

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	viii

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 What Is Amplitude Versus Offset/Angle (AVO/AVA).....	3
1.2.1 Seismic Energy Portioning at Boundaries.....	4
1.2.2 Mechanics Of Quantitative Avo Analysis.....	6
1.3 Theory Of AVO/AVA.....	7
1.4 Application Of AVO/AVA.....	8
1.5 Problem Statement.....	10
1.6 Justification Of The Thesis.....	11
1.7 Research Objectives.....	12

CHAPTER 2

2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Principles Of AVO/AVA.....	15
2.3 Reflection Coefficients Of An Interface.....	21
2.4 Approximation To The Knott And Zoeppritz Equations.....	24
2.4.1 Linear Approximation Of Zoeppritz's Equation.....	24
2.4.2 Reflection Coefficient Based On Zoeppritz's Equation.....	25
2.5 Constitutive Relations Of A Porous Media.....	27
2.6 Constitutive Relation.....	28
2.7 Gassman Fluid Substitution.....	29
2.7.1 Gassmann's Equations.....	30
2.7.2 Fluid Properties.....	31
2.7.3 Frame Properties.....	36
2.7.4 Matrix Properties.....	37

CHAPTER 3

3.1 Introduction.....	39
3.2 What Are Seismic Data.....	41
3.2.1 Background Of The Invention.....	42
3.3 Classification Of AVO.....	44
3.4 Methods Of Acquiring And Processing Seismic Data.....	47
3.4.1 Data Acquisition.....	50
3.4.2 Multiple Shotpoints.....	50
3.4.3 Static Correction.....	52

3.4.4 Stacking (Velocity Analysis, NMO/DMO).....	53
3.4.5 Migration.....	55
3.4.6 Interpretation.....	56
3.5 Research Methodology.....	58

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 Introduction.....	62
4.2 Data Analysis.....	62
4.3 Results.....	69
4.4 Diagrams Of Different Avo Plots.....	69
4.4.1 Figures of constant Poisson ratios.....	69
4.4.2 Figures Showing Reduction In Poisson Ratio Across The Interface.....	72
4.4.3 Figures Showing Increment In Poisson Ratio Across The Interface.....	75
4.5 Discussion Of Results.....	77
4.6 Classification Of The Avo Plots.....	79

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 Summary And Conclusions.....	81
5.2 Recommendation.....	82
References.....	83

List of Tables

Table.1 showing the steps of data acquisition and processing.49

Table. 2a. Parameters of some layers for five Zoeppritz models for gas-sand structures. The parameter of the top layer is kept constant with a constant Poisson’s ratio of 0.3 across the interface.....63

Table. 2b. Parameters of some layers for five Zoeppritz models for gas-sand structures. The parameter of the top layer is kept constant with constant Poisson ratio of 0.2 across the interface.....64

Table. 3a. Parameters of some layers for five Zoeppritz models for gas-sand structures. The parameter of the top layer is kept constant with a reduction of Poisson’s ratio across the interface from 0.4 to 0.2.....65

Table. 3b. Parameters of some layers for five Zoeppritz models for gas-sand structures. The parameter of the top layer is kept constant with a reduction of Poisson’s ratio across the interface from 0.3 to 0.2.....66

Table. 4a. Parameters of some layers for five Zoeppritz models for gas-sand structures. The parameter of the top layer is kept constant with an increase of Poisson’s ratio across the interface from 0.2 to 0.4.....67

Table.4b. Parameters of some layers for five Zoeppritz models for gas-sand structures.. The parameter of the top layer is kept constant with a reduction of Poisson’s ratio across the interface from 0.2 to 0.3.....68

List of Figures

Fig 1: A seismic wavefront hitting a reflector.....	5
Fig 2. Reflection and transmission at an interface between two infinite elastic half-spaces for an incident P-wave.....	16
Fig. 3 Plot of P-wave reflection coefficient versus angle of incidence for constant Poisson's ratio of 0.2 and 0.3.....	22
Fig 4 . Plot of P-wave reflection coefficient versus angle of incidence for a reduction in Poisson's ratios across an interface.....	23
Fig 5. Plot of P-wave reflection coefficient versus angle of incidence for a increase in Poisson's ratios across an interface.....	24
Fig. 6 The seismic experiment.....	26
Fig. 7. The derivation of the intercept stack and gradient section.....	46
Fig. 8. Shot-detector configurations used in multichannel seismic reflection profiling, (a) Split spread, or straddle spread, (b) Single-ended or on ended spread.....	50
Fig.9. Data acquisition for reflection seismic.....	51
Fig.10. Shows an example of the principle of the common midpoint over an interface.	52
Fig. 11. Showing the Datum Static Terminologies.....	53
Fig.12. Shows source-receiver layout and corresponding ray paths for common point spread.....	54
Fig. 13. shows both corrected (on the left) and uncorrected (on the right) traces.....	54
Fig.14... shows a stacked section.....	55
Fig. 15. shows the Post stacked migrated section.	56

Fig.16. showing the facial changes from bedding changes.....	57
Fig. 17. Three layer hypothetical gas-sand model.....	59
Fig. 17a. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model A given in Table 2a and 2b for constant Poisson ratio of 0.2 and 0.3 with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	69
Fig 17b. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model B given in Table 2a and 2b for constant Poisson ratio of 0.2 and 0.3 with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	70
Fig. 17c. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model C given in Table 2a and 2b for constant Poisson ratio of 0.2 and 0.3 with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	70
Fig 17d. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model D given in Table 2a and 2b for constant Poisson ratio of 0.2 and 0.3 with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	71
Fig. 18a. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model F given in Table 3a and 3b for decreasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	72
Fig. 18b. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model G given in Table 3a and 3b for decreasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	73
Fig 18c. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model H given in Table 3a and 3b for decreasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....	73

Fig 18d. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model F given in Table 3a and 3b for decreasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....74

Fig 19a. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model K given in Table 4a and 4b for increasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....75

Fig 19b. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model K given in Table 4a and 4b for increasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....76

Fig 19c. P-wave reflection coefficient versus incident angle for model K given in Table 3a and 3b for increasing Poisson ratio with varying values of the P-wave velocity contrast for each of the model across the interface.....76