamic Simulation Continuity Illustration 12
2	Section Volume and Section Boundaries 13
3	Section Volume and Section Boundaries 13
4	Example Simplified Well Completion Schematic 14
5	Dynamic Simulator Flow Regime Groups 14
6	Well Cleanup with Lost Circulation Material (LCM) Viewer Snapshots Sequence 17
7	Slugging Flow, Front and Tail of the Gas Bubble 18
A.1	Penguins Field Schematic Layout in Relation to the Brent Charlie Platform 39
A.2	Dynamic Model of Well Including Annulus 42
A.3	Profile of Each Well 42
A.4	Comparison of Dynamic Simulator X and Steady-state Simulators Y and Z 43
A.5	Simulation Results for Case 1 44
A.6	Simulation Results for Case 2 45

Contents

Page

A.7	Simulation Results for Case 3	45
A.8	Simulation Results for Case 4	46
A.9	Simulation Results for Case 5	46
A.10	Simulation Results for Case 6	47
A.11	Simulation Results for Case 7	47
A.12	Simulation Results for Case 8	48
A.13	Comparison of Simulator X and Y at 2 MMscf/d Gas Rate	49
A.14	Comparison of Simulator X and Y at 4 MMscf/d Gas Rate	50
A.15	Comparison of Simulator X and Y at 8 MMscf/d Gas Rate	50
A.16	Overview of Slug Frequency and Size vs THP	51
A.17	Rate vs Time for THP of 1 bar and 5.2 bar	51
A.18	Rate vs Time for THP of 13.8 bar and 18.6 bar	52
A.19	Rate vs Time for THP of 20.7 bar and 25.5 bar	52
A.20	Average Daily Liquid Rate vs THP	53
A.21	Effect of Orifice Port Size on Flow Stability	53
A.22	Initial Design Evaluation	54
A.23	Design Evaluation After Redesign	55
A.24	Gas-lift Design	55
A.25	First Unloading Simulation	56
A.26	Unloading Simulation with Revised Design	57
B.1	Example Well Production Trend	59
B.2	Well Loading-up—Dynamic Simulation (Gas in Grey; Liquid in Blue)	60
B.3	Well Dynamic Simulation Output Comparison (Gas in Grey; Liquid in Blue)	61
B.4	Typical Flow History of a Gas Well	62
B.5	Liquid Transport in Vertical Gas Wells	63
B.6	Minimum Gas Rate for Unloading a Well	63
B.7	Liquid Transport in a Vertical Gas Well	64
B.8	Tubing Performance Curve in Relation to Well Deliverability Curve	64
B.9	Illustration of an ICD	66
B.10	Possible Cross-flow Situations During Well Flowing	67
B.11	Possible Cross-flow Situations During Well Shut-in	67
B.12	Effect of Tubing Performance Curve on Liquid Production Rate	68
B.13	Effect of Gas-lift Rate on Liquid Production Rate	68
B.14	Integrated Technical Operating Information Management System	75
B.15	Integrated Simulators Under a Unified Software Environment	76
D.1	Vertical Well Profile	83
D.2	Horizontal Well Profile	83
D.3	Multilateral Well Completions	84
D.4	Vertical Well Profile (Y = Depth; X = Deviation from Vertical)	85
D.5	Illustration of Common Vertical and Horizontal Multiphase Flow Patterns	86
D.6	Schematic of Well/Flowline Common Geometries	86
D.7	Effect of Critical Velocity in Horizontal/Inclined Flow	87
D.8	Inside Diameter Scale Deposits	87
D.9	Dual-pocket GLM Cutaway with Scale	87
D.10	Changes in Flow Patterns in a Vertical Well with Pressures and Temperatures	89
D.11	Flow Pattern Map for Vertical Upward Flow	89
D.12	Well Production Rate (Black Dots) is in the Gravity-dominated Area, Left of the Minimum of the Intake Pressure Curve (IPC)	90
D.13	Well Trajectory Can Trigger Terrain Slugs	91

Contents

Page

D.14 Illustrations of Riser-induced Slugging	91
D.15 Example P, T, and Water Condensation Rate Values Along the Flowline Profile.....	92
D.16 Hydrates P-T Curve—EOS: PR78 Peneloux.....	94
D.17 Hydrate Margin in Riser vs Time During Well Kickoff— 60 MMscfd, 15 Water-Gas Ratio, Profile Data (°C)—Riser Length (m) Time (min)9.....	94
D.18 Hydrate Dissociation Curves with MeOH Inhibition (0 % to 60 %)	95
D.19 Hydrate Inhibition Curves with the Overlaps of the Worst-case P-T Trends from Riser Profile Plots	95
D.20 Tracking MeOH Injection and Hydrates Potential	96
D.21 Thornhill-Craver Equation and VPC Model Valve Performance Comparison	99
D.22 Thornhill-Craver Equation and VPC Model Orifice Performance Comparison	100
D.23 VPC Model Performance Comparison with Different Load Rates	100
D.24 Stem Travel Valve Performance Comparison	101
D.25 Valve Size Performance Comparison	101
D.26 Comparison of Valve Performance with and Without a Choke	103
E.1 Continuous Gas-lift Production Processes	104
E.2 Schematic of Dual Gas-lift Installation	106
E.3 Intermittent Lift Cycle	109
E.4 Plunger Lift with Gas-lift System.....	111
E.5 Schematic of an Auto Gas-lift Well	113

Tables

1 Applications of Dynamic Simulation.....	11
2 Most Popular Empirical and Mechanistic Multiphase Flow Correlations.....	20
A.1 Details of Each Case.....	43
A.2 Comparison of Simulators X and Y for Cases 1, 3, 5, and 7 at 0 % Water Cut.....	44
A.3 Comparison of Simulator X and Y for Case 5 at 95 % Water Cut.....	48

Dynamic Simulation of Gas-lift Wells and Systems

1 Scope

This recommended practice (RP) provides guidance and background for the application and use of dynamic simulation of gas-lift wells and their related systems. Discussion is included for use of steady-state, “pseudo” steady-state, and dynamic numerical models. Also presented are guidelines to facilitate the application of these techniques to optimize well/system integrity, operations, life cycle design, and production. Additionally, a range of artificial lift and natural flowing systems and topics (e.g. gas well liquid loading) are addressed. The dynamic simulation recommendations (e.g. stable flow, hydrates, waxes, corrosion, liquid loading, and complex wells) can be implemented in other production systems (e.g. natural flowing wells).

This RP is also designated for managers, production technologists, reservoir engineers, facilities engineers, production engineers, well testing engineers, well analysts, operators, and researchers who want to gain a general understanding of dynamic simulation, areas of application, added values, and benefits. The contents compare transient vs steady-state techniques and provide readers with when and how each technique may be effectively applied.

Not included are technical requirements for the hardware of the dynamic simulation system, the specifics of the system calculations, the responses to the output of the dynamic simulation, data output, and specifics of what actions are required after the provided data is considered.

An extensive bibliography is provided of documents for additional information on the topics included.

2 Normative References

There are no normative references in this document.

3 Terms, Definitions, Abbreviations, and Symbols

3.1 Terms and Definitions

For the purposes of this document, the following terms and definitions apply.

3.1.1

beaning-up

The process of increasing the wellhead choke size to adjust the flow rate for adjustable choke.

NOTE For fixed chokes, this is the same process, excluding shutdown periods.

3.1.2

black oil correlation

Assumes that the reservoir fluids consist of three phases: oil, water, and gas.

NOTE These are defined with a minimum of information [specific gravity, gas-oil ratio (GOR), and water cut], with gas dissolving in oil and oil vaporizing in gas. Water is assumed to be inert. Use correlations to determine the fluid properties at different pressures and temperatures (P-T).

3.1.3

boundary conditions

Fluid type, flow rate, pressure, and temperature values assigned to the selected model boundaries (inputs, outputs, and surrounding environment of the model) used in solving the differential equations that apply to dynamic simulation.